## INITIAL REPRESENTATIONS OBJECTING TO THE PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT OF PLÉMONT HOLIDAY VILLAGE

REFERENCE	NAME/PARISH	REPRESENTATION
1PIO	Valentine Aitken, St Helier	My belief is that the area should be bought from Mr Hemmings and returned to nature with absolutely no buildings on the land whatsoever. Some footpaths should be created that would not compromise the indigenous flora and fauna so that the area can be enjoyed by the public. Mr Hemmings should be obliged to remove the buildings that are on the land on health and safety grounds as they are a in hazardous condition.
2PIO	D Austin, St Brelade	On the face of it, the current proposal to 'develop' the Plemont site, such that two thirds is returned to nature, might even seem reasonable. But it will inevitably create a precedent and make future violations of even more unspoilt areas that much more difficult, if not utterly impossible, to refuse. However as I believe the present owner is a substantial multimillionaire, lives in the Island and presumably enjoys, as we do, those parts of the Island as yet untouched by human hand, would it not be possible to suggest that he may even consider gifting this area back to the Island in his name? Would it be too much to hope that he may indeed have already decided upon such a course? Should that be the case then he would most certainly incur the gratitude and goodwill of a majority of Islanders, thereby bringing this whole sorry business to the very best possible conclusion. However, even if such a desirable outcome does not occur, should it not now be resolved that never again in future years shall parts of this Island be sold off to private developers for commercial gain? Surely some form of 'lease', instead of outright sale, should become the accepted way of negotiating this type of commerce. Unless something on these lines can be arranged this sort of situation, whereby parts of the Island are effectively held to ransom by private individuals, will simply recur with the tax payer eventually having to foot the bill in order to restore something that should never, in the first place, have had the potential to become contentious.
3PIO	Andrew Averty, St John	There are valid arguments for and against the re-development of Plemont, but in this case, there is an overwhelming groundswell of opinion among the population that this area should be returned to nature. The local people have had enough of developers pillaging the Island for their own enrichment, at the expense of our quality of life. It is time that we stood up to them and said: "Enough is enough. Go forth and multiply elsewhere".
4PIO	Fleur Benest, Trinity	There is a presumption against development in environmentally sensitive areas. The birth right of the Island is its natural beauty which it ought to take pride in safeguarding for the enjoyment of all its residents. Research, as well as common sense, concludes that wild places are essential for well-being. Access to unspoilt beauty and tranquillity supports physical and mental health, resulting in fewer demands being made on medical services. As more and more people are required to live

		inside development envelopes in small quarters so that the countryside is protected, it is clearly not in the spirit of planning provision that the protection of the countryside should be disregarded to enhance the wealth of particular individuals. It is right that the owner should be compensated for the land, but not for the fantasy profits he may have imagined. It is not the case that this parcel of land represents the only asset of an otherwise impecunious person. Jersey derives positive publicity from Durrell's connection with the Island. Durrell campaigns internationally for the protection of endangered species, and the habitats on which they depend. We criticise other countries for allowing the desecration of limited environments for financial reward. It would be hypocritical of the Island to permit in its jurisdiction the kind of activity that attracts condemnation when it occurs in the developing world. The States has a duty to act in the interests of the majority. The natural assets of the Island should not be sacrificed so that the already well-off should be able to add to the benefits they have accrued. Preserve the loveliness of the Island for the people of the Island and leave a legacy for all that all may be proud of.
5PIO	James Averty, St John	My thoughts/ ideas for Plemont. Being a runner I pass the headland many times each year. To me it does not lend itself to a large housing development . I would : Buy the site. Install 1 large or three medium wind turbines. Create ties with a good Eco organisation and build an eco/science centre. Tie up with a top University and provide a place to investigate tidal power. Centre would include a top class science/eco area for local families and tourists.
6PIO	Senator Sir Philip Bailhache	<ol> <li>I am a senator in the States of Jersey and have given notice of my intention to lodge a report and proposition seeking the approval of the Assembly to the acquisition, by compulsory purchase if need be, of the land at Plémont owned by Plémont Estates Ltd ("the owner"). The Assembly rejected a similar proposition on January 2010 but I believe that the newly elected Assembly will agree to acquire the land.</li> <li>I have endeavoured, unsuccessfully, to obtain the agreement of the owner to discuss the possible acquisition by the States, with a view to negotiating a fair and proper price. The latest letter from the owner indicates that it would be premature to meet me until the outcome of the Public Inquiry is known.</li> <li>My submission is that the Inspector should recommend that the application by the owner be rejected. The proposed development site is in a prominent position in the Green Zone and all the relevant policies in the Island Plan seem to me to militate against planning permission being granted. Not only is the development site in the Green Zone, but it is also on an exposed and beautiful part of Jersey's north coast. Article 2 (2) (d) of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 provides that one of the purposes of the Law is "to ensure that the coast of Jersey is kept in its natural state". The broad purpose of the Law is "to conserve, protect and improve [my emphasis] Jersey's natural beauty". These provisions of the 2002 Law reflect similar provisions</li> </ol>

r	
	<ul> <li>in the Island Planning (Jersey) Law 1964, the Preservation of Amenities (Jersey) Law 1952, and earlier triennial regulations that introduced planning controls in 1947. In short, ever since planning controls came into force in Jersey, one of the principal aims has been to protect the Island's magnificent coastline. With only rare exceptions, that aim has been achieved to great public benefit.</li> <li>4. It has been suggested to me by the owner that there is some element of philanthropy involved in its plans in the sense that it is proposed to give a proportion of the site to the States free of charge once planning permission has been granted. This seems to me disingenuous. No "gift" will be made unless planning permission for a major residential development is granted. This is, and always has been, a speculative development application based upon a speculative acquisition. The purpose is entirely commercial – i.e. to make a much profit as possible. No weight should be placed upon any alleged philanthropic motive.</li> <li>5. The application is founded upon the contention that there would be a substantial planning gain if development were permitted in the sense that the ruins of the former holiday camp would be removed. The owner appears to have persuaded planning officials of the merits of this argument. In my submission the officials were mistaken. Whatever the architectural merits of the proposed development in itself, the construction of 28 houses on this land at Plémont would be as disastrous in environmental, ecological and planning terms as the continuing existence of the crumbling eyesore that the owner has permitted to remain in place for more than a decade. It would have a severely adverse visual effect upon the landscape by transforming an essentially wild area of Jersey into a domesticated suburban implant bearing no relationship to its surroundings and, by reason of its three separate parts, giving no impression of organic development. The reasons given by the previous Planning Minister for</li></ul>
	crowded Island, it is now recognized that there are a number of stakeholders in the planning

		<ul> <li>the Royal Court in subsequent cases, and represents the law of the Island.</li> <li>7. Finally, in my submission there is no planning gain from the demolition of the existing former holiday camp (however desirable that might be) because the tourism use has been abandoned. Although the facts of the case were rather different, the Royal Court has recently held in <i>Maletroit v Minister for Planning and Environment</i> [2012] JRC 027A that useful guidance could be found from decisions of the English courts on abandonment of a use. Whether or not an intention to abandon a use can be inferred is a matter for objective appraisal. In my submission there can be little doubt that the owner has never intended to use the Plémont land for tourism purposes. It was always the owner's intention to try to persuade the planning authority that some form of residential development should be permitted. It was, as I have stated, a speculative acquisition for that purpose. The former holiday camp has not been used for tourism purposes for at least 12 years. It is true that an application for outline planning permission was made in November 2009 for permission to construct 46 two bedroom and 27 three bedroom self-catering units but that application was refused and not pursued. Taken in the round, there is no doubt that the tourism use has been abandoned.</li> </ul>
		<ol> <li>I respectfully request that I be permitted to make oral submissions in support of these outline contentions when the hearing takes place on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2012.</li> </ol>
7PIO	Mrs J Baker, Grouville	I am completely opposed to any development of Plemont. There has been too much development already, the island will soon look like a concrete jungle if we do not take a stand and say enough is enough. Whilst I know more affordable housing is required, it is hardly likely ordinary islanders will be able to purchase the houses the developers wish to build at Plemont. So why should we sacrifice Plemont to make way for the wealthy to live in? Plemont should be returned to nature for future generations, both islanders and visitors, to enjoy whist we have this opportunity.
8PIO	Anne Barnes, St Brelade	As a senior citizen, who has lived here all my life, apart from the war years and service commitments. I am really concerned that Plemont will be given permission to build on the land. Apart from some dreadful building such as Portlet, Jersey has so far resisted the temptation to build non stop around our coastline. Anyone that has been to the Cayman Islands will know what I mean, there is hardly a yard between the buildings along the coast. If we allow Plemont to be built on whats next? Hotels, expensive housing etc.all along the north coast. I love my Jersey and want it to stay as lovely as it is now for my children and grand- children. However there will be little chance of that once permission is given for building at Plemont. Please please do NOT give Plemont planning permission for building. Instead start an Island wide appeal to raise the money to buy the land for Future generations to enjoy.
9PIO	Mark & Margaret Baylem St Lawrence	We wish to state our opinion that no development should take place on the site of the Holiday Village at Plemont. Anyone wishing to know why should visit Portelet. Jersey is a small overcrowded island and the States should be protecting our remaining unspoilt areas of which Plemont is potentially the best. If this requires the States of Jersey to purchase the land, perhaps in

		conjunction with the National Trust then so be it. Perhaps this could in part compensate for what the planning department allowed to happen at Portelet. The land could then be returned to its natural state and protected for the enjoyment of wildlife, islanders and visitors, surely a worthwhile objective. These may be difficult times financially, but we are still a relatively wealthy community and should use some of this wealth to protect our natural environment, which is after all also an asset, for the future. Once this land has been developed residentially, there is no going back and a wonderful opportunity has been lost. On no account should planning permission be granted.
10PIO	Rosemary Bett, St Brelade	This part of the north coast should be cleared of the ruins of the holiday camp so that the whole area can be returned to nature and rejoin the magnificent north coast park. A group of 24-30 houses built there would utterly destroy the natural state of the area, even given that some of the land would be spared and left untouched. In a few years more houses would be added and the built ones would be enlarged and altered. This always happens in new developments, and soon a whole village would have developed. People have pets and cars and live lives which would involve far more than just the ground plan of their properties, however environmentally friendly and caring they may be. Our North Coast Path is one of the treasures of Jersey. It is much used and loved, especially because for most of its length there is no intrusion of houses or buildings. A large part of it is already declared a place to be kept unspoilt by any intrusion. It is tragic that the States did not have the wisdom to buy the Plemont headland years ago, instead of letting developers in. Once anything at all is built on any of this area, the coastal path has lost its integrity. Do not, I beg you, allow the projected building to take place. £14,000,000 is a lot of money, but the security of the area for posterity would be beyond price.
11PIO	David Bisson, St Ouen	I would like to express my opinion on as to whether the Plemont site should be developed along the lines of the latest planning application. I strongly oppose any development of the site the current holiday camp should be demolished and the land returned back to its natural state. This Island has precious few areas of such natural beauty much of our coastline has been given over to developers who have built luxury properties the likes of which the average Jersey person could only dream of.
12PIO	Peter Bisson, St Saviour	I believe that the application for housing development on the Plemont Holiday Village site should be rejected, the present derelict buildings removed and the whole site returned to nature. Even though the current development proposals have been carefully designed and would leave a substantial area of open land, any development at all on this site will involve a degree of human intrusion on the headland which cannot now be justified. The location is simply not appropriate for housing, any more than Noirmont or Les Landes would be. Though I appreciate that this case has to be dealt with under the Planning Law as it stands, I believe that the law should be amended to empower the Minister, whenever buildings on a site have become derelict, to order them to be removed and the site returned to nature or agricultural use as the case may be, at the expense of the owner. Any further application for development would then have to be made <i>ab initio</i> on the basis of current planning considerations, without regard to whether there were buildings there before.

13PIO	Council for the Protection of Jersey's Heritage	SEE ANNEX 1
14PIO	Jurat Collette Crill, St Brelade	We have a unique opportunity, with the Plemont Headland, to preserve a glorious piece of our natural heritage for the benefit of future generations of Jersey people. The States should grasp this chance with both hands, and make the purchase, for the benefit of all. True islanders will applaud such vision and foresight.
15PIO	Andrew Blake, St Helier	I believe it should be returned to its natural environment. Especially after the fiasco with the Portlet !
16PIO	Charles Blampied, St Helier	it's my personal view that the site should not be built on and the STATES should buy it and return it to its natural state the views that it be developed by private enterprise or the STATES to own it are quite valid as a political view either state control or private enterprise I believe the states should buy it by negotiation before it's too late before it's lost for ever. it could always be sold some time in the future if it was in the ISLANDS interest.
17PIO	John Boulton, St Brelade	The development proposed at Plemont will not rival in shock that vast, staggering disfigurement forced on to Portelet Bay last year. However, it is a sensitive site in the eyes of Jersey people and in the potential to link up the headland flora and flora on each side. The developer's suggested green area left on the seaward side will just be a sterile sop to protesters. It may seem a luxury to induce the owner to desist in his proposal with a lot of public money, the reasons ostensibly being that money could be better spent in schooling, the economy, health etc. There will never be a time when there is so much money about that the above arguments can't always be rolled out. Economies, health care, schooling have peaks and troughs constantly and to 'fix' one of these for a short time with that money is false economy. An undeveloped Plemont will be a gratefully received return to nature for most islanders and their descendants in perpetuity. The everyday needs of finance will continue day in day out and will not be much influenced by a grant from the States towards the protection of Plemont, hopefully bolstered by contributions from sympathetic sources. I do not feel any obligation to the owner. He should be offered a sum - not some huge arbitrary figure for a building site- but the profit he might be expected to make on the site after paying for all the building. Even less important should be the considerations of people who might live there. Jersey is awash with luxury developments waiting for clients. I hope the local people in Plemont will be vociferous in their objections. I live the other side of the island but still covet Jersey's coastline. People on the North coast probably hoped those near Portelet would be vociferous in objecting to the Dandara development – we failed horribly. I hope it won't happen again.
18PIO	Mrs Jennifer Bratch, St Mary	Please do not allow houses to be built on the Plemont headland. It should be bought by the States to be returned to nature for the future generations of the island.
19PIO	Mrs M Friswell, Trinity	Last week my friend & I walked from St Aubins around the coastline to Beauport. We were truly dismayed as Portelet came into sight - a true Jersey Costa Brava - what must it look like to visitors approaching by ferry? Please, please do not allow a development of any size or description to take

		place at Plemont. I know we always need more housing & I know many people on the island have never visited Plemont but for the sake of future generations we must preserve our wonderful North Coast. Also, as our island can offer fewer and fewer tourist attractions (eg Fantastic Tropical Gardens gone, Living Legend looking to close) together with a natural decline in the traditional bucket & spade holiday, our tourism industry will rely more heavily on those who come to enjoy the natural beauty of the island. This must be preserved. Please do not allow development at Plemont.
20PIO	Mr Paul Bratch, St Mary	I'm writing to voice my opposition to the development of the Plemont site. It is my strong view that it should be returned to nature. Unless we stop building in the countryside now then the whole Island will eventually be consumed!
22PIO	Sir Nigel Broomfield, Trinity	Letter to the Jersey Evening Post, July 2012 The Minister for Environment and Planning recently invited Islanders to express their views on the merits or otherwise of the planning applications involve a balance between the property rights of the private owner and the public interests of the community in which the development is planned. In this case the application concerns a unique area of Jersey's coast line and deserves to be given the most serious consideration. It is important to remember that when the holiday village at Plemont was constructed the custom was for the holiday makers to stay on the site and use the facilities provided. The small road which connected the Plemont village to the rest of the island was perfectly adequate. With 28 luxury houses planned and a probable count of 56 cars let alone tradesmen, visitors and others it will not be long before the road is criticised as dangerous and a wider one demanded. But that is only one aspect of a development whose architects have done a good deal to stress the landscape and other advantages of their new plans over those which have gone before. Let us first take the interests of the owner of the site. I do not believe that Mr Hemmings and his family will suffer a major drop in their living standards if the project does not go ahead. Then there are the interests of those who might buy the houses. One glance at the estate agents brochures in Jersey shows that there is no lack of luxury homes of £ 1 million or more for such people to buy. Admittedly their views might not be so spectacular, although some are. But if they wanted to admire the view they could always take a walk at Plemont. If we turn to the interests of the community I believe the arguments lie overwhelmingly on the side of not allowing this development to go ahead. Since the Pontins holiday village at Plemont was built in the 1960's, the population of Jersey has increased considerably and although the council of Ministers is trying hard to limit future immigration it is difficult to see h

		can walk in unspoiled countryside have diminished considerably. The demonstration by thousands
		of Islanders last year (see Mr Tomkins letter of 29 June) showed what value very many people
		placed on retaining as much of their unique coastline as possible. Surely we can learn from the
		development of Portlet. If Plemont is developed as envisaged it will only be a matter of time before
		another scheme is put forward to 'in-fill' a bit more of the coastline. In my personal view an
		equitable way forward would the proposal by Sir Philip Bailhache for the States to buy the property
		and return it to its natural state for future generations to enjoy. Some will argue that at a time when
		finances are under particular strain we cannot afford gestures like this which will cost several million
		pounds. I do not agree. At the heart of this decision lies the problem which is convulsing the
		financial world – favouring the short term gains of the few against the long term losses of the many.
		Unless we make a confident statement of this sort about our future we will be prejudicing
		irreversibly something which gives this island its unique character. I hope that we will give
		generously to the fund set up by the National Trust and that the States will agree to make up the
		balance after negotiating fairly with Mr Hemming's company. The original wooden holiday camp
		built at Plemont in the 1920's was called the Jubilee Camp. In this Jubilee Year can we not give a
		lasting gift to future generations in our Island.
23PIO	Mrs C Burgess, St Brelade	I have lived in Jersey almost all my 62 years and have 2 sons preparing to have children of their
20110		own. It is a beautiful Island and its jewels are often to be found on its coast. These areas are rapidly
		being taken over and developed for the benefit of a few individuals taking them out of the access to
		other islanders not to mention the change of outlook and appearance. Plemont is yet another area
		of natural beauty that cannot/must not be lost in this way, whilst we have a chance to save it. Once
		gone it's gone forever. Our family have supported the plan to save it since the beginning. St
		Brelade's Bay is falling to the developers money and Portelet is ruined already. What will I tell my
		grandchildren in 20 years time when the cliffs are lined with luxury houses and large glass and steel
		dwellings. Like my favourite character in the film 'Love Actually' The time has come to say 'Enough'!
		We have had the line in the sand. We have made our feelings known. Now is the time for our political masters to listen for once. Please help us to save our Island.
24PIO	Fiona Cassels-Brown, St Ouen	The Pontins site should be reclaimed as land and allowed to return to nature.
25PIO	Nancy Casey, St Ouen	This is the comment I would like to be included in the Inquiry for the proposed development of the
		Plemont Headland. "From the heart - please return the Headland to its natural state, so that we, and the generations that follow us may enjoy the sheer beauty of our wonderful North Coast. A
		huge NO to any development. The States must buy the land on our behalf. If the States members
		cannot see the importance of acting against the Developers on this issue they should be ashamed
		to be standing as our elected representatives."
L		

26PIO	Andy Chadd, St Ouen	I moved to Jersey some 21 years ago and have always taken great delight in walking the coastal footpaths. The most naturally beautiful section being from Devils Hole to Grosnez, spoilt by the huge white carbuncle that is the ruins of the Plemont Holiday Village. Why the site has been left to fall into derelict and (and if the signs on the fencing are to be believed) dangerous condition is beyond belief. The headland should be purchased and turned back to nature without further discussion. The building trades are complaining of no work and every day in the JEP we see people looking for work. How about we use some of the fiscal stimulus fund to put the building trade and the unemployed together and they can demolish the buildings. The site owner, with his professed green intentions, surely can't complain if it was removed, and we would all get the chance to see what the headland looks like without the ruins, I am afraid that the building is being left in place so we will all eventually accept anything that is better than the pile of rubbish that is currently there. Please get rid of that horrible carbuncle on our coastline without further dithering, The States should be ashamed that they haven't acted, especially after the 'Line in the Sand' protest.
27PIO	R & Jane Churchill Blackie St Clement	My wife and I are staying with my sister in Utah and are about to visit the natural beauties of the Grand Canyon and Monument Valley. I understand that the public are invited to send you their comments about Plémont by Friday of this week. Over thirty years ago I journeyed through Yosemite and was struck by its grandeur and natural beauty. Yosemite was one of the areas of the United States that convinced the great Theodore Roosevelt of the absolute and essential need to conserve and preserve areas of natural beauty within the United States. There are many quotations that I could set down, but perhaps the one that sums up his views best is this:"We have fallen heirs to the most glorious heritage a people ever received, and each one must do his part if we wish to show that the nation is worthy of its good fortune." Plémont is not Yosemite or the Grand Canyon or Monument Valley, but it is, potentially, an area of great natural beauty of the kind that is now too rarely found in Jersey. It is rough and rugged and of a piece with so much of the North Coast and, without question, part of Jersey's "most glorious heritage". We now have a unique opportunity to return it to its natural state. I have no doubt that twenty-eight luxury homes will be a very heaven to their owners and the views they afford matchless, but once those houses are built something will be lost forever or at least for many generations. There are plenty of other places in Jersey where luxury homes could be built without the surrounding landscape suffering, but the North Coast is one of those havens where residents and visitors alike can go to savour Nature in all its bucolic beauty. The acquisition of Plémont by the public is so important to the spiritual well-being of the Island, that it is something that cannot be allowed to fail. We who live in the Island now are but trustees for future generations. When P. G. Wodehouse's idyllic world can never stale. He will continue to release future generations from captivity that may be more irksome

		than our own". Even in the thirty-three years that I have lived in Jersey there have been tremendous changes to the landscape. If I look across the Channel to Exeter where I was brought up, I find that the lanes and fields through which my mother and I walked sixty years ago have long since disappeared beneath tarmacadam and bricks and mortar. Those houses and much of what has grown up in Jersey are essential housing necessary to cater for the needs consequent upon the growth in the population. No such argument can be advanced in favour of the proposed development at Plémont. Luxury homes are an indulgence that no compromise solution, with its concomitant changes to the environment and infrastructure relating to increased traffic, can justify. All of this land should be in public ownership so that it might be enjoyed by present and future generations as a release from the "irksome captivity" of which Mr. Waugh spoke half a century ago. We are therefore strongly of opinion that the chance to acquire Plémont for the common weal should be grasped firmly by the States. Such a golden opportunity to preserve the uniqueness of Jersey's natural beauty will not occur again.
28PI0	Paul Clements, St Helier	I'd like you to record my view on the future use for the existing derelict holiday camp at Plemont. Plemont is a strategic site on the North headland, which is the natural habitat for many indigenous and migrant species. It is also a wonderful place to relax and have a picnic. At present the site is a mess and any further development would be an injustice to this beautiful natural spot. I would strongly recommend the States of Jersey purchase this land, at a reasonable price and return the area back to nature or a preservation area, which can be enjoyed by everyone.
29PIO	Rosemary Clements, St Helier	I wish to object most strongly to the above application to develop Plemont Headland. I urge you to think most carefully about any development as once built on, can NEVER be returned to nature. Please do not make the same mistakes as previous committees have done ie "The Portelet Development". I stood in the Line in the Sand with my grandchildren and since then have noticed that our beautiful coastline is still being developed. You can make a difference and you will be well remembered for generations to come for turning down this application. I live in hope and look forward to walking around Plemont Headland with only the birds for company.
30PIO	Alex Cole, St Brelade	The Government should purchase the land and return it to its natural state. If consenting to development in 1946 was deemed necessary it is not now, and we have a last chance to redeem this beautiful headland for the public for ever. If the politicians do nothing else in their careers but purchase this land, they will always know they have left a permanent gift to the people.
31PIO	Jane Collins, St Saviour	I wish to make known my strong opposition to any development on the Plemont headland. Who will benefit by the desecration of the area but Mr Hemmings and those who dwell in the houses, while jersey as a whole will have another coastal area ruined for ever. Please please stop these wealthy immigrants from making money out of our lovely Island. It wouldn't be long before the householders would start putting up barriers like Mr Mansell at Beauport.

32PIO	Deborah Colman, London	I have been a visitor to Jersey every year for more than 20 years, having married a Jersey-born man, and have introduced my children to the island who have also come to love it. The almost completely unspoilt north coast is one of the main attractions and Plemont is definitely our favourite beach. We hate the ugly Pontins site and would love to see it returned to nature. The idea that it could be replaced with a housing development is profoundly depressing. Even one house would be bad but 28 houses is a conurbation that would inevitably grow and would require infrastructure. There would be irresistible pressure, once started, to carry on growing. The lane would be clogged, residents would be irritated by the tourist traffic and there would be pressure for widening the lane. I would urge you to resist this development and return the site to nature. There are surely other areas in Jersey, already developed, that are better suited for new housing development. There are still parts of Jersey that are unspoilt and represent an asset for tourism, for islanders who truly love the island and for future generations who will fall in love with Jersey's natural beauty. Please support the conservation of beautiful Plemont and the north coast for all of us, not just the developers and potential residents
33PIO	Geoff Compton, St Brelade	Jersey's coastline is one of the Island's genuine natural marvels. Returning Plemont to nature would undoubtedly reinforce its splendour. It would also underline Jersey's commitment to its natural heritage.
34PIO	Terry Connor, St Clement	It has now become urgent that Plemont should be Purchased (or protected) for the Public good & enjoyment, & not to just further line the already bulging wallet of some uncaring millionaire & builder before those Zombies @ Planning again invite some five eyed Yahoo over to design even more unimaginative frilly boxes to rape yet another headland (or Bay).
35PIO	Mrs G M Coutanche, St Brelade	For over 30 years I have walked and climbed round the cliffs and paths over the Plemont Bay area. It would be tragic to build houses anywhere near the cliffs – houses mean domestic pets – cats kill wildlife. Get rid of the eyesore of the Holiday Village ruins by all means and return the land to nature. Build inland, if you must, but nowhere near the cliffs – it's a very special and valuable area.
36PIO	Jean-Pierre Cremer, St Peter	We have spent many many happy holidays on the beautiful Island of Jersey. Thanks to the wisdom of the National Trust for Jersey the North Coast has remained beautiful, wild and unique in Europe. We sincerely hope that the Plemont headland will be allowed to regain its original "grandeur".
37PIO	Kevin & Christine Cronin St Ouen	The development on the brown-field site at Plemont should not be allowed as it was bought quite a time after the Pontins holiday camp site (as maybe they knew the original Pontins holiday camp would never be allowed to be developed) also they could not have built 26 houses on its footprint. It should be returned to nature and not built on.
38PIO	Parish of St Ouen	SEE ANNEX 2
39PIO	Sue Curtis & Michael Goulborn St Lawrence	I am writing in support of the Plemont site reverting back to to its natural state and to remove the ugly eyesore that is Plemont holiday village. There are not many coastal areas of Jersey that have

		not been permanently ruined by housing developments that are unsympathetic to their landscape and surroundings. This is a chance to restore this area of outstanding natural beauty to its original state. This would benefit the residents of Jersey for the future. The only people to benefit from developing this site is the developers and the current owner of the site. Once it is gone it is gone forever. This is a once in a life time opportunity to rectify the terrible planning decision to turn this headlands into a holiday village. This should not be used as a precedent to develop the site again albeit in a different guise. The States of Jersey should purchase the land for the common good after all they had their chance years ago to put a stop to the holiday village and didn't.
40PIO	Diana Daniels, St Clement	I hereby give notice of my strong opposition to any development at Plemont. It is imperative that the natural beauty of this area be preserved for all time. The Island's coastal open spaces are slowly and insidiously being eroded by development and overbuilding. The headland at Plemont should be bought by the States of Jersey, the current structures demolished and the land returned to its natural state, with a covenant protecting it in perpetuity.
41PIO	Arthur De Caux, Grouville	I am writing to add my voice of protest to any continued intention to develop the headland above Plémont. Permission should never have been to build a holiday camp on the site in the first place and it would be tragic for the island to lose the opportunity to return the site to its natural beauty. The development at Portelet is a perfect example of how a site of considerable natural beauty can be wrecked simply to create a handful of houses. In the event of houses being built, the area around Plémont will require roads and amenities which also will spoil the area. In short, the island must not give up any more of its natural beauty.
42PIO	Mrs Barbara De Caux, Grouville	I have recently walked from Gros Nez to Plémont. The view of the derelict holiday camp on the approach is certainly a blight. But twenty six new houses, whilst modernising and sanitising the site, would look hardly more suited to that wonderful, wild headland. And they would benefit only those families who are lucky enough to gain exclusive rights to the area, while the rest of Jersey's residents would be confined to a limited part. Although large, the 'natural' part would be overshadowed by the proximity of that new estate with its trappings of modern life - pavements, satellite dishes, access roads, fences, not to mention the pressure from more to come, for those residents would gain rights to improved facilities as the years go on - extensions, garden sheds ,bonfires, street lighting, maybe more houses. The wildness, the essence of the place would be shattered. But by allowing the whole space to be restored to a natural environment, the States, Planning, even the owner, Mr Hemmings himself maybe (for he is from a non privileged background himself and is known to be a philanthropist) would leave a lasting legacy to ALL the people of Jersey and the visitors to this unique island. Public money may need to be spent to achieve this but it is not a question of choosing nature over hospitals, they have their place, but of examining this

43PIO	Mr & Mrs Radcliffe, St Ouen	<ul> <li>particular piece of stunning scenery and giving it the respect it deserves. The National Trust has done much to protect what it can of the dwindling natural coastline with its singular widlife. Once it has gone it is gone forever. What would happen if planning permission was given here - where next - Noirmont? Those with responsibility for decision must think of what we have in this island which is world class and make sure it is protected and conserved.</li> <li>SEE ANNEX 3</li> </ul>
44PIO	Genette Dagtoglou, St Ouen	<ul> <li>1)The original Holiday Camp was built on land which today would not possibly be considered suitable for development, given its unique wilderness appeal in an increasingly overbuilt island, and its proximity to highly protected coastline. There were economic reasons at that time for the benefit of the island economy which was in great need of employment opportunities after being shattered by years of occupation. The Holiday Camp provided a considerable number of jobs. The proposed development would not benefit the overall economic situation in the island, merely the private pocket of the developer Mr. Hemmings.</li> <li>2) Previous 'village' developments in country parishes have taken place by expanding the parish village centres and close to main roads and amenities for the benefit of the island's less well off. The main exception in Victoria village was inland and not in a sensitive area. The entire coastal area from l'Etaq through Grosnez and Plemont and along the north coast is an area of exceptional natural beauty, with the only eyesore being the abandoned holiday camp</li> <li>3) This eyesore is frequently referred to as a reason for allowing new building. However I consider it most probable that if the site were returned to island ownership, contributions would flow in to restore the site. People are less willing to put money into the hands of an already extremely wealthy developer.</li> <li>4) The road structure from Portinfer is entirely unsuitable for the traffic to be generated by well over 50 residential cars in constant year round communication with the rest of the island. There will be a danger of permitted further expansion which will exacerbate this problem still further. There is no justification for a widening or changing of the road merely to account the distance to be covered from Plemont to schools, shops and places of employment when considering the site's suitability for residential development</li> <li>5) It is said that sums needed to purchase the site should be better spent on</li></ul>

		<ul> <li>planning permission for change of use from Holiday Camp to residential village. The value of the land therefore depends on what level, if any, of development is permitted. At the time of purchase it had no value, and so long as the States do not allow change of use the situation remains the same.</li> <li>7) .Moreover, the cost of any suggested purchase of the site by the States is an important factor in islanders' assessment of the proposed development, and they may be reluctant to express views opposing the development as long as very large sums are demanded by Mr. Hemmings.</li> <li>Uncertainty about the cost may inhibit participation in the Inquiry opposing the development.</li> <li>8) This development has been in question for a very long time. The Inquiry should bear in mind that the public's energy in resistance can flag after so many years, though the opposition remains intrinsically the same. This is a factor that developers frequently take advantage of, so the Inquiry should take careful account of campaigns and opposition over the years.</li> </ul>
45.1PIO	Société Jersiaise Environment Section	SEE ANNEX 4
45.2PIO	Société Jersiaise	The Société Jersiaise has been concerned with environmental issues since its foundation in 1873. Its core objects are the study of the history, the antiquities, the ancient language, the geology and the natural history of the Island: the preservation of antiquities and the conservation of the environment. The Plémont headland has many significant features that are of importance to our objectives. The major concern of any development is the effect on the visual landscape, including the geological appearance, the archaeological landscape. Equally, of concern is the natural history of the area which includes one of the few locations where there are puffins, razor-bills, jackdaws and linnets. The applicant has submitted a Desk Based Archaeological Report (Museum of London Archaeological Service MOLAS) which states that within the area of the proposed development are flint scatter areas which have never been properly investigated, but are likely to be from the Mesolithic period. The latter period has received little attention in the past and any reduction of the application by the landscape and scenic value of the site is important and removal of the redundant buildings would be desirable. The Société Jersiaise would welcome rejection of the application by the Inspector and would recommend that a way be found to bring the whole area into public ownership with reasonable compensation to the present owner. Representation has been made with regard to previous applications by this society in conjunction with The National Trust for Jersey and other organisations.

46PIO	Michael J Stentiford MBE Trinity	Having been previously involved in attending at least three public meetings (opposed to the development proposals), a 10,000 strong petition and over 7,000 islanders peacefully demonstrating against inappropriate coastal development (The Line in the Sand – 2 October 2009), I wish, once again, to voice my strong opposition to the application to create 28 new dwellings on the coastal headland at Plemont. The strength of public opposition, as per above, clearly indicates that it is most definitely not a small or insignificant proportion of islanders adopting a 'nimby' attitude. On the contrary, the depth of public feeling strongly displays a deep pride in, and great respect for, the natural beauty and heritage of Jersey's stunning north coast. The Island's coastline has been recognized, time and time again by resident and tourist alike, as Jersey's premier asset and one that should be afforded the highest degree possible of respect and protection. Creating what will inevitably be no more than an expensive housing estate on this north-west facing, wild headland will, without question, negate both of these factual statements. Unwavering public opposition to any development on what should rightly be an area of stunning unspolled coastline, accessible to the general public and home to a diversity of wildlife, has been ongoing for the past twelve years. In an ever-expanding island and an increasing population, retaining areas of open coastline for future generations to freely enjoy must now, in my opinion, be responsibly regarded as a truly moral beauty and heritage rightly deserves the highest degree of protection. In essence, I strongly feel that the undoubted future benefits derived by the permanent protection of the Plemont coastline and landscape – for every individual living here - would be consistent with the aims and spirit of the Planning Law to conserve, protect and, above all, to improve our natural environment.
47PIO	NOT USED	
48PIO	Alison Taylor, St Helier	I wish to object to the proposed development of Plémont Bay Holiday Village on the following grounds. The development will be isolated without shops or other amenities, which will mean frequent car journeys for supplies. Just because there has been previous building on the site, it should not mean that there is presumed permission to rebuild. There is no reason why the area should not be bought in its entirety for public use. There is no other building on the cliffs in the vicinity, which would enhance the recreational use of the North Coast. I am a member of the National Trust for Jersey and support their work to obtain the headland for future generations.
49PIO	NOT USED	
50PIO	B Tompkins, Grouville	I firmly believe that the proposed development of the former holiday camp and surrounding lands would in no way enhance the landscape, benefit the local community or improve the bio-diversity of the area. Neither would it result in the return of a large portion of the land to the island as has been

muted. The site is situated on an iconic headland surrounded by coastal reserves which in turn contain vital habitats for internationally important, endangered bird species such as Puffin,
Guillemot, Razor Bill and Shag as well as smaller threatened terrestrial birds. A number of these
habitats are unique to the north coast of the island and any loss or disruption to them would have a
devastating effect on wildlife already under duress. Major alterations to the profile of the land,
introduction of alien plant species, increase in hard landscape run off and permanent human
occupation of the site would sound the death knell for yet another of our vital coastal spaces. Whilst
the removal of the camp site buildings would provide some visual relief, the buildings only ever
provided temporary holiday accommodation, whereas the building of what effectively is a small
village, inland from the original footprint and on good agricultural land bring about permanent
human occupation with all the negative environmental impact that would inevitably result from such
changes. Given the target market for such dwellings it is reasonable to assume that twenty five
units of housing would introduce an average of seventy five road vehicles, fifty bicycles, twenty five
air conditioning systems, twenty five oil fired boiler systems, fifteen lawn mowers, fifteen domestic
cats, ten dogs, six small boats and landscaping which would not be sympathetic with the native
flora and in turn carry a high risk of containing plant species with the potential to invade and
colonise the area. The building work would by its very nature mean major disruption to the
environment and the long term effects of this work would be to totally alter the natural balance and
character of the land. Upgrading of utilities would be required with the inevitable earth movements
that are necessary for this work and the narrow approach lanes altered to facilitate passing places
for the increased number of vehicles continually using the approach lanes. Outdoor activities such
as mountain biking and the use of the local walk ways would dramatically increase the erosion of
already fragile foot paths, damaging native flora and increasing wildlife disturbance. Using current
data studies have shown that the UK domestic cat population numbers are estimated at nine million
and over a year period they showed that Felix catus is responsible for killing fifty seven million
mammals, twenty seven million birds and five million reptiles and amphibians. Baring this in mind it
is clear that the impact of the introduction of just a small number of domestic cats, especially if un-
neutered would have a devastating effect on local wildlife. Hedgehogs, bank voles, shrews and
ground nesting bird populations are just some of the species that would be negatively affected. Dog
disturbance would also greatly affect nesting birds and impact on prey species such as rabbits.
Summing up, how this high profile coastal site can be threatened with such a proposed
development, against the wishes of islanders, in what is clearly an extremely sensitive
environmental area and which will have nothing but a negative effect on the surroundings be
allowed to proceed is beyond comprehension. The only reward for such a scheme would go to the
developers and speculators. It should be made clear by rejecting this development that greater
value is placed on the land for its natural beauty and the quality of life it brings and that what is left
of our coastal spaces should be kept in perpetuity for the island.

51.1PIO	Norma True, St Brelade	What more can we do or say to convince you that Plemont is immensely important to us – the Jersey people. The photographs (see Annex 5) will show how we feel about our coast line. We have written letters, we have attended meetings, we have signed petitions and we have stood in line on the beach. We try everything and will not give in. Plemont should not be built in again. In our hands Plemont would be returned to the natural state, beautiful and safe. There are many rules and regulations which are there to protect our vulnerable areas and I cannot understand that those with the power do not use it in defence of their Island.
51.2PIO	Violet Beer, St Lawrence	After the petitions, the line in the sand, Parish meetings and numerous letters it must be clear that the majority of Jersey people want to keep Plemont in its natural state and not covered over with buildings. We do not want another disaster like Portelet. Ideally it should be returned to nature with paths, a visitor centre and café for tourists, and residents. As it is there are numerous houses for sale and sales are very slow, the roads round Plemont are too narrow and would have to be widened and the whole place would be spoilt. Over the years the rats have multiplied and we hardly have any puffins left so if it was brought back to nature and the rats cleared hopefully the puffins would return. We must save our coastline it so easily could be lost for ever.
52PIO	Linda Williams, St Clement	I repeat my previously expressed total opposition to any development or re-development of this site whatsoever.
53PIO	Ion Dagtoglou, London	I'm writing with reference to the proposed development of 28 houses at the Pontins site at Plemont. The north coast of Jersey is one of the most beautiful and dramatic coastlines I have seen anywhere in the world. With a few exceptions the coastline is unspoilt by buildings. This is an extraordinary achievement of conservation. The Pontins building is an exception; it is an ugly blot and should never have been built. Now that it has been abandoned there is a unique opportunity to raze it and recover a part of Jersey's natural beauty. Even a low-lying "sensitively" designed development would be an ugly feature of the area. Plemont bay is outstandingly beautiful and this includes the surrounding area. This natural beauty is an extremely valuable asset for Jersey and should not be blotted by modern development of any kind. At the moment there are no houses in this area, it is not a residential area. Even a few houses now would start a long-term phase of residential development. Despite the best intentions of current planning authorities once a small residential area had been developed it would be hard to resist more houses, then shops, a school, etc The rights of residents would have to be considered and would weigh strongly against conservation arguments. There is nothing between zero development and even the smallest residential development. Either the north coast is natural / agricultural or it is not. This would be the thin end of the wedge. 28 houses would constitute immediately a substantial village which would require infrastructure to support it. This infrastructure (shop, utilities, etc.), once established would

		support an argument for further residential development to increase the efficiency of the initial infrastructure investment. The road to Plemont is a small charming road that follows the edge of the fields. It does get a little busy in the summer but there has never been, and should not be, any need to widen it, straighten it or in any way alter the road. However, a housing development would increase the traffic significantly with residential and support traffic (rubbish, utilities, post, maintenance, etc.) and eventually the inevitable argument for "better" access would be won on practical grounds and the charm of the current lane would be lost. I have followed the debate about this development over recent years and have been depressed by the callous and cynical promotion of the development by those with an interest (e.g. the developers themselves and others). The choice to resist the development would be hard but brave and ultimately right. PLEASE make the right choice an return this site permanently to nature.
54PIO	Patrick Delafield, Trinity	So much has been said and written about this very long-running and unnecessarily touchy subject that I don't suppose you really want to hear any more. Nonetheless I take the opportunity to write a note to express my and my family's 100% support for the idea of funding the return of this very special area to open, unadulterated headland. Some of the best remarks were published recently in a letter from Sir Nigel Broomfield who pointed out in very careful terms the necessary understanding of the balance of benefits from development. I myself recall quite clearly the time when the headland and that holiday camp belonged to Pontin's, then its subsequent takeover by Scottish & Newcastle Breweries when they bought that company, and the subsequent speculative purchase by Mr. Hemmings. I recall clearly some very long conversations about the property, prior to their divesting themselves of it, with friends at Scottish & Newcastle with whom I did extensive business. They asked me very solicitously for my opinion on the matter. rsimply pointed out that they were sitting on some form of white elephant, because at that time the strength of opinion in favour of returning that headland to natural state was very great, and that they (S&N) would need to have planning permission to give the plot any commercial value at all. At the time of their trying to sell the property there was no definitive ruling on the planning aspect at all. Their move in selling to a speculator was very clever, for both parties knew perfectly well that they could sit and wait, and wait, and wait, in the knowledge that there was a very strong likelihood that the Planning Department, despite enormous pressure to the contrary, would eventually capitulate to their demands - thus making the investment "worthwhile". The aggressive involvement of Dandara, in threatening the Planning Department, did not help either. The remarkable turnout of people in support of the maintenance of as much as possible of Jersey's beautiful coastline without the

		cancer of gratuitously cynical development ought to be sufficient weight to lead to the obvious
		decision. As Sir Nigel remarked, the lesson of Portelet should be enough. I wish you well in your
		pursuit of the argument and hope that sanity prevails.
55PIO	Nicola & Michael Doleman	We are opposed to the proposed planning application at Plemont which we believe should be
	St Brelade	returned to nature and the people of Jersey. This is one of the few remote and unspoilt areas of the island and would be spoilt not only by the buildings but the noise and traffic that those dwellings would generate. This may result in losing a few houses which would only be affordable for the wealthy and there are plenty of properties on the market for that sector especially at Portelet. Please, please do not pass these plans and keep this little part of Jersey for the people who love this island.
56PIO	Richard Dupré, St John	I firmly believe Plemont should be returned to nature. The site was built on when there were no strict planning laws as at present. One house stood on the site prior to the holiday camp development. It was probably allowed for tourism purposes and under today's strict planning guidelines would probably not have taken place. Let's regain the site for the people of Jersey – It's in the coastal area where there is a presumption now against development.
57PIO	Michael Eades, Guernsey	Whilst resident on the sister isle of Guernsey, I frequently visit Jersey to stay with friends and one of the favourite pastimes is to walk on your wonderful cliffs. I understand that there is a proposal at Plemont to create an estate of 28 luxury houses. I am aware that the proposal envisages transferring a substantial portion of the headland to the public, however, the developer obviously would not be making the offer unless it was in their financial interest. With respect, I think the point is that the existing development should never have been allowed in the first place and now there is a wonderful opportunity for the States of Jersey to redress the wrong that was committed many years ago by then allowing building on this magnificent headland. Some years ago in Guernsey there was a proposal to build a golf course at a similar headland, lcart Point, with all sorts of inducements being offered by the developers. This was roundly rejected due to the universal public protest in Guernsey.
58PIO	C Evans, St Martin	I am writing to oppose the proposed development at Plemont. It is a golden opportunity to put right past mistakes; one which future generations will treasure. Nothing that is built there could be as beautiful as what would be there if it was returned to its natural state.
59PIO	Rosemary Evans, St Brelade	If you go up to the North coast, stand on the cliff path and look left and right, all you will see is the small lighthouse at Sorel Point and the gateway to Grosnez Castle: this before the appalling planning decision that was made to allow the holiday camp. The island now has its last chance to put that right, demolish it and return the area to its natural state. I am shocked at the number of houses (the cars that will come with them) proposed for this area. Does not the current owner and

60PIO	J P V Falle, St Saviour	<ul> <li>his architects know that it is served by one small lane (perfectly in keeping with this area) giving access to Plemont beach and much used by islanders who feel it to be the most beautiful beach Jersey has. Cannot this man be offered an alternative site or be persuaded to give it to the island? I read that philanthropy is much in fashion at the moment among the super rich. Or we could perhaps use the "Crown " money from the recent amazing find of coins to buy this site. There must be some way of saving this unique area for the people of Jersey in perpetuity.</li> <li>To add my penny's worth, use this land for a wind farm.</li> </ul>
61PIO	Gerard Farnham, St Peter	I object to the development at Plemont due to the distance from town - these homes will have the greatest car-mile demands of anywhere in the island. I also believe that enough development is going on to allow one key location to be left undeveloped.
62PI0	Emma Gardner, St Lawrence	In my opinion the entire site is of too much environmental importance to the island to be given over in any part to development. With the benefit of our current knowledge of the damage poor planning has allowed in the past, I feel this is our opportunity to take a stand & say enough is enough. I say this as a local person who has absolutely no prospect of ever being able to afford to buy my own house. I would certainly rather forgo this than see more of our coastline ruined - particularly as these areas are exploited largely for high-end developments anyway. As someone who enjoys the outdoors, I would love to see this last piece of the north coast restored to its natural beauty (not some developers idea of what landscaping the area should look like) so that we can set an example of environment being respected before profit to a small number of individuals.
63PIO	Mrs Jennifer Gare, St Ouen	I wish this letter not be interpreted as a N.I.M.B.Y. as I chose to buy property here some thirty four years ago when the holiday camp was still functioning at full capacity and wished to live in this area despite its presence. I am extremely familiar with this area, the costal paths, the road structure and traffic throughout the seasons as I have been a keen walker of the local area during this time. Probably my major concern is the narrow lane access to the development site. I can recall the traffic problems when the holiday camp was occupied in the summer months. There were constant snarl-ups and frequent impasses with the traffic, this made walking down the lane extremely difficult and unsafe as a pedestrian and sometimes the only option was to climb a bank or clamber through a field in order to safely bypass the problem. There can still be incidents now on a busy summer day but not to the same extent. I can envisage that these difficulties could easily arise again with the volume of traffic, both service and residential if the building project proceeds. Indeed I wonder how access to the beach and building site could safely be maintained during the re-development. Another concern I have is that this is not a family friendly residential area. The holiday camp had three metre high fences to safeguard the guests and their families from the precipitous drops close to the cliff paths. A large proportion of the proposed development is for family sized housing! This

		headland\ promontory has a very high visual impact from the coastal path for a considerable
		distance from either side. Whilst acknowledging that the main development will be moved a little
		away from its current position it will still have a huge impact on that area of coastline. The
		architect's models that I have seen make great use of planting of trees and shrubs to minimise this
		impact. Having managed a large garden in this area I can assure you that it is very difficult to grow
		trees or shrubs to maturity because of the exposed nature of the terrain. I would like to see what is
		realistically possible in terms of adequate screening to be considered, rather than what I feel to be
		architectural "fantasy". Mr Hemmings is without doubt a successful and informed businessman. At
		the time that he bought the site the nature of tourism here in Jersey was already well into a process
		of change, as was the public's awareness, and desire, to safeguard and indeed restore areas of
		natural beauty and importance (namely the Bal Tabarin which had been a bar and was on the other
		side of this headland overlooking St Ouen's bay, subsequently restored to nature). This site,
		Plemont, was bought with a risk attached, and no doubt the purchase price reflected this. Perhaps
		•
		the reality of taking that risk might now have to be faced by Mr Hemmings, for the greater good, so
		that this site can be returned to the Island for future generations to come. Once this challenge is
		lost it will be virtually impossible to change at any time in the future!
64PIO	Ellen Garnier, St Clement	Plemont headland would be best served to be returned to nature.
65PIO	G V Gaudin, St Clement	I wish to register my objection to the plans or any development at this site and wish to be kept
		informed of any further information appertaining to this development.
66PIO	J H Gaudin, Grouville	I wish to register my objection to the plans or any development at this site and wish to be kept
67PIO	Mrs J Gaudin, St Clement	<ul> <li>informed of any further information appertaining to this development.</li> <li>I wish to register my objection to the plans or any development at this site and wish to be kept</li> </ul>
07FIO	Mis J Gaudin, St Clement	informed of any further information appertaining to this development.
68PIO	Mrs N J Gaudin, Grouville	I wish to register my objection to the plans or any development at this site and wish to be kept
		informed of any further information appertaining to this development.
69PIO	Mrs R H Gaudin, Grouville	I wish to register my objection to the development and wish to be kept informed of any further
	,	information appertaining to this development.
70PIO	Andrea Gavey, St Helier	Without any doubt the Plemont site should be returned to nature and preserved in that state for the
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Island for evermore. I'm Jersey born and bred and even in my lifetime I've witnessed too much of
		the wrong kind of change, too quickly, here. That's a hugely difficult experience to which it's hard to
		adapt. You feel your very identity, heritage and culture is continually being eroded everywhere you
		look. The killer is, whatever you do, you feel powerless to check it. Loss of a natural area like
		Plemont would just be another soul destroying change. Growing up in Jersey the most important
		thing to me was getting out into the countryside, into natural open spaces, being out in the fresh air.

That's continued to be of the utmost importance to me through my life to the present. I'd like to hope that opportunity would always be open to locals and in turn that they would gain a real appreciation of the natural world. Plemont is just the kind of place we should do everything to preserve so that everyone has that opportunity. The problem is now, with so many people here, there is little opportunity to get away from the stress and busy ways of the place. At heart I'm a country person, with no choice but to live in a town flat, with no outdoors. On a daily basis I crave the opportunity to be somewhere natural, open, with fresh air. Unfortunately, this can only happen on weekends when I'm part of the ridiculous practice of sitting in traffic in a car, causing more pollution, just to try and achieve that. Then, on reaching the destination just finding there are too many people trying to do the same thing. With too many people already we desperately need to keep what natural open areas we have. It's vital to try and curb the ever downward spiral of our quality of life here caused largely by overcrowding. The above is just on a human level and to my mind, at the end of the day, the bigger picture of the environment seems to be considered less important than human whims, greed, selfishness, etc. One, to my mind, feeble argument that gets trotted out in cases like this, pushing for development in natural areas, is that not many people even go there. This is a pointless argument on so many levels. For one thing, that's the whole point. It's somewhere to go to get some peace and recharge. Not everyone can cope with constantly being with others and they should have the right to have access to a quiet, natural space. For me, personally, I've already lost too much in that regard and after all, in an overcrowded island, most of us can't experience that peace and solitude in our own homes. Also, the feeble argument doesn't even apply to me, as I make every effort to be out walking in a smuch of the island as possible w
range of wildlife inhabiting the area already. Please don't give that wildlife more to contend with by allowing more humans to inhabit their space, especially considering increasingly common factors

r		
		addition, it always seems to be the way that once built on, the door is opened for creeping development until another part of the island is forever spoilt. To allow new development at Plemont would inflict the usual results. With increased human habitation inevitably comes more vehicles, pollution, litter, noise and may be even some vandalism thrown in. No doubt roads to the area would be modified and providing extra services and utilities would be a factor, all of which changing the character of even more of the surrounding area. Any human action always seems to have a knock on effect with unwelcome side effects. Another factor is that of the tourist industry which this island desperately tries to hang onto. For this industry, the holiday village would be better replaced by an outstandingly beautiful natural space which can often be a draw for today's tourists. It's so difficult to write this because all too often you get the impression people don't take appreciation for nature and the wish to care for the environment seriously. They appear to possess an inability to really comprehend or perhaps they just don't want to, apparently just driven to generate money and possessions. In addition, you get used to a familiar disappointment and your heart sinks when seeing another area you value get ruined by inappropriate overdevelopment. We've lost too much in this island, hope gets lost along with it and you wonder what's the point of even trying. Plemont should be seen as a precious opportunity to do the right thing and redress the balance, rather than allowing the usual depressing scenario of enabling greedy developers to make a quick and no doubt vast profit. The developers and their ilk have had more than their fair share of this tiny island. Please let us regain and keep forever the beautiful natural area at Plemont.
71PIO	Mrs Christine Gill, St Lawrence	An Advocate for Wildlife - The total area of land in question at Plemont is not an insignificant proportion of Jersey's cliff coast and habitat. Every piece of the coastline that can be preserved in its natural state is of value, especially to the creatures that either do live there, or would like to. Humans should not presume to have rights over other species. This particular piece of land has clearly been abused in the past and it is the duty of the current generation(s) to return it to nature. Everywhere in the world we are talking about extinctions and threatened habitats, and yet as soon as money is involved those concerns seem to be forgotten. We can go on adding a bit here, and a bit there, in Jersey each one perhaps a 'minor' development, but the sum total is an assault on every other kind of creature trying to make a living on this small island. We are building in gardens, converting barns, and always with plenty of concrete and paving. The plants, birds and insects don't have a chance. This year there is particular concern about wildlife because of the cold and wet summer. Being attacked on all sides, these creatures need even more space in all habitats to be able to survive in the long term. Plemont should therefore be returned to nature at the earliest opportunity. To argue that money is needed for hospitals, or pensions, is once again completely human-oriented, short-term and one-sided. If we neglect wildlife we are threatening our own long-term existence in any case. It is no good bemoaning the destruction of the Amazon rain forest, while at the same time consenting to the destruction of our own ecological niches, however small they may be. The argument here should not be about short-term gain for the few (very few) but the

		long-term health of a particularly special environment. Yes, we may need houses but not ones in the upper price bracket on a cliff-top where all journeys will involve cars. Even with the sop that two thirds will be 'returned to nature' there will still be cats and dogs to further reduce the unfortunate wildlife and at weekends noise from the myriad of garden machines to which modern man has become so attached. This will be suburbia on one of our most precious headlands. We have done enough damage already and all building on the coastline should cease forthwith. For those of us who are Jersey born and bred, with a deep understanding of the nature of the place, these constant battles with developers are heart-breaking. This is why 7,000 of us went down to St Ouen's Bay to draw a line in the sand. The development of this site is clearly contrary to Policy SP4 and also to Paragraph NE1, as well as many other aspects of the Island Plan so carefully enunciated in favour of the environment and approved by the States of Jersey. What hope if it is simply ignored?
72PIO	Hugh Gill, St Lawrence	I am a Jersey registered Blue Badge Guide and have been for the last 16 years. I guide visitors on this beautiful island from many countries around the world, particularly from Europe. I also guide journalists on behalf of the Tourism department, many of whom come to see and hear not only about our long and fascinating history and heritage, but also to experience the beauty of our lanes, amazing beaches and the spectacular north coast. For years I have heard with dismay the same question, why we allow the glory of the north coast to be tainted by an ugly ruin and why the authorities have not forced the removal of the eyesore that is the former holiday camp and return the area to its natural state. At least and at last there is a proposal for its removal, but this only on condition a development be permitted. This is still building on land which could and, in my view should, be returned to nature. While arguments may be made that the investor should be entitled to his return, it is a different consideration when the opportunity arises to rescue the area from concrete, brick and tarmacadam altogether. There may well be a demand for million-pound houses in the island, but there are surely better places to put them than Jersey's uniquely beautiful north coast. When one sees the stunning colours of Les Landes and Portelet Common at this time of year, with carpets of glorious heather and western gorse, the prospect of that beauty being returned to Plémont must be sufficient to turn down any application for development there. SEE ANNEX 5 for photographs of the heather on Portelet Common taken on Monday 16th July this year.
73PIO	June Gould & Dale Baker St Ouen	We feel very strongly that this beautiful headland should be preserved in its natural state for future generations of islanders. This point should take precedent over any commercial activity/development, which seems unnecessary. The island certainly has enough housing of the sort being planned, and many overwhelm the environment, and prohibit the general public from enjoyment of these special spaces. We need to treasure our headlands, as it is these very special areas that make Jersey the beautiful island that it is. We are the caretakers, so let us care for the future.

74PIO	Jonathan Gready, St Peter	I make this submission as a concerned islander. My concern is over the potential development of the Plémont Bay Holiday village site which has been derelict for many years. The site, located on the north west corner of our island, forms part of an area of the island renowned for both its natural beauty and its wildlife. I understand that many years ago St Ouen's Bay was vulnerable to development but was preserved and is today acknowledged as being an area of the island where wildlife flourishes and which can be enjoyed by both locals and visitors. The Plémont Bay Holiday Village site needs similar respect and should to be returned to its natural state. Such a action would enable that part of the north west corner of our island to be enjoyed in its natural state by the public of the island.
75PIO	Elizabeth Haas St John	I understand that today is the last day that opinions relating to the development of Plemont may be submitted to you. Please accept my apologies that mine is a little 'last minute' but I have recently returned to the Island after two weeks break and have just caught up on the Jersey Evening Posts with the notification that now is the last chance for the public to have their say prior to a public enquiry in September. I am sure you will receive many letters from residents who, like me, feel passionately that Plemont should be returned to nature for future generations. I am not a new comer to the Island, having lived here for nearly seventy years and with each major building development that has and is taking place I feel a deeper sense of despair and outrage. This was particularly brought home to me yet again when I looked through the aerial views of the Island in the recent JEP supplement and the monstrosity which is now the Portlelet headland was clear for all to see - again. It stands and is a classic example of all that has gone wrong with development and particularly coastline development in Jersey over the last decade or two. I am afraid that I have no confidence in the developments and as in the case of Plemont, the promise that much of the land will be 'given back' to the public. This has a hollow ring to it and in any event, the development of 26 houses with all the accompanying traffic etc would hardly seduce one into taking a quiet stroll along this particularly unique and beautiful part of the coastline. I have viewed the prospective plans on the web site and as ever, the proposal is I am sure, light years away from what will actually evolve should the plans be passed. We all remember the 'pretty' pictures depicting the Portlet development - the end result being so far from what we ended up with. History cannot be allowed to be repeated. The debate on Plemont has been going on for so long that I am afraid that I have lost track of some of the twists and turns of the commercial aspects for both the ow

76PIO	Nigel & Suzi Hall, St Ouen	Our property above and attached grazing land is very close to the holiday village and the village can be clearly seen from around our property. My wife and I object in the strongest terms to any domestic development in this area of wild natural beauty not because we are 'NIMBY's', not in my back yard, but because it simply makes no sense. We have lived at Woodlands, a farmhouse built over 200 years ago, since 1996, and as a former Centenier in St.Ouen I confess to having had to make visits to the holiday village from time to time on policing matters. This was towards the end of the village's life as an active holiday camp destination. The holiday camp was never designed to be a domestic housing development. The roads are too narrow, the schools already at capacity, the shops some two or three miles away, and a very irregular bus service serves this remotes part of Jersey. We have objected to any development from day one and continue to object to any development which would spoil an area of natural beauty, an SSI site. Were we to seek permission to build a new house on the coastline or headland of Jersey it would be flatly refused as there is an embargo on such new development. This is, however, exactly what the developers want to do and not for one house but for a housing estate! We support absolutely the position taken by Sir Phillip Baillache and our retired Connetable Ken Vibert. No to any development in one of the most beautiful parts of Jersey and adjacent to one of the prettiest beaches. Yes to the States acquiring the land and removing the eye sore of a dilapidated holiday camp.
77PIO	Nicki Hamon, St Ouen	Please, please, please return Plemont to nature. Economic times are very tough & it may appear that there are many other better & more deserving causes to spend the hard pressed Jersey tax payer's money on but if we do not take this opportunity to rectify the mistakes of the past, then we will regret it in the future. Plemont deserves saving!
78PIO	Suzette Hase, St Helier	I am staggered that this issue of redeveloping Plémont remains unsolved. Of course it should not be turned into a housing estate – it is the most beautiful area of the island and beautiful because of its remoteness and exposure to the coast. The answer has been with us all along within the planning law- all we need is a Planning Minister with some courage to execute it. The purpose of the Minister is to execute and be guardian of the law and the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 states its purpose as:
		"(1) The purpose of this Law is to conserve, protect and improve Jersey's natural beauty, natural resources and general amenities, its character, and its physical and natural environments. (d) to ensure that the coast of Jersey is kept in its natural state;"
		It continues by saying: "84 Minister may require repair or removal of ruinous or dilapidated buildings.
		(1) If it appears to the Minister that a building is in a ruinous or dilapidated condition the Minister may serve a notice requiring that the building or a specified part of it be demolished, repaired,

		decorated or otherwise improved and that any resulting rubbish be removed.
		(2) The notice shall be served -
		<ul><li>(a) on the owner of the land on which the building is situated; or</li><li>(b) by displaying it in a conspicuous place on or near the building"</li></ul>
		All surely then the Minister has to do is serve a notice to Mr Hemmings requiring that he demolishes and removes the rubbish from the site as the Minister believes the building to be in a ruinous and dilapidated state. Then refuse any redevelopment of the site. Hemmings will then sell the land at a reasonable rate for a conservation area and we will get back a part of Jersey at a low cost and none of the work.
79PIO	Mrs Jane Hill, St Mary	No planning permission for any future or past permission for any buildings on Plemont. Bring back retrospective legislation law.
80PIO	Preston Hobbs, St Saviour	The present holiday village building spoils what would otherwise be a lovely stretch of coastline in that area. As for building what would no doubt be 26 luxury homes, the map shows them in large groups scattered over the area away from the former village building, and after all the roads needed for the clusters of houses have been built, and land allocated for their private use, will result in comparatively much reduced open land for the public to use, the very opposite of campaigns which have gone on for more than a decade to have the buildings removed and the land returned to nature for future generations to enjoy. There can be no doubt that Jersey people want the campaign to be successful this year. I sincerely hope so. When will rich people realise that we come into this world with nothing and cannot take a penny back to the world from which we have all come. All we can take back is the record of what we did, good or bad, in each short life of the many lives we had before and those to come when the time is right for every one of us to come again.
81PIO	Alan Holmes, St Peter	SEE ANNEX 6
82PIO	P F Horsfall CBE, St Helier	In 2002 when I was a Member of the States of Jersey I expressed the view that the site of the Plemont Holiday Village should not be re-developed but should be bought by the States of Jersey on behalf of the Public and returned to a natural state. This view remains unchanged and undiminished. At that time progress could not be made because the value of the site depended entirely on what the Planning Committee of the day would allow to be built in that location. Ten years later and at the time of writing, we still do not know. Once that decision is made, the site can and should be valued and negotiations to purchase opened. Should there be no agreement on price, the compulsory purchase procedure should be invoked. This allows for a valuation to be arrived at by an Independent Panel of expert people who have to be fair to both parties. My main

		reason for expressing this view is that the rugged natural North Coast is one of the Island's most precious attributes and the opportunity to claim back such an important part, affecting as it does, the coast from L'Etacq to Greve de Lecq, should not be missed. If it is, that opportunity will be gone forever. States' policy and thinking regarding similar previous decisions should still apply. Those decisions include the purchase of the Bouley Bay Hotel site at the top of Bouley Bay Hill from Mr Matcham and also the purchase of the Bal Tabarin site above L'Etacq. Those decisions to purchase were made to prevent redevelopment on prominent coastal sites. I suggest that the great majority of Islanders would agree that these were wise decisions and are very pleased that the States acted so that there was never any redevelopment of those sites. At around the same time as the acquisition of the Bouley Bay Hotel site many individual plots of land on the seaward side of the Five Mile Road were bought from individual owners for the benefit of the Public and for their protection from development. This represented the States' long term commitment to protect Jersey's coast for Public benefit. That commitment should not be allowed to die, even in difficult times, because once lost, the Island's priceless natural beauty is lost forever.One further point has to be made. If the ruin of the Holiday Village was not in that location what would be the Islanders' view be of a proposal to build houses there? Without question, people would be horrified, up in arms and the answer would be a resounding "no." We are not in that position at this time but the opportunity exists to get to that position, that opportunity must be taken and, if not, our descendants will think back of people with vision and an appreciation of what is precious to the Island of Jersey and to its heritage and to its inhabitants.
83PIO	Dr & Mr Howell, Trinity	We wish to oppose development of the Plemont Holiday Village site on the grounds that this contravenes the GREEN ZONE POLICY and also because the access road is unsuitable for additional housing in this area. Please, as it is the Queen's Jubilee Year, remove the dilapidated buildings and restore the area to nature this would be a lasting and wonderful legacy for the people of Jersey. Thank you!
84PIO	John Peter Hunt, St Ouen	Despite the fact that there have been buildings at the Plemont site since before the Second World War (so I understand), it is imperative that the island takes this golden opportunity to improve our dwindling natural assets - the most important of which is the North coast. There can be no good argument (other than profiteering) to build houses here now as a balance must be introduced between the need for housing and the need for an environment in which the housed population can breathe freely and enjoy nature. This site does not suit development for purely logistical reasons. There are no road structures in and from the Parish that can absorb more traffic - traffic which is even now putting excess pressure on on-road parking and the creation of rat runs. Fort these and other practical reasons, I ask the States to ensure that no development is made as this site and the golden opportunity is taken to return it to nature.

85PIO	Barbara Journeaux, St Brelade	Many years ago, as a young woman, I gave money which I could not afford towards the reconstruction of la Rocco Tower which otherwise would have fallen into the sea. You will appreciate how important the Tower has become to the Island, for instance as a photographer's dream, home to wild birds, and a visually important part of St. Ouen's Bay. Similarly, if efforts are not made to preserve the Plemont Headland and the development is allowed to take place, this beautiful wild headland will be damaged and ravaged for ever. The development at Portelet comes to mind. The argument against the proposed housing estate is well known, and if completed will presumably be home to a select few. I was amongst the many people who made a line in the sand. I would be grateful if you could kindly pass on my thanks and admiration to Senator Sir Philip Bailhache for his attempt to save the Headland and I hope most sincerely that he is successful. I also hope that the decision makers, whoever they may be, will put the importance of this historical, wild and beautiful place which is now so needed in our overcrowded Island before the requirement to develop and destroy.
86PIO	Jill Keogh, St John	I feel very strongly that Plemont headland should never be built on. What was built there in the 1930s (the holiday camp) is irrelevant now - we have strict planning laws (well, fairly strict!) and this is an opportunity for the people of Jersey to retain this wonderful open space for all time. Once houses are built on it, however beautiful they will be, it will be gone for ever. I took part in Mike Stentiford's Line in the Sand a few years ago & it was amazing to see so many people give up their Sunday afternoons to register their support for Mike and safeguarding our special places; whether or not we visit them on a regular basis is unimportant, these special places must always be there for locals and visitors alike, to walk on or just stand and take in the beauty around them - on a clear day, the other islands are visible, on dull, wet days (lots of those this year!), just to stand and be there is good. What a wonderful gesture if the owner of the area would give it to the States as a Diamond Jubilee gift of goodwill for the privilege of living in such a beautiful place.
87PIO	Susan Kerley , St Lawrence	With regard to the proposed development of 28 houses on the Plemont headland. The stated purpose of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 ' is to conserve, protect and improve the Island's natural beauty, natural resources, and general amenities, its character, and its physical and natural environment'. The intention of the law is 'to ensure that the coast of the Island is kept in its natural state.' Plemont is in the Green Zone of the Island in a remote area of Jersey. It is proposed to demolish the existing holiday camp and build 28 houses in a sprawling estate on previously undeveloped historic fields in the Green Zone of the Island. One of the main pillars of the Island Plan is Sustainability. Any development at Plemont would be contrary to the following Policies of the 2011 Island Plan. Paragraph 1 of Policy GD1 of the Island Plan states that Development will not be allowed unless the development contributes to a more sustainable form and pattern of development in accordance with the Island's Spatial Policies SP1 Spatial Policies; SP2 (Efficient use of Resources) and SP6 (Reducing dependency on the car). Paragraph 2 of Policy GD1 prohibits developments that have an unreasonable impact on the character of the coast or

T
countryside. Paragraph 5 of the same Policy states that developments must provide safe and convenient access for all. The Island's Spatial Policies seek to centre development on St. Helier and the Islands developed areas. It prohibits development in areas where there are few amenities and where Islanders have to rely on the car to shop, to take children to school and to go to work etc. Plemont is such a place it is a remote area of the Island Plan 2011 regulates the Green Zone and only permits redevelopment of existing commercial buildings for other uses when a demonstrable environmental gain is secured. The developer has to make a 'positive contribution to the repair and restoration of the landscape and a reduction in visual impact.' Paragraph 2.85 of this Policy says that 'new dwellings can only be justified where there is a strong justification related to the essential requirement for a countryside location.' Not only has the developer failed to show clearly the boundaries of the area they propose to return to the States as environmental gain, but the 28 houses do not have an essential requirement for a countryside location. Indeed it is very questionable if the Island needs new luxury houses. The 2011 census revealed that there were over 3000 units of accommodation empty. There are a great number of houses on the market and many more have been approved by Planning and not built. The scale and mass of this sprawling development on this site will be seen from Grosnez in the West to Sorel Point to the East. Any development all effect on the sensitive character of this stretch of the coast. This runs contrary to Policies G2; G3; and H8 of the Island Plan which all seek to preserve the beauty of the area. If Jersey does not need to build new luxury dwellings in a remote area of the Island then what is the best sustainable use of this land for the benefit of all Islanders? 24% of the land in Jersey is already developed. 1% of which has been developed so the reserve the beauty of the area. If Jersey does not need
White Paper were to increase exercise, improve health and reduce obesity. A recent article in the

		everyone. DEFRA argues that access to the countryside and other green spaces is one of the best ways to obtain these benefits. They assert that high quality accessible green spaces provide considerable benefits to quality of life and wellbeing and inspire lifestyle choices. Mind(the U.K. organisation for Mental Health) has joined with the University of Essex to compare the benefits of recreation in an urban environment and in the coast and countryside. 90% of the people in the studies who took exercise in a wild environment agreed that it improved their mental and physical health; increased their self-esteem and decreased depression and tension. The participants also found that exercise in a green environment added to their quality of life and was much more beneficial and uplifting than exercise in an urban environment. It would therefore seem highly desirable for us all to take responsibility for some of our health needs and take exercise in the countryside. This as far as Jersey is concerned creates a problem as 24% of the Island's land mass is already developed. Much of the undeveloped land is under agriculture and therefore inaccessible to the general public. The Island's previously tranquil country lanes are now used by an increasing amount of traffic and wild places away from the urban sprawl are becoming very rare indeed. The proposed development at Plemont would spoil many of the vistas of the North Coast to an urban development would be an enormous loss to all Islanders. This development would have a detrimental effect on the life of all Islanders not only in terms of their health and access to wild places, where they can recharge their batteries and regain a sense of wellbeing and perspective on life, but also because it would destroy the beauty and history of this scenic area, which in itself would be a blow to the Tourism Industry. It would appear that in terms of land use for a small island, with limited resources that need to be used wisely, it would be prudent for Plemont to be returned to nature
		preserved in its natural state. To summarise the development of 28 luxury houses is against many of the most important Policies of the Island Plan and would be an unsustainable and profligate use of land. I respectfully submit that this Application is unreasonable and not in the best interests of the Island as a whole.
88PIO	Colin King, St Mary	Yet again developers have the upper hand versus nature and the public. Must we see a marine skyline permanently defaced in the manner of progress. I understand that the developers have scaled back initial plans, notwithstanding they can "afford to wait" and eventually realise their intentions. If we must loose such a site to public access, although we have not been able to access for legal developer perimeter fencing I used to traverse the headland as a young person and miss having the views formerly enjoyed. Surely we can reach an adult compromise to benefit future island generations This is a much neglected, wishfully forgotten area of natural beauty, that should

		be restored to before it was built on to provide the likes of a visitor experience that few places in Europe can compare. Just watch a September sunset and you will understand.
89PIO	Mrs Lavarack, St Saviour	<ol> <li>I agree that the land should ideally be returned to nature;</li> <li>Why doesn't the National Trust make an offer that the seller can't refuse - they have the money don't they?</li> <li>This would alleviate the need for a costly public inquiry and would make a lot of Islanders happy.</li> </ol>
90PIO	Mrs Kay Laverty, St Martin	I would just like to say that I don't want to see any development on this headland and I would like it to be returned back to a natural area no matter how much it costs. It's got to be worth it in the long run.
91PIO	Philip Le Brocq & Jurat Sally le Brocq OBE St Clement	<ul> <li>We are strongly in favour of the public acquisition of this headland and its restoration to nature. It would be a very significant addition to the already impressive Coastal National Park and a facility for the people of this island to wonder at, and visitors and future generations to savour and relish. In a word, it is unique. As a past President of the Societe Jersiaise and past member of the Council Of the National Trust for Jersey I can think of no more fitting a legacy to our children than the return of this piece of Jersey's natural and magnificent coast line to its natural state. As Gerard Manley Hopkins said in his poem "Binsey Poplars" –</li> <li>"After-comers cannot guess the beauty been Ten or twelve strokes, only ten or twelve Strokes of havoc unselve The Sweet especial scene, A rural scene, Sweet especial rural scene."</li> <li>And he was writing about a few felled poplar trees – we are talking about a whole headland.</li> <li>Please do all you can to protect it for us and for our children. The people of Jersey will hail you as a saviour if you do!</li> </ul>
92PIO	June Le Feuvre, St Lawrence	I feel I must comment on Plemont, although the Line in the Sand demonstration was a huge expression of opinion by lots of people which appears then to have been ignored. I am shocked that by just 2 votes the States can decide to do something that will affect the environment for generations. I am totally against <u>ANY</u> development at Plemont. The road is too narrow firstly for construction equipment which will have a significant impact on the local area during the whole building process and then for extra residences. There will be noise impact from building and living, light pollution as well as the general impact of extra people living in the area. There will be no true natural areas within a residential context as any areas are going to be impacted on. There are now so many houses for sale in Jersey. It seems very shortsighted to spoil the one chance of returning this headland completely to nature for the sake of accommodation which is not even truly needed.
93PIO	James Le Feuvre & family	I feel compelled to register my very strong and sincere hope that the headland at Plemont can be protected. This is a very prominent headland, above one of Jersey's most precious bays, and is

	St Lawrence	just the sort of area that must be protected if we mean what we say about protecting our amenities and if we are to continue to promote high end discerning and sustainable tourism. I acknowledge that this is potentially a significant investment - in times of austerity - but remain confident that, if saved, generations to come will applaud the courage and foresight we will have had to act before it is too late. I can think of no finer way of celebrating the Diamond Jubilee and would love to think that HM might be able to visit a restored headland, during her next visit, and unveil a granite plaque formally opening the Queen Elizabeth Coastal Park.
94PIO	Simon Le Feuvre, St Clement	I am writing to you with reference to the future development of the Plemont Holiday Village site. I very strongly feel that no development should be allowed at this site, regardless of the proposed plan, as it is an area of outstanding natural beauty and should be preserved as part of the island's heritage. Ideally the area should be purchased by the States and returned to nature but at the very least, by not allowing development, the opportunity remains for this site to be preserved.
95PIO	Alec Le Sueur, St Ouen	While there is so much pressure on Jersey's natural environment and precious coastline, this would be a wonderful opportunity for the island to restore the site to nature. Any amount of housing will lead to an increase in domestic pets in the area which would have a negative effect on the wildlife of the Plemont headland – the puffins and green lizards.
96PIO	Bob Le Sueur, St Clement	You will have had letters of protest cascading on to your desk by people concerned about any building at all on this site. Whilst I largely share these concerns the main thrust of my own objection is an access from the Portinfer crossroad and, come to that, on the rather narrow main road from the Parish Hall onwards. I am old enough to remember a 19 <sup>th</sup> century Plemont Hotel more or less at the far end of the upper car park and then the building of a very basic and small holiday camp. This was greatly extended in the fifties. In those the days the way of life was quite different. There was not much cash in people's pockets, neither in those of the generality of our holidaymakers nor of most local people. In the years just after the war only a minority had cars. Plemont was a popular beach and one paid a small toll to use the pedestrian bridge. People went out either on the bus or on bicycles. This was also the transport of most of the people staying at the holiday camp. The road from Portinfer was adequate enough with occasional problems late afternoons on a fine summer Sunday, not enough to inconvenience anyone seriously. Now things are different. Virtually every adult has a car. On a good summer day and we did have quite a number in 2011, the lower and upper car parks are quite full and there can be real congestion when people try to leave. Just imagine what it will be like if permission is given to build a whole estate of quality properties! This will be an estate where every adult will have his/her own transport, in virtually every case a car, probably an upper grade one or a Chelsea tractor. That access road will be hell for those living there and also for those wishing to reach the beach. It will not only be those living there who will use the road but the delivery people, the readers of meters, the cleaners of windows, the contract gardeners. There will be constant two-way traffic. Almost all of this additional traffic will also use the main road to the Parish Hall, most of it the main road as far as the

97PIO	Susan Lissenden, St Peter	<ul> <li>be delayed by the congestion, there will be a temptation to speed, that road is not suitable for the extra two-way track a housing estate would generate. Nobody looking at a map of the Island and for a place to house surplus population would ever choose that distant and wind-blasted headland. The cost of buying the site with public money is a totally different consideration and not one for Planning. I urge that it is rejected.</li> <li>I have previously written to the Department on the subject of Plemont, in particular the environmental and socio-economic benefits of a 'wilderness' space. I should now like to add a further representation. It seems to me that the Department, the Minister and previous inspectors have failed adequately to relate the issues pertaining to Plemont to the existing Island Plan. As all three failed also the make the necessary correlation when it came to building at Portelet and Wolfs Caves and other sites, it has led to developers feeling encouraged again and again to ignore the provisions made for environmental protection. I beg respectfully that on this occasion the Plan is adhered to in a robust manner and the application be refused.</li> </ul>
98PIO	Melinda Lowther, St Clement	I am writing to object to the planning application for the development of the Plemont site. I do not believe that any development should be allowed on the site. This is a beautiful area and the site to be converted to an area for wildlife. There is very little unspoilt coast line left in Jersey and we need to maintain what we have left, this is an important part of us being a tourist attraction.
99PIO	Becky Makin St Brelade's Bay	I refer to the planning application regarding the Plemont community village and would like to place my objection. Although I appreciate that it will cost and take time to restore the land to its natural environment, whether that be a woodland area or nature reserve, I am concerned that the growing number of properties in Jersey, especially around its coastline, are damaging the Islands beauty and appeal to visitors to come to the Island. The greed of the building industry in Jersey is getting out of hand, with the number of flats that are available on the market and so called "affordable housing", is there really a need for more? I was under the impression from the local media that the States wanted to slow down the immigration rate, so why build more accommodation, bit of a contradiction don't you think? It is upsetting to see the Island already becoming a mini-city and if the States keep allowing developers to 'get their own way' the future is looking very bleak and like many other Jersey borns, I'm not going to stay to see the end result of the greed being inflicted (and even worse ALLOWED) on our Island.
100PIO	M Marquis, St Clement	Regarding the Plemont site, I implore you, please negotiate for the States to buy this land for the Island to be returned to nature so that this wonderful headland can be preserved for posterity.
101PIO	Jenifer Marshall, St Helier	Plemont headland should be purchased by the National Trust or the States of Jersey and then returned to nature.
102PIO	Sophie Marshman, St Clement	I object to this planning application, I think the site should be kept as an area of outstanding natural beauty. There are very few areas of coastline left that haven't been tampered with and keeping it as a beautiful natural area will contribute to attracting tourists to the island and therefore benefit the

		island as a whole as opposed to a rich few. The types of houses being built don't look to be affordable and the focus for building houses should be on making housing affordable to first time buyers rather than ruining this lovely area in order to benefit the millionaires club.
103PIO	Nicky Martini, St Helier	I am concerned that the States still believe they need public feedback on the development of Plemont. I have not seen one comment or letter from a member of the public insisting we should build housing on this land. The States should either buy it on behalf of the public or let the National Trust for Jersey buy it for the purposes of preserving the flora and fauna that live there. Any development should be sympathetic to the landscape and be used for environmental educational purposes. It's as simple as that. We have already ruined Portelet!
104PIO	Michele Masterton, St Ouen	I am writing to register my complete opposition to any plans to redevelop the Plemont Holiday Village site. As a Jersey "bean" and one of the people who took part in the Line in the Sand demonstration I feel that this is the final opportunity to reclaim this wild and beautiful site and preserve it for future generations of islanders and native wildlife to enjoy. Please explore every other option available. If this site is lost to development for purely commercial gain it will indeed be a very sad day for Jersey.
105PIO	Melissa Messervy, St Ouen	Along with huge concern raised over the aesthetic & environmental impact of building houses on the Plemont site (which have been well voiced though various forms of media, petitions, and demonstrations) I would like to draw attention to some of the practical issues. In particular the fact 26 houses is likely to add in the order of 50 cars to particularly narrow roads and a very tricky intersection (opposite the North Point cafe). With less than 20 houses on the road between north point and L'Etaq - the addition of 26 houses in one area seems entirely disproportionate. This is an opportunity to actually action all the words in the Island Plan and protect an environment which is unique to Jersey. The public have made it very clear what their overall opinion is concerning this development & there has been outrage over several recent coastal developments. I believe it is in Jersey's interest to demolish the buildings that are there and to return this area to natural habitat in keeping with the rest of this beautiful coast line. This would be in keeping with a whole sections on the States website outlining protecting our Environment.
106PIO	Peter Messervy-Gross, St Ouen	I'd like to submit the following with regard to the application for development of the Plemont headland: I have been on the planning website and reviewed the proposed development plans. In my view the application for residential development should be rejected on the following grounds: The development would have a considerable impact to the character of the area. It will change the headland from one (the with the exception of the derelict Butlins site) of beauty and idyllic countryside to an active residential area - just as can be found anywhere else on the island. Along with its associated noise, traffic, additional services etc Unless protection of the countryside is given and strictly adheard to we will end up with a bland island - covered from coast to coast in residential tarmac and hardcore. Which surely is not what the island plan is trying to achieve. The problem being every time decisions are given to build large developments in rural areas - it takes

		away from the diversity of the island. In the words of the Island Plan itself: "The character and quality of Jersey's countryside is a crucial part of its identity" With so few areas of open land and coastline available in Jersey - any change to allow further residential development will cause an enormous impact on a rare, finite and irreplaceable piece of land. Without firm protection, these hugley important parcels of land will be lost forever. I would hope that consideration is given to the amount of public interest and outcry surrounding the development. i.e. 'Line in the sand', over 10,000 signatures in the 2007 to the chief minister, or from the island plan (section 2.15) "It is quite apparent that public attitudes to further development of the countryside in particular have hardened" In my opinion - the plans should be wholly rejected, a fair valuation for the land should then be established and an offer put to the owner by the States of Jersey to purchase the land. The States should then return the land to nature for people to enjoy for generations to come.
107PIO	Wendy, Andy & Tom Middleton St Ouen	We would like to support the States purchase of the land provided that the ownership of the land is then gifted to the National Trust so as to ensure that no-one attempts to build on the site again in the future. Given the close proximity of the few surviving puffins on the Island, we would like to see Plemont restored to its former beauty with the Pontins buildings carefully removed at a time when the least possible disruption will be felt by the puffins. Glyn Young at Durrell is possibly the best person to be able to advise on a suitable timing for these works. It has always been a surprise to us that the Pontins buildings were built at Plemont and we feel that it would be a retrograde step for the States to allow anyone to build once more on this site of tremendous natural beauty. We hope that this is helpful.
108PIO	B A Morris, Grouville	I am writing in response to the public notice inviting written representations concerning a proposed Public Inquiry into an application to develop the Plemont holiday camp site for housing. Prewar, there was a small hotel on the site, which was presumably built at a time when there were few controls, and it was fashionable to erect hotels on cliff tops to take advantage of scenic views, with little thought given to the effects on the environment. Similar hotels were built above Sore} Point, and Bouley Bay, which fortunately have been removed and the land made good. The Bouley Bay site for instance, was acquired by The States for this reason. Corbiere headland was not so fortunate in that ungainly hotels built there have remained. After the war the holiday camp was built, presumably with the consent of the then Planning Authority - The Natural Beauties Committee - a contradiction in terms - and totally contrary to the first Article of its own law, which stated that it forbad the building of houses or buildings in the bays, or on the cliffs, and coasts of the island. The first Island Development Plan - The Barrett Plan - approved by the States in 1963, indicated those areas of particular landscape value, and a 'view' line beyond which any new building would affect (adversely) the whole of the zone between the view line and the coast, which the holiday camp obviously did. Barrett also stated that areas of particular landscape value within the coastal zone are of greater significance than the remainder of the zone, and should be preserved at any cost,
		and that the States should approve a policy whereby extension and repetition of mistakes shall not occur, and that unsuitable buildings are not replaced at the end of their useful years. The Plemont headland and the camp were included in the Green Zone in both the 1986, and 2009 Island Plans, in recognition of its particular landscape value, and to prevent building within it. The headland is not zoned for residential or any other form of development, so why is an application for housing in a totally inappropriate place even being considered? The assumption is being made by the developer, that the former holiday camp buildings must be permitted to be replaced with new buildings, but is this the case? The existing buildings are semi derelict, have no further use as a holiday camp, have been abandoned as such, and have come to the end of their useful life. They are now a liability, and have no value in this respect. The only way forward is demolition, but they should certainly not be allowed to be replaced. The overriding factor is the position of the site in the Green Zone, which should be the guiding principle in rejecting the scheme. Admittedly, once rejected, the developer has the limited option of repairing the camp buildings, but to what purpose. Permission to rebuild them, or convert them to residential or any other use should also be resisted. It is uncertain what the outcome of the inquiry will be. A hearing of an appeal by an Inspector in UK proceedings would normally be followed by either permission being granted, or the appeal being refused. There is no such set up locally, so presumably the Inspector could make no decision, and could only refer his findings to the Minister who would then have to decide. So the matter goes full circle, when what is needed is an independent and decisive outcome taking into consideration
--------	----------------------------	---
		powerful planning factors, and especially the position of the site in the Green Zone, which hopefully
109PIO	C O'Connor, Grouville	points to rejection of the scheme.         I wish to register my objection to the development and wish to be kept informed of any further information appertaining to this development.
110PIO	Mrs R O'Connor, Grouville	I wish to register my objection to the development and wish to be kept informed of any further information appertaining to this development.
111PIO	Mr & Mrs Olson, St Brelade	We are strongly in favour of the public acquisition of this headland and its restoration to nature. It would be a very significant accretion to the already impressive Coastal National Park and a wonderful facility for the people of this island, visitors and future generations to cherish and enjoy. There will be those, no doubt, who consider that the compromise offered by the proposed developer would be perfectly acceptable. That compromise envisages the transfer of ownership of a substantial portion of the headland to the public at no cost, and one can readily see why many Jersey folk would find that attractive! But in our view, the proffered compromise completely misses the point. An estate of 28 luxury houses would entirely change the character of the area, no matter how well designed or camouflaged the houses were. One shudders at the prospect of manicured gardens, walls and fences, cupressus leylandii and flowering cherries, garages and porticos In addition, the traffic generated by

112PIO	James Painter, St Brelade	residents, their families and guests, tradesmen, refuse collectors and the like would be entirely inconsistent with a completely natural, open area, as would the tarmacadamed estate roads and pavements along which such traffic would travel. Contrast that scenario with a wonderful, natural, wide-open space on our north-western coastline. We understand that the National Trust for Jersey would like to return the area to maritime heath land, as is the case at Les Landes, so that there is a chance that heath species can be encouraged to prosper and delight future generations. The stonechats at Les Landes are a joy to behold. We are told that the National Trust is currently working with Durrell to return the red-billed chough to the north coast cliffs. What an exciting prospect that is! For our part, we cannot imagine the magnificent Noirmont headland with 28 luxury houses in the middle of it, or Les Mielles, or Les Landes, or indeed any of our precious few open spaces. They would to all intents and purposes be lost. We cannot, we must not, let that happen at Plemont, We have an incredibly rare opportunity - a fantastic opportunity - to do something here that will be of benefit to many generations to come, to show that the people of Jersey have taken a wise and unselfish long-term view and, as an added bonus in 2012, to celebrate the Diamond Jubilee of Her Majesty the Queen. Nelson Henderson once said, "The true meaning of life is to plant trees, under whose shade you do not expect to sit." As true and pithy as that may be, the position here is even simpler, as we see it. If the people of Jersey grasp this wonderful opportunity, not only will future generations benefit, but also this generation - and this quite soon. In short, this is an opportunity that is too good to miss. We simply must take it.
		have, to return this part of the Island to nature. Once housing has been built there is no possible way agreement could ever be reached to take this course of action. Jersey is such a small place that retaining coastal land is essential to preserve the true spirit of Jersey and it would be a travesty to waste this change to turn back the clock and convincely enhance our lalende enneal
113PIO	Kat Painter, St Brelade	<ul> <li>to waste this chance to turn back the clock and genuinely enhance our Islands appeal.</li> <li>I only hope enough residents take the time and effort to email their concerns and thoughts on this subject. I hope for the sake of the natural beauty of the area and the unique remoteness, that this land is either bought by the Islanders or States and returned to its natural state of beauty. I feel it would be an absolute tragedy to develop further on this site and it specifically should be designated</li> </ul>

		as a site of special interest, as the States have done so, so successfully around the rest of the Island. There are some unique and special areas of our beautiful Island that we should cherish and nourish. Many species thrive on peace , quiet and natural habitat and they need protection from development and greed (someone made a brave and visionary decision about St. Ouen's Bay some years ago, I am sure no-one nowadays would say 'yes' we should have gone ahead with that planned development!). Absolutely 'NO' to development.
114PIO	Hugo and Vicky Peterson St Brelade	I have just joined Jersey Heritage and regard myself as conservative when it comes to finances and I am not a 'green'. I would therefore regard myself as the kind of person who would struggle to justify the financial cost. However having gone for walks there, I can truly say that it is probably the most scenic and tranquil spot on the island. We have a great chance to right a wrong and think of future generations. You cannot replicate Plemont so lets pay the developer a fair price. Over time that price will never be remembered, only the wisdom shown in returning it to its natural state for future generations. In a way you could liken the situation to St Ouen's bay. If far seeing people had not stuck a ' preservation order' over the land, God knows what monstrosities would have been erected.
115PI0	NOT USED	
116PIO	Nigel & Judith Queree St Ouen	SEE ANNEX 7
117PIO	Trevor Rabet, St Ouen	Whilst being a resident of St. Ouen, my sentiments with regard to the development of residential accommodation of the above site, are not due to the site being in my home Parish, but more on the basis that no headland in Jersey should be developed. It is my belief that the States of Jersey should, and indeed I would say must, purchase the site to prevent it from being developed as they did with the Corbiere headland, adjacent to the site of the former "Chalet Hotel" in 1987,and subsequently, the site of the former "Adrian's" ("Bal Tabarin") in St. Ouen. A precedent has been set and should be followed to protect important natural vistas for the benefit of the Island as a whole. The so-called "rainy day" fund, which as I understand it, is in credit to the tune of several hundred million pounds, could easily finance the purchase of the site, and although it will cost several million pounds to purchase the site, the long term gain to the Island is priceless. There is also the question of whether the owners of the site have addressed the size of the access road to Plemont, it is only one cars width for the majority of its length and, unless land purchases have been or will be made along the length of the road in order to widen it, I strongly suspect it does not meet the criteria for any housing development. I know from personal experience when the holiday camp was in operation during the summer months and I used to go fishing at Plemont how often I would have to pull over in one or two of the passing points or even go into a field entrance to allow traffic to get by. With a proposed development of 26 houses, that will be at least 52 cars and if the house owners have two children who are old enough to drive, that could be a potential additional 52

		vehicles. I trust the above will be considered in determining the future of Plemont and that it will not go the way of many other sites in Jersey, under concrete.
118PIO	A de Gruchy, St Aubin	In common with many others I object most strongly to any development at Plemont, and before it is too late the whole area should be purchased from the owner, at a fair price, by the Island or privately. I am a member of the National Trust and I support all the work they are doing in connection with preservation of the north coast, in fact I had, sometime ago, along with other islanders, pledged a substantial sum to purchase the land. Unfortunately at that time sufficient sums were not forthcoming. It follows, that the States must not hesitate and proceed to purchase the area.
119PIO	Bruno Rioda, St Ouen	Regarding Plemont and whether the building of houses should be allowed or not; I would like to make the following points: 1) The poor access of the proposed development in regard to traffic, services and other necessary
		facilities makes it a bad project in practical terms. 2) The visual impact of such an undertaking would, on completion, be disastrous for the coastline, and probably even more so than Portelet's.
		3) The wilful damage to the island's struggling natural habitats would not be forgivable by our children and grandchildren, who would have to live with such dire consequences.
		4)Headlands' protection was the message included in "The Line in The Sand" campaign; there was a clear indication of the will of the people versus profit and speculation at the cost of the very nature of Jersey's environment.
		5) The difficulty of the Planning Department in terms of facilitating the licit usage of the site by the owners is appreciated, nevertheless, could the aforesaid "P D" use a little of King Solomon's logic and allow the developers to build, but exactly what has been in place? We may well expect that faced with the reconstruction of the current ruin or the return of the land to nature any reasonable, or upprecised and allow the developer to be appendent to the latter.
120PIO	John Roberts, St Helier	or unreasonable man, would have to consent to the latter.           Arguments that the money would be better spent on meeting more immediate needs are attractive but at the end of the day we would just be stealing the rights of countless future generations to enjoy a unique unspoiled place in order to benefit our own short term interests. Haven't we done
		enough of that already? Has consideration been given to a public conscription? One anonymous donor has promised a large sum conditionally on the land being purchased for public use. Perhaps others would follow that example for smaller amounts. Taxpayers could be offered the chance to make a similar conditional donation by addition of a minimum of say 1% to their 2012 assessment.
		At least that would give them some say in how a bit of their money is spent and they could be recognised on an on-site plaque. Also I strongly agree with arguments that the access road is inadequate and there would soon be pressure to have it widened and straightened. I have no problem with Mr Hemmings asking a fair price for his land if that is his decision.

121PIO	Ian & Ruth Rolls, St Brelade	We feel very strongly that the headland at Plemont should be protected from any development. Jersey's wild and open areas are few and far between, (the St Ouen's Bay area is a national treasure) but they are incredibly important in a tiny island where pressure from developers is intense. It would be a powerful symbolic act to redress the damage done by insults to nature and the landscape such as at Portelet, the Incinerator at Havre des Pas and the Waterfront, to name just three there are numerous other smaller blots! Finance should not be the driving factor in cases such as this money can always be found (as happens with public service payoffs). It is all matter of priority.
122PIO	Thelma Rondel, St Saviour	As a Jersey-born resident aged 79, I wish to submit my representation regarding the future of our Plemont Headland. I would like to see old wrongs righted with the restoration of the total area of headland to the Island for public recreational use. I have already made a token donation to the National Trust for Jersey in support of their past attempt towards the purchase of this land and would be willing to make a further donation to them towards this end. I wholeheartedly support Senator Philip Bailhache in his present attempt to secure the return to the Island of Plemont headland.
123PIO	Dr Freda Ruderham, St Peter	SEE ANNEX 8
124PIO	C W Twiston Davies St Lawrence	Please register my objection to this plan which will deplete the rapidly diminishing Jersey countryside still further. It is dis-ingenious to state that 67% will be returned to nature for the benefit of the public when the building of so many units will bring with it all the trappings of urbanisation. I believe that this application if not contravening the <b>Planning and Building ( Jersey) Law 2002</b> <b>Article 2,</b> is certainly not in the spirit of what was intended.
125PIO	NOT USED	
126PIO	Celia Scott Warren, St Saviour	I am writing to you regarding the current planning application for houses to be built on the Plemont site. This is a unique and beautiful area of Jersey. In my opinion it is worthy of preservation for the enjoyment of future generations and this is likely to be the last chance to do so.
127PIO	Mr C Shales, St Helier	I am 78 years old and lived in Jersey all my life, and I think the Island should buy Pontins and return it to nature. There is enough of our coast line going already. Too much concrete our Island is going to sink.
128PIO	NOT USED	
129PIO	Mr & Mrs Simpson, St John	We are strongly in favour of the public acquisition of this land and its preservation for nature. Such a move would ensure that the character of the cliffs and surrounding terrain are maintained and improved and the environment for wildlife protected. Any development of the area will permanently change it, with the inevitable increase in tarmac, traffic, and all the trappings of semi-suburban life which come with this sort of estate. This is a matter on which one has to take the long term view. The proposed development will irrevocably change the area forever, for future generations and for nature, all in the interests of short

130PIO	Mrs P Small, Trinity	<ul> <li>term profit. By contrast, an acquisition by the public in order to proted maritime heath land would be of great benefit to future generations. It has been demonstrated that there is strong support in Jersey for the preservation of our coastline for nature. It is time to recognise this and to prevent damage to this valuable and irreplaceable resource.</li> <li>I am strongly opposed to any development at Plemont. The Holiday Camp was built for a different era, and was always a blot on the coastal landscape. No longer used, it became a derelict blot on the coastal landscape - a rude interruption to the Coast Path and something to feel deeply ashamed of. It needs to be razed to the ground and NOTHING put in its place. Housing simply shouldn't be considered, even if set back a little from the Holiday Camp site. The North Coast is already seeing a creeping intensity of development where hotels and other buildings once stood. Whenever you allow building it seems to lead to more building. For the sake of Tourism, Nature and Jersey Residents, keep an undeveloped area there. Have some thought for the future, not for a development near Plemont would be equally out of place. The approach roads are narrow. To allow more traffic would be foolish and to widen the road would completely change the remote feel of the area. Architects' drawings always show a pristine site, a place without people actually living there. But residents move in and bring cars which litter the roads where they are parked. Residents have children and children WILL roam away from their immediate surroundings in search of play and meeting space - skate boards and bicycles included. More litter is almost certain to be an issue. The family dogs will need to be exercised and would doubtless leave their mess scattered as widely as it is presently near the car park above Bonne Nuit. All these are likely to change the nature of the Coast Path completely. I cannot understand why this issue is still being debated. Plemont should be bought for the public,</li></ul>
131PIO	Judy Smith, St Ouen	Please spare Plemont. We have a unique opportunity to return this area back to nature. If development is allowed we will never again be able to reverse it. We owe it to future generations to seize the moment and protect this beautiful headland. Our coastline is beautiful and the north coast particularly stunning. As part of our National Park this area would be a great asset. As an area for walking and recreation it would be available to everyone to enjoy. Its comparative isolation and such steep cliffs nearby would seem to make it inappropriate for family houses. Even small developments breed more development and would change the ecological balance of the area. A land swap would free this headland without huge cost. Better still, could the owner of the land be persuaded to gift it to the island in his name which would be associated forever with this beautiful part of St Ouen? There is already a recent precedent in the island for such philanthropy.
132PIO	Simon Stead, St Brelade	This Island needs to keep all of its natural area clear and beautiful, so the next generation can walk freely on them without obstruction. We do not need any more pigs eared developments in their way.

133PIO	NOT USED	
134PIO	Tony Taylor, St Ouen	Over the last five years or more there has been an overwhelming public demonstration of people's concern for the environment in Jersey and, in particular, its coastline. Many Sates Members have endorsed such sentiments and policy exists in its support, to protect it. Meanwhile, numerous breaches of the spirit of Planning guidelines have taken place on prime coastline sites. We should not tolerate such inconsistency. The Plemont site is in hands of a private developer and he has some rights in this matter and could expect to gain financially from his investment. But gain by this developer and by the thirty or so eventual potential owners/dwellers of the proposed housing scheme would mean that very few benefit at the expense of the many – and the Island of Jersey itself. The Planning question is not: "Is the proposed housing scheme acceptable as a replacement to the (now derelict) holiday camp?" But, instead, in my view, it should be: "If this were a green field site, would the Planning Office approve development of thirty houses?" The answer to the latter would clearly be "no". (If you have any doubt, ask if the public would like to draw a "line in the sand", as many did on St Ouen's beach some years ago, around the Plemont site as a demonstration of their desire to protect the area from further violation. I think the response would be an overwhelming display against development.) In addition to returning the whole area to nature, no doubt many other options exist for smaller and more discreet developments on the site. Many members of the public and business community could offer you alternative schemes! Muy members of the guals to development that would create benefits for the long-term interest of the island's tourist industry. But please RESIST the option of seeking alternative ideas would only lead to delay. This enquiry needs to be decisive and lead to quick action. Please decide to acquire the land and to clear the site of all construction. Improve the existing car park and install public toilets and a vie
135PIO	Andrew Thompson, St Brelade	Despite the many fiascos that we have witnessed in Jersey over the past few years, I still have faith in democracy. Planning should, therefore, listen to the democratic wish of the overwhelming majority of the island, which is for Plemont to be returned to its natural state – free from development. The Planning Department should be safeguarding the wishes of the majority not pandering to the greed of the few (i.e. most developers).
136PIO	Mrs Vardon, Trinity	I would love to see the Plemont headland site returned back to its original natural state. I think the States should only part fund the cost of the site possibly with lottery money, the rest could be raised with private donations, but only after a fair price for the site has been assessed.
137PIO	Mrs J Vibert, Trinity	Mr Hemmings is already rich enough without making more money from developing the Plemont site and there are already plenty of expensive properties for sale in the island without yet more. Please return the site to nature for both locals and visitors to enjoy. Surely planning must have learnt a

		lesson from the Portelet development which has spoilt one once beautiful area. Please don't ruin Jersey further. The States waste money all the time but money spent buying back this site won't be wasted as it will be there for future generations. I asked my husband what he thinks and he says that the States never listen to us so why now? Please prove him wrong!
138PIO	Vivien Vibert, Walter Saunders & Jackie Doran, St Martin	The rural nature of this site can be seen on page 15 of "Jersey from the Sky", printed as a supplement to the Jersey Evening Post on 19 July 2012, and the narrow zigzag road system can also be seen. How the cliff could and should look can be seen on page 20. The Island plan shows the site in the green zone, but this is because of the existing buildings, and geographically it belongs in the coastal zone, and is a bulge in the natural curve of coastal zone between Grève de Lecq and Grosnez. It also looks out over the sea to the Paternosters reef, which is a Ramsar site, and a holistic, integrated view would take account of this. We object to the proposals which are inconsistent with the rural sense of space in the North West of the Island of Jersey. The proposal would not deliver social and/or economic benefits to Jersey in general as Jersey does not need more large up-market houses in remote corners. The two thirds of the land to "be returned" to nature and be publicly accessible, would not ameliorate the situation as the entire 4,7 hectare site would be wrecked during construction and with three clusters of buildings the open land would be chopped into plots useless for wildlife or valuable public access. 1. During construction, many lorries would thunder and squeeze through one of Jersey's most rural areas, in lanes narrowing from 6 to 3 metres (para 4.2.1 of Parsons Brinckerhoff's Transport Assessment). These transport consultants dismiss the construction for the numbers of lorry- (and van-)loads required for 28 houses. 2. After construction the traffic pressure would also be significant. Parsons and Brinckerhoff suggest that it would be no worse than when the holiday camp was in action, but their October 1999 figures show that non-seasonal traffic was only 10% to 50% of that in high season. 28 high-end houses are likely to have two cars and two drivers each, both making at least one two-way trip a day, plus say 14 trips for delivery men, visitors etc, so 70 two-way trips/140 per day which over a 14 hour

4. Noise, air and light pollution, and potentially liquid and solid waste finding its way down the cliffs
during and after construction.
<ul> <li>5. Digging up of roads for the infrastructure supply of electricity, optic cables and sewage, unless sewage is to be dealt with on site in which case the land destruction would be even greater.</li> <li>6. Visual damage, comparable to the Portelet development, with the NE cluster being up to 3.85 metres higher at roof ridge than the present buildings.</li> </ul>
7. All the above would tend to damage tourism, as many people walk the north coast and would be shocked at the desecration caused by these proposals.
B. The effects of the proposals are in stark contrast to the aims of planning policy as enunciated in many documents, examples of which are:
<ol> <li>Island Plan 2011, Foreword by then Planning and Environment Minister, Senator Freddie Cohen: "Protecting our precious coast and countryside is a key part of the new Plan"</li> <li>Island Plan 2011, Objective GD1:</li> </ol>
"3. To protect and enhance the natural, historic and built environment;
4. To achieve more sustainable forms of development;"
3. Integrated Coastal Zone Management Strategy March 2008:
a) Preface: "The coast and seas around Jersey are an integral part of Island life. It is therefore essential that the coast is protected and managed so that it can continue to be enjoyed by generations to come. " and
"The benefit for Jersey in the long term will be a well managed, healthy coastal and marine environment that supports a thriving economy and which is a source of pride for the community" b) 2.4 Ecosystem approach
"[The ecosystem approach] recognizes that people depend on healthy ecosystems and that there are limits to how much the environment can sustain in terms of social and economic benefits. If these limits are exceeded, the integrity of the system breaks down and it becomes less stable and less productive. This can severely affect our quality of life." c) 4. Strategy Objectives, Key Aims and Desired Outcomes
"A. Protect and conserve the wildlife, habitats, geodiversity and cultural heritage of Jersey's coast and sea, their supporting ecological processes and overall resilience."
4. The Paternosters Ramsar Management Plan, Foreword by Deputy Rob Duhamel, Minister for Planning and Environment "Good stewardship of our coastal and marine environment is vital for the island and future generations" and
"If Jersey is going to support the natural environment and be a resource for all the other interests it is vital management is responsible and integrated. "
Our submission supports these and many other stated concepts of the integrated sustainability and protection of coastal areas being key, essential and vital in making planning decisions such as this

-		
		one. Past generations have allowed the building on this precious site a sprawling holiday camp and is a good example of a bad planning decision now visited on the 'future generation' which is our generation. Let us not repeat past mistakes, but preserve this corner of rural Jersey for the community pride of generations to come. Some commentators in the media have said that it would be a waste of public money for the States to buy this land, but that is short-term thinking – there would be no old oak or apple trees, for example, if our ancestors had not planted them, no fine granite masonry if our ancestors had not spent time, money and care on them. We must do what we can today for the health of the island and its inhabitants, plant and animal as well as human, and in this way we will be doing something for the world too.
139PIO	Martin Walton, St Martin	I am 68 and Jersey has always been my home. I have Worked in Environmental Health and, now retired, act as a guide for Tourism. I have a good idea of changes in Jersey over my time. Once where you might have walked in solitude, you will now find ten people jogging, walking or cycling in areas of countryside and along the coastline. It is these areas, along with beaches and bays that have made Jersey so special and supreme to live in. Jersey vanishing into a suburbia of buildings and manicured lawns is now a real problem. An increased public need more of these areas which are getting less. A special consideration over change from holiday village to luxury housing is that a temporary holiday population does not have the same effect on the natural environment as a permanent residential population which brings manicured, exclusive and constant use, together with the effects of domestic pets on Fauna and Flora. Arguments that money would be better spent on Health and Housing are fallacious. These are problems that can only be treated on their own ground by long term government policy and not cash injection. Jersey deserves better than continuing to be treated as a development playground for those mainly concerned with material gain. I am pessimistic about present States changing from their traditional stance.
140PIO	Olivia Warham, London	I would like to make a submission against the current planning for houses at Plemont. The site is clearly an area of natural beauty and should remain so. Building 28 houses there would irrevocably change the look and feel of the local environment. Plemont is Jersey at its most picture-postcard-perfect. The reason tourists come to Jersey is for the beautiful beaches which can't be beaten throughout all the Mediterranean. It would be criminal to spoil this incredible, precious and unique area of coastline with housing. The fact that Pontins is there already should be put down to an error of judgement the first time round. This should not be repeated. A postcard of modern Plemont should not include a housing development on top of its stunning cliffs. Not only would a planning development spoil an area of such outstanding beauty which is unique to Jersey, there is also no infrastructure to support such an undertaking. A tiny lane takes beach and cliff-goers to their nature destination. There is no room for 28 families to be engaged in the toing and froing that is a must in modern life. Any additional development would go further to destroy the area's peace and tranquillity and is not currently sustainable. In addition, there are fewer and fewer parts of Jersey's coastline that are in their natural state. Those that are should be cherished, not vandalised further.

		This is completely the wrong area to choose to as a development site. It goes against nature's beauty, tourism and common sense for modern life. I urge you to abandon the plans for this development urgently. NB I was born in Jersey and visit the island for weeks every year.
141PIO	M West, St Helier	Jersey is a small island with a large population and a limited amount of space. Space for developments have been given by planning over the past few years. Many of these have resulted in comments from the public and states members, to the effect of 'we didn't realise this was going to be so out of proportion/hideous/unsympathetic/expensive. Such as Portelet, Radissson Hotel, waterfront, houses on the north coast, etc etc. We cannot afford to continue to make the same mistakes. Plemont was developed in the 60's when scant attention was paid to ecology, environment etc, and surely such a building programme would not be permitted today if it was still untouched land? On that basis, future development should not be permitted on a large scale. We understand that the developer now owns the land, and that gives certain entitlements. However, to develop on a large scale against public opinion, when living in a small island, is unseemly at best and greedy at worst. We all know the developer does not need the huge sums that will be made from the proposed development. A small return on the original investment should be offered by the States, which should be accepted by the development which have been permitted, for better or worse. Alternatively, a very small Eco compliant development with community amenities such as a camp site and nature trails etc for the use of the population as a whole - similar to Crabbe, could be considered. This could be a learning centre for the island and perhaps a place where people could come to learn about the follies of the past and how they have been avoided for the future in the case of this site and hopefully many more to come. In addition there is the matter of all the services in a small area which should be kept as natural as possible. The states should be learning from past mistakes, not continuing to make the same ones over and over again. We believe that ownership of a wild area in Jersey is a privilege and something to be treasured, not something from which to make huge profits. We
142PIO	Sue Widdowson, St Brelade	In common with many Islanders I have views about any development at Plemont and I am glad to have an opportunity to express them. As the Island becomes more crowded our open spaces become fewer, but small isolated areas of green surrounded by buildings don't really fulfil people's need for them. Before it is too late we need to preserve our North Coast and as much of our remaining coastline too as an extended area of natural countryside. I think this is necessary for Islanders, but we also attract many visitors who are drawn here for the wonderful walking and
		natural scenery we have to offer. Any residential development at Plemont would need to offer at least a shop and other facilities, is this being taken into account? So often a small development is

		extended over the years. Ideally the site should be bought by the States or perhaps the National Trust, with perhaps donations from some of our better off residents? WE CAN NEVER RESTORE THIS SITE ONCE IT IS DEVELOPED!
143PIO	Mr & Mrs R L Williams & Family St Martin	I am sending this e-mail in support of returning the Plemont Bay Holiday Village in St. Ouen to its natural State. I add my support to The National Trust and Islanders who are in support of returning this beautiful head land back to nature for Jersey residents, tourists and future generations to be enjoyed. On a personal note as a new comer to Jersey in 1993 I visited Plemont with Mike Stentiford on one of his coastal walks. I was appalled that there was a development on such a beautiful natural spot. In the Western world natural scenic place are being protected; although Jersey has an Island plan, too often, it is tempered with. One only has to look at the development at Portelet Bay. Senator Ozouf has just again announced he will release millions to start kick an economic recovery. I believe one should also plan for the increased population of Jersey. It is a small island and citizens do need natural spaces to retrieve to. Although there was a Holiday Villiage built at one time, to be enjoyed by many people during a time when Jersey tourism was the main source of income. Times have changed. Jersey's population has increased many times over. There are sufficient homes on the market, one only has check the property pages in the JEP. to confirm this. There is no need to have a select enclave built of, I believe 26 homes, for the benefit of at the most 100 people. I strongly support that the States of Jersey purchase this site for the well being of its people and tourism. Also with the assistance of The National Trust, I sincerely believe we can achieve to return this headland to its original natural state.
144PI	Mrs Valerie Wood, St Saviour	I would like to express my opinion as a Jersey born person who has lived in the Island for over 50 years. I feel very strongly that the Plemont site should be returned to its natural state to encourage the return of the natural vegetation & wildlife & to do away with the hideous monstrosity of Pontins Holiday camp. Let us learn a lesson from the horrendous development mistakes which were made during the 50's & 60's & do everything in our power to prevent further spoilation of our unique & beautiful coastline.
145 PI	Deputy John Young, St Brelade	SEE ANNEX 10

## Background

The Council for the Protection of Jersey's Heritage has consistently maintained that to permit the building of a large-scale housing estate on the historic coastal headland at Plémont would be in direct contravention of the fundamental purposes of the Building and Planning (Jersey) Law 2002 and identified policies effective under the Law described in Jersey Island Plan 2011, specifically designed to protect important coastal and countryside areas<sup>1</sup>.

It is the considered opinion of the Council that to allow development as planned would constitute an environmental disaster of major proportions.

Conclusions reached in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and the Site Specific Landscape and Visual Assessment (SSLVA) submitted in support of the application are disputed. The EIA fails to take proper account of the definitive assessments made in the Countryside Appraisal Report 1999<sup>2</sup>, a key document in the production of the Jersey Island Plan. The SSLVA does not consider the most important landscape viewing area near Hougue de Grosnez, from which the whole site is plainly visible from the land.

Directions by previous planning committees have been ignored in this latest application. For example, in 2002 the Planning and Environment Committee advised<sup>3</sup> that it would not support:

- i. Any major residential development in this location;
- ii. A residential development of the same floor-space;
- iii. Any form of housing 'estate' style development in this location.

This is an 'estate'<sup>4</sup> style development with an effective area spread over the site larger than the existing holiday-camp buildings. The limited comparison of the buildings floor-space, which ignores garaging, parking areas and gardens, has nothing to do with judging the actual visual impact of the proposed development.

Reasons given by the Minister for refusing an application P/2006/1868 for 36 dwellings<sup>5</sup> are relevant to this application and remain valid.

# The Importance of the Plémont Headland

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> CPJH letters on P/2011/1673 dated 30 January 2012, P/2009/2108 dated 6 December 2009, P/2006/1868 dated 2 November 2006.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Countryside Character Appraisal commissioned by States of Jersey Planning and Environment Committee and published in 1999.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee 20 June 2002.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The Concise Oxford dictionary defines 'estate' as "a modern residential or industrial area with integrated design or purpose."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Planning and Building Services letter Application P/2006/1868 dated 17 July 2008.

The importance of the Plémont coastal headland as part of a prominent, scenically beautiful and historic landscape of the North coast cannot be over emphasised. It is in clear view along the coast from Grosnez in the West to Sorel Point in the East. It is noted for its geological formation, its largely treeless, scenically beautiful, natural windswept wildness and wilderness character. The Plémont headland is an integral part of the coast stretching from L'Etacq in the South.

There is no comparable stretch of coastal cliff in the Channel Islands, in Brittany, in Normandy or in Southwest England that can claim such a range of geological, archaeological, historical, natural historical and other features as this area of cliff and heathland in Jersey<sup>6</sup>. As such, it is priceless, scenic, cultural heritage which should be preserved for the enjoyment of future generations.

## The Existing Blot on the Landscape

The derelict holiday-camp buildings create a dreadful blot on this largely unspoilt and remarkable landscape. Their existence is the only possible justification for the present application. The closely built holiday-camp complex was built at a time when the tourism industry was seen as having paramount importance to the economy of the Island. Furthermore, the decision to permit its building in this place was made at a time when preserving historic, coastal landscapes, scenic beauty and cultural heritage was not appreciated as it is today.

The developers will have to provide strong justification for repeating a serious planning mistake made is less enlightened times and when economic circumstances were very different. It will need to be demonstrated that this development is necessary to meet an essential community need, and that it cannot be located elsewhere. The present, derelict buildings represent a failed commercial enterprise in the declining tourism industry which was no longer viable and ceased trading in September 2000. These buildings have been in decay ever since.

A representative has stated in public<sup>7</sup>, on behalf of the owners, that they have the means to restore the derelict buildings for their original use. There is a measure of general agreement that this constitutes an existing legal entitlement. The same representative also stated in public that the present buildings are dangerous and rat infested. Therefore, the Inquiry should consider instructing the Planning Committee to issue an order in accordance with Article 84 of Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 requiring the repair or removal of these ruinous or dilapidated buildings within a reasonable time-frame. In conjunction with this order the Inquiry should consider the applicability of Articles contained in Chapter 3 of the Planning Law which deals with dangerous buildings.

#### The Unique and Precious Character of this part of the North coast

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Unpublished paper 'Evaluation of the North Coast of Jersey with Particular Reference to the L'Etacq to Plémont Stretch' Dr. J.T.Renouf 2002.
 <sup>7</sup> Public meeting held in St Ouen's Parish Hall.

The Inquiry should also take full note of the Countryside Character Appraisal document and in particular its description of Character Area A1: North Coast Heathland, and Character Area E1: North-West Headland (St. Ouen) where it is stated:

The visual and aural impacts of developments on, or adjacent to, the heathland edge such as the holiday complex at Plémont, shooting range at Crabbé, model aircraft site at Les Landes and proposed go-kart race track all threaten the peaceful, remote, wilderness qualities of the north coast.

It is recommended that the north coast heathlands should have the highest level of protection and:

There is no capacity to accept further development. In this area, even small scale isolated developments can have a major impact on the sense of wilderness, isolation and remoteness which are important, although diminishing qualities in Jersey.

Addressing threats to local character it is stated:

New residential 'suburban' groups of houses go against the grain of the remote 'rural' character of the area.

And on required levels of protection and capacity to accept change:

The North-West Headland of St. Ouen is characterised by sparse development and remote character. It should remain undeveloped.

### The need to preserve the panoramic views and scenic beauty of the coastal landscape at Plémont

To replace the present derelict holiday-camp with a large-scale housing development, with the majority of the planned buildings, not on the site of the present buildings, but displaced onto undeveloped land, would, in addition to being in direct contravention of Island Plan policy NE7, destroy for ever this scenic, coastal landscape and urbanise the area, thereby detracting from the heathland character and historic field patterns on the site itself, and on the adjacent areas clearly shown on the Duke of Richmond map printed in 1795.

## Planning Application P/2011/1673 and its Non-Compliance with the Provisions of Jersey's Planning Law

It is certain that a large-scale housing estate with an extended access road with 28 new houses arranged in three groups with walled gardens interconnected by new footpaths all set in un-natural, managed grassland areas with extensive, alien tree-planting will result in the permanent destruction and suburbanising

of one of the few remaining and rapidly disappearing natural coastal landscapes in Jersey. Clearly this would be in direct contravention of the very purpose of Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002, as laid out in Article 2, which is:

to conserve, protect and improve the Island's natural beauty, natural resources and general amenities, its character, and its physical and natural environments.

to protect sites and places that have special importance or value to the Island

to ensure that the coast is kept in its natural state.

To replace one large blot on this magnificent landscape with another cannot be seen as justifiable under present Law.

# Jersey Island Plan 2011

Many Island policies are relevant to this application. The most important concerns the protection, under Policy NE7, of the designated Green Zone within which the whole site is situated. Also directly applicable here is Policy ERE 1, 'safeguarding agricultural land'. The Council agrees with the observation made by in the Main Inspectors' Report on (Draft) Island Plan 2009 about the importance of

safeguarding agricultural land to increase the security of food supplies<sup>8</sup>

The Council disagrees with the applicant's claim that the whole site, though including parts of Fields 44 and 47 and farmland<sup>9</sup>, is all 'brownfield'.

The Jersey Island Plan Glossary definition<sup>10</sup> lacks the detail provided in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3, effective in the UK<sup>11</sup>. All the houses in the South East 'cluster' numbered 1 to 12 inclusive, part of house number 14, houses 19, 20, 21 and 22 are planned to be built on previously undeveloped land in the Green Zone, in direct contravention of Policy NE7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Inspectors' Main Report on The (Draft) Island Plan 2009, Para. 2.8.
<sup>9</sup> Claim reported in The Jersey Evening Post, 3 July 2012 (page 3).
<sup>10</sup> Jersey Island Plan 2011, Glossary at Appendix B.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> UK Planning Policy Statement 3(PPS 3).

### CONCLUSION

Application P/2011/1673 to build a housing estate of 28 houses in this sensitive Green Zone area is in contravention of the very purposes of the present planning Law and identified policies of the Jersey Island Plan 2011. The applicant's contention that there will be positive environmental improvement betrays a fundamental misunderstanding of the importance of the Plémont coastal headland as outstanding cultural heritage that should be protected at all costs from any new development. Any large-scale development here would constitute a major environmental disaster for Jersey.

In these circumstances the Council is convinced that the Inquiry cannot support the present application in Law and it should therefore recommend to the Minister for Planning and Environment that it is refused forthwith.

## **ANNEX 2**

The Parish fully supports a public enquiry and asks that the Planning inspector considers this application within the overall context of the 2011 Island Plan as approved by the States of Jersey. It is worth noting that much of the proposal information is based on the 2002 Island Plan. The Parish questions the environmental and visual benefits achieved by the proposed development of 28 houses, spread over the site in three relatively dense clusters especially as the site falls within the green zone and is surrounded on three sides by the Coastal National Park. Comments are based on information provided by BDK architects in support of their application dated 12 December, 2011. This has proved difficult as the non-technical summary dated November 2009, has not been updated although a schedule of revisions was provided separately.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PLANNING CONTEXT

The Parish believe that this site is totally unsuitable for a new community of this size: there is a poor public transport service, no social provision and a general lack of amenities. The application does not meet the objectives contained in the Island Plan, designed to protect such areas from large scale development. The Parish supports the removal of an intrusive and ugly development, the proposed residential development is significant and may not provide the environmental and character improvements it seeks to achieve.

The following matters should be considered;

- The appropriateness of the proposed development in this environmentally sensitive area.
- Whether the application meets the overall policy requirements as set out in ISLAND PLAN 2011 and specifically what impact the approval of this application will have on the protection of the Island's GREEN ZONE, Policy NE7 and the COASTAL NATIONAL PARK, Policy NE6, also see Policies SP3, GD1,GD2, GD5 and NE4
- The appropriateness of the Design Statement provided by BDK Architects including; The Environmental Amenity and Character Benefit. The suitability of the proposed 'Gross Habitable Area', in particular the use of Roof spaces. The general positioning and layout of the houses. The provision for cars including garages, car ports, open and visitor parking.

The traffic generation report of 1998/1999 may no longer be relevant and contrary to policy SP6.

Insufficient parking to one of the most popular Island beaches.

The Parish have following observations, refer to the title sections found in BDK Architects- Non technical report.

### 2.00 SITE PLANS AND ACCOMMODATION SCHEDULES

• Roof spaces (unidentified on some plans) could provide 15 or more habitable rooms. Overall built space is likely to be increased over time, if conservatories and extensions were allowed.

## 5.00 PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

## **Detailed Layout Description**

- It is proposed to build predominantly large, tightly grouped 2 or 2.5 storey houses, not low level buildings which would minimise the visual impact.
- The biggest houses have been located within the North East Cluster. This is inappropriate as it is the highest point, resulting in 'skyline' development contrary to Policy GD5 (a policy new in the 2011 Island Plan which there is no reference in the proposal).
- Notwithstanding current planning guidelines on car parking provision, the number of spaces will be inadequate. Parking on nearby roadways within the development is not unacceptable.
- The current public parking area adjacent to the site does not provide sufficient parking to meet current usage.

In the event that the development of the site was acceptable the Parish request that parking and traffic issues must be fully addressed prior to any approval.

- Built Floor Areas do not include roof space and attics. They will impact upon the stated ratios and percentages used to support the application.
- The revised figures will increase occupancy numbers which will impact upon vehicle parking and traffic.

## 5.20

- The creation of a village type development in this isolated area is inappropriate and out of keeping. This is borne out by previously submitted applications.
- Traditional hamlets normally consist of a mixture of 1 and 2 storey buildings, far less imposing than those proposed.
- The 'Clusters' could become 'gated secure enclosures' an undesirable element in any "Coastal National Park'.

## 5.4 and 5.6 TRADITIONAL PRECEDENTS

- External perimeter boundaries of granite walling, banques, hedges and trees are fine in theory. The exposed location and poor ground quality will lead to probable failure of most vegetation, and species will strive to mature.
- 'Unsecured' boundaries will lead to a wide variety of fencing. Also as there will be no planning control 'down the line', it is likely that the whole aesthetic nature of the site will unravel with conservatories etc.
- The Coastal National Park adjoining the site supports an outstanding variety of vegetation, flora and birds. How will open spaces within the confines of the 3 clusters reflect this natural environment and deliver the gains to justify the development.

## 6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.4 Energy Efficiency
- The Parish questions the adequacy of information provided and the ability to achieve the gains described in the statements provided by the agent.

## 6.8 School Capacity

• Some occupants will choose to send their children to fee paying schools, States schools are required to accommodate about 60% of children. Consideration must be given to the availability of places in the catchment area.

### 6.9 Traffic and Transport Impact

From the traffic assessment, the development will increase the level of traffic, to the point that the road will be used to its capacity. This would be considered unacceptable in a rural location and demonstrates that the study is flawed. An up to date assessment should be undertaken to determine the impact this application will have on the surrounding area.

#### 6.12 Landscape and Visual Impact

- There will be a substantial improvement to the area if the present buildings are removed, however, the construction and number of new properties will not necessarily 'merge sympathetically into the landscape'.
- The North East cluster will become a prominent 'skyline development' as the ridge/roof lines will be higher than the present building, by an estimated 3.0 metres.
- How does this application comply with the General Development and Control policies; GD1-paragraph 2 a,b,c and GD2-paragraph 4 and 5. The
  Parish considers that the failure of the applicant to provide revised arguments based on the 2011 Island Plan is particularly disappointing. The extant
  EIS addresses criteria which no longer apply, especially the context of the Coastal National Park, where the level of test has to be much more robust
  than "the proposal is better than the existing buildings" which is effectively all it says. Given the revised planning context, any proposal in this location
  should surely have to prove significantly positive benefits. Had the Holiday Camp not existed, the site of the application would be entirely contained
  within the Coastal National Park.
- The landscaping of the site together with the proposed new planting scheme must be subjected to further scrutiny, as failure to screen properties will result in a continuance of a visual intrusion.

#### CONCLUSION

In summary, the Parish of St Ouen has significant concerns over the proposed development as outlined below:-

- The location of the site does not suit the scale of the proposed development.
- The scale and density of the 28 houses will not provide the long term benefits that must be gained from any new development of this important Green zone site.
- Due consideration must be given to potential habitable rooms which are likely to be constructed within roof/attic spaces as the use of these additional spaces will have 'knock on' affects as explained.

- The drawings of the proposed 'South Street' and 'East Street' sectional/elevations showing the groups of houses numbered 13-16 and 17-28, clearly illustrate how the new housing will dominate the open headland landscape.
- Attention is particularly drawn to the heights of the houses in the North East grouping where ridge levels will be higher than the existing Holiday Village buildings by approximately 3.000 metres or 10 feet.
- The success of any proposed scheme will depend upon the integration of the housing into the landscape. Unfortunately, our view is that this will not be fulfilled, due to the probable failure of most/or all of the proposed hedging and tree planting.
- The new planting even if successful, will take many years to mature and during this period the development would be, without doubt, an undesirable scar on the Island's Landscape.
- The open area within the confines of the 3 clusters is described as managed grassland, it is difficult to imagine how this area will contribute to or encourage public access or use.
- The 'Cluster groups' could easily over time become secure gated mini estates all too familiar in urban locations. This would not be appropriate in a country setting.

All the above questions the credibility of the proposed development and the claim made by the applicant, to deliver a 'Green' plan with over 60% of the site returned to a natural landscape.

The Parish are unable to support this latest application.

Parish of St Ouen

- This is a Green Zone, an area of 'Outstanding Beauty', and development is against the Island Plan.
- There is a change of use, from a holiday village to residential, so there should not be a presumption that development can take place. Further development is hardly going to be an improvement on the area or 'enhancing the area', one of the arguments put forward, when compared to 'No Development at All', and the existing buildings removed.
- It is acknowledged that a development would never be considered there, if there were no existing buildings, so why continue with this mistake?
- It was put at a Public meeting at St Ouen's Parish Hall, that the development would be in the nature of the 'traditional Jersey Farmstead.' This is fundamentally flawed. There would hardly be around 28 houses on a site of this size. There would be the original Farmhouse, possibly 15<sup>th</sup> or 16<sup>th</sup> century and possibly then a Victorian addition, or a replacement house, with a hay barn and other smaller outhouses. Except of course it was never built there as it was far too exposed. This shows a lack of understanding of 'traditional Jersey, and the plan is a poor pastiche of the values of Jersey Farmhouses, and has no place here. It is an insult to our intelligence. It is a housing estate.
- BDK's environment report's closing argument, as reported in the JEP, 'that because there are already a few houses in the area it is not going to make any difference to the wildlife if there are more' is quite ludicrous. Of course it will make a difference to the wildlife, building some 28 dwellings and their associated activities, pets and noise.
- There would be a large increase in light pollution, especially if conservatories were added at a later date.
- Noise pollution: For example imagine a summers evening where houses may have there windows open: T.V., radio, vacuum cleaners, music systems, all playing different sounds. Outside there may be: lawn mowers, strimmers, and those (ridiculous) blowing tools. All of this in an 'Area of Outstanding Beauty above a beach and a cliff path that many locals and tourists go to.
- There is talk of careful natural planting suited to the area; will this really be maintained? People will want to plant what they like and prefer, leading further to the 'suburban look'.
- Gardens, unless organic, may use pesticides which will further impact on wildlife.
- Rendered concrete walls are totally inappropriate in this location.
- There is much talk of colours blending in: how will this be achieved with probably about 60 cars parked around these houses? (Allowing at least two per household plus visitors) Will washing hanging up to dry enhance the area?
- The statement said that 'visual impact of any buildings is virtually eliminated' is farcical. What! We won't notice a suburban sprawl on this headland!
- We are also concerned that this housing estate is alongside the road and looks like it has been designed for in-fill.
- A concrete mound was proposed as a way to 'improve the local micro- climate'. This is simply a way of dumping their rubbish! (Thick banks of hedges would be far more environmentally friendly)
- Mr Harding of BDK Architects also said at the meeting that 'some development will be taking place so we had better get used to the idea'. What amazing arrogance, or has a deal already been agreed with the Planning Department, and all this is just a Public Relations exercise?
- We heard mention that there may be a 'Human Rights' issue that the speculator has on this land to apply to develop. 'The Human Rights' came in after the 1<sup>st</sup> World War, as a result of all the atrocities; we are missing the whole point here are we not? A refusal would hardly be taking away

someone's freedom etc. This argument is an insult to those who died and suffered as a result of either World War. Do the 'Human Rights' apply to Development Companies anyway? The owner did not see fit to even come to the meeting and face the people that his scheme will be affecting, is this really showing concern for how the locals feel?

- There was an argument that there is an obligation to allow some development as the speculator has bought the property. This is nonsense! No one forced him to buy it. This is the nature of speculation.
- We are also told that prices, as stated in the JEP by BDK Architects, would start at around £360,000. This is seriously misleading, as according to a later advert in the JEP, by the same Architects, the value of the site is £15 million. This makes the site value of each house an average of around
- £500,000 without any building works; or are we to believe they will be sold at a loss as a philanthropic gesture? The value of the site without building permission is not £15 million, (we believe they paid around £5 million) and this advert of theirs was 'bullying'; how dare they tell us, quote, what 'the only options are'!
- A member of BDK Architects has told us that the developer wants to do something that will please the people of Jersey. This is his opportunity. Except for those with a vested interest in the development, no one at the meeting was in favour. It was interesting to note that two people that spoke for the development did not declare their interest. Can we ask the owner to donate the land to the people of Jersey; perhaps money could be raised to clear the redundant buildings, and the owner would be remembered as a great philanthropist.
- We meet many tourists who ask what is going on with this area, and when we explain what is proposed they are quite astonished it is even being considered; 'why on earth would you put a housing estate in such a wonderful area, it will destroy the beauty of the place, and dramatically reduce the attraction for tourists, don't you care?'
- There were just over 10,000 people who signed a petition against development. On another occasion about 7,000 people stand in a line on St.Ouen's beach to say 'No to coastline development', supporting Mike Stentiford and the National Trust, all these people demonstrating how they care passionately about our Island and in particular this beautiful area at Plemont, above a truly stunning bay. This is a wonderful opportunity to return the whole area into more wilderness, which is a fundamental need for everyone to enjoy and unwind in; in this crowded yet lovely and fragile Island. We are building more and more at an increasing rate, we must protect these sensitive areas. Are these people to be ignored, and if so what does this say about our representatives and democracy?
- If this is passed, then our generation will go down in history as the ones that missed a wonderful opportunity to say no to unwanted development. However, if it is refused, then it shows that true democracy, in the real sense of the word, can work, and that the people are listened to.

Please refuse this for the people and the future people of this Island.

Mr & Mrs Radcliffe

### **SOCIÉTÉ JERSIAISE - Environment Section**

Of major importance is the fact that the site is in the Green Zone, although this has then to be considered within the over-riding policies on Sustainability.

Proposal 4, Coast and Countryside Character, gives a clear expression of the Department's current thinking and, by implication, clarifies the hierarchy of current relevant policies. It expresses the over-riding status of general policy on protection of the countryside. It follows that the later Green Zone policy is – and was earlier - intended to be interpreted within the general policy and subservient to it. Thus, where there may be any doubt as to the relevance and interpretation of any Green Zone policy, enhancement and restoration of the local landscape must be the deciding factor.

#### Policy NE 7 – Green Zone:

'The areas designated as Green Zones on the Island Proposals Map will be given a high level of protection and there will be a general presumption against all forms of new development for whatever purpose'.

A comprehensive list of exemptions makes no reference to permitting any new housing other than (1) extensions of existing houses, (2) limited ancillary building, (3) replacement of a dwelling, (4) staff accommodation, (5) redevelopment of existing non-residential building where its use remains the same, (6) conversions and (7) to meet agricultural needs.

The proposal in this application is to change from commercial use to residential use: associated environmental gain may be a welcome element but it does not validate an application that otherwise fails to meet other conditions. Also, it is implicit that, to qualify as a re-development, a replacement should be on the original site – not some distance away and on a number of different footprints.

The policy recognises that any new building should have a reduced visual impact and be more sensitive to the character of the area and local relevance. In the proposal, 28 houses would be erected in three groups on a new site on which there have been no buildings. The groups have been described as simulating hamlets – but these are not a feature of the north-west of the Island. Any reduction in visual impact from the blocks of the Holiday Village would be replaced by the more widely-spread intrusion of the numerous individual houses. Rather than appear as hamlets, the three groups would be more like a new housing estate on agricultural land that has historically never found favour as being appropriate for residential use.

Thus, in this case, new buildings are for a different purpose and in a different area from that occupied by the old buildings that are to be removed: they cannot be accepted as qualifying for exemption from the presumption against development in the Green Zone.

#### ASSOCIATED LAND USE

It is claimed that the proposal would return 2/3 of the site to publicly accessible natural landscape. An area of this extent is difficult to explain unless the curtilages of all the private houses are included. This return of land to nature is welcomed but does not alter the fact that, even if the claim of returning 2/3 to natural landscape is accepted, the proposal is to develop 1/3 of the site by new buildings in the Green Zone contrary to policies in the Island Plan.

#### The current Island Plan.

### Policy SP4: 'Protecting the Natural and Historic Environment

The current Island Plan retains the application site in the Green Zone. Further, the preamble (2.73) notes *The vigorous public response, in the Green paper and Imagine Jersey 2035, to further protect the countryside from development has demonstrated a clear need to review and strengthen existing countryside policies in order to protect this important asset.*' This is developed into the proposed establishment of a Coastal National Park which applies to *'all those parts of the Island of highly sensitive and valuable landscape quality*'. Surprisingly, although proposed by consultees when the now-adopted Plan was at the Draft stage, the Plémont headland is not included, even though it is surrounded by the Park on three sides. This proximity is relevant in that this zone will, in Policy NE 6, 'be given the highest level of protection from development and this will be given priority over all other planning considerations. In this area there will be the strongest presumption against all forms of new development for whatever purpose.'

In this case, the continued public demonstration of opposition specifically directed to proposed development on this site illustrates the expectation that Green Zone policy to protect and enhance the landscape should be enforced. Certainly, because of this site's intimate juxtaposition with a part of the Coastal National Park, Green Zone policy should be strictly applied rather than loosely interpreted No new buildings should be allowed even if old ones are removed.

#### **Spatial Strategy**

Policy SP1 states "Development will be concentrated within the Island's Built-up area.

The Plemont site – introducing residential use at the greatest possible distance from St Helier - is not (1) appropriate to either the nearby coast or the surrounding countryside;

(2) even if accepted as being brownfield land, meets no identified need other than a general shortage of housing;

(3) if it were to be considered as greenfield land, it would not be supporting parish communities or the rural economy; there is no identified need, and it is not appropriate to introduce housing.

Policy SP 4 is concerned with Protecting the Natural and Historic Environment.

This site – when clear of development - is typical of the North-west coastal landscape and its protection should therefore be given the highest priority.

It has been suggested that other developments of similar size have previously been permitted. In response, whatever past decisions may have been made, this development would be additional to any environmental damage that may have resulted from previous departures from the Plan. The proposed development would be contrary to both the spirit and letter of a fundamental policy of the island Plan. Two wrongs do not make a right.

At the Public Hearing in 2008, the Highways Section of T&TS noted that it had been been taking a progressively firmer stance on the issue of traffic associated with any development at Plemont. Argument centered on what significant effect there would be from 36 houses and comparisons were made with the time when the previous holiday camp had been operating. T&TS opposed the application on the basis of the sustainability/car trips issue: whatever the traffic generated from a new development might be, the application could not be supported because the site location involved the use of the car for most trips, whereas the emerging Integrated Travel and Transport Plan proposed that significant new housing development should be located to encourage sustainable modes of transport. This approach is, of course, maintained in the Spatial Strategy SP1 in the 2009 Plan. The level of the accompanying traffic should not be compared with levels of the time when the former Holiday Village was operating 11 years ago: now, any new traffic will be a straight increase on the current level.

#### SUMMARY

Thus, new development should be judged on its own merits. It conflicts with at least 5 policies in the Island Plan – GD 1, SP 1, SP 4, NE 6 and NE 7. The proposed residential development in the Green Zone does not meet the requirements of any of the allowed exemptions to the general embargo. There is no provision in the Island Plan for replacing an obsolete development with another on a different site. Neither is there provision for allowing a different development as a compensating element in exchange for the removal of an eyesore. In 2008 an application for 36 houses was refused, although an Officer recommendation was made that, were an application for 30 houses to be made, it should be accepted.

The Minister is now being asked for a decision on a scheme with 28 houses. In 2007 the Royal Court, during the 'McCarthy' Appeal, noted that 'the wider public interest should be given significant weight' and stated that 'the Minister should not be held to indications by officials or other promises or hints that a planning permission will be granted.'

With the history of applications for this site, we believe that an Inspector should properly recommend that the Minister should consider himself to be free to reach whatever decision he understands to be the intention of relevant Policies in the Island Plan. In so doing, he should take note of what he may see as being the wider public interest, and give primary attention to the Countryside Character Appraisal, where no exemptions to Green Zone policies appear to apply.

The proposal in this application is to change from commercial use to residential use: associated environmental gain may be a welcome element but it does not validate an application that otherwise fails to meet all required conditions.

R. Anthony Environment Section Chairman

# ANNEX 5





#### **ANNEX 6**

14<sup>th</sup> July 2012

Dear Sir/Madam,

The saga of Plemont has ebbed and flowed like the massive tidal movements around our beautiful Island home, Plemont Headland and it's equally pristine beach are without doubt the one remaining jewel in this Islands crown.

That this land should even be considered for 'a housing development' (for that is what it is) is a complete and utter travesty, the old holiday camp was built to cater for a particular point in our history when hundreds of holiday makers were looking to get away for a 'cheap' holiday the dawn of the wide body jet airliners saw an end to all that and the complex simply died.

That this happened is a simple fact of life, this fact does not however automatically mean that this magnificent area should now still be considered a building site onto which housing can even be considered as a possibility, the old holiday camp had it's day and that day is long gone, the time is now absolutely right to remedy the mistakes of the past and for our government to show some true foresight for this generation and the generations to come.

New York has Central Park and many other places around the world have had the foresight to set aside land for the simple enjoyment of people to walk and see nature as it should be seen, on a personal level I would like to draw to your attention a very good example of far sightedness from the pages of history.

I was born in Jersey but spent many years living and working in far flung places around the world, nearly twenty of my years were spent in Perth Western Australia, when the fledgling city of Perth was first established the founding fathers had the truly impressive foresight to see that the City would grow (and how!!) and with this in mind they set aside a huge track of native bush (1003 acres) on the top of Mount Eliza which overlooks the Swan River, this land was left in its native state and has become without doubt one of the most important assets to the city of Perth.

I would most strongly recommend that everyone on the enquiry committee 'google' Kings Park Perth Western Australia and see for themselves the value of this open land to the city of Perth and how just such an area of land, namely Plemont here in Jersey would become such a similar asset to the people of this Island not only now but perhaps more importantly in the years to come.

Plemont is not the place to build houses no matter how clever the proposed scheme and how 'Jersey' the proposed dwellings may look, this area has some of the most spectacular and highest cliffs in the Island that combined with it's unique flora and fauna make it a very special place.

On a more sober note presumably the proposed houses will be taken up by families with children and not to make too fine a point 'children and cliffs' don't really go too well together, in fact it is a tragedy waiting to happen.

We as taxpayers have recently seen truly vast sums of our hard earned money being squandered (there really is no other word for it) on payouts, failed projects etc ad nausea, BUT perhaps just for once the collective brainpower of our combined States of Jersey could get it 'right' and stop thinking 'short term' and make a truly progressive move and purchase the Plemont Headland for this Island and the generations to come, this moment in time <u>must not be</u> <u>missed</u> because once it is gone it is gone forever.

Perhaps in an ideal world Mr. Trevor Hemmings, the owner of the land would follow the incredible philanthropic gestures of the likes of Howard Davies, Jessie and Florence Boot and more recently the incredible generosity of Mr. Kirch.

I hesitate to place too much emphasis on Mr. Hemmings motives because this would be most unkind but by all accounts he probably does not really need the money resulting from the sale of these few dwellings and as the old saying goes "There are no pockets in a shroud". It has been suggested that Mr. Hemmings might be mindful to sell Plemont to the States, if this is so then the price offered to him must be a fair one and completely devoid of quibbling about a few pounds here or there, please let us not see any more Lime Grove nonsense which in reality saved nothing and cost millions.

One last comment and perhaps it can be summed up in one word and that is 'LEGACY' that which is handed down to a successor, let this current States of Jersey obtain Plemont as a true and permanent 'legacy' to the foresight of our generation for the generations yet to come.

Alan Holmes

We believe the proposals for the redevelopment of the Plemont Holiday Camp should be rejected for the following reasons :

- The proposal does not meet the general principles of the 2011 Island Plan indeed the proposals to be considered at the inquiry have not been reviewed or updated to take into account the revisions of the 2011 Island Plan
- The proposals represent estate development which was expressly rejected as a proposed form of development ten years ago
- The proposals are therefore too dense and an over-development
- The development threatens the natural environment of the area

Island Plan 2011 and general development issues

Policy GD1 section 2 states

Development proposals will not be permitted unless the following criteria are met such that the proposed development;

.....

2 does not seriously harm the Island's natural and historic environment, in accord with Policy SP 4 'Protecting the natural and historic environment', and in particular; a. will not have an unreasonable impact on the character of the coast and countryside (Policy NE 6 'Coastal National Park'; Policy NE 7 'Green Zone' and Policy NE 5 'Marine Zone'), biodiversity (Policy NE 1 'Conservation and enhancement of biological diversity'), archaeological remains (Policy HE 5 'Preservation of archaeological resources') or heritage assets (Policy HE 1 'Protecting Listed buildings and places') and includes where appropriate measures for the enhancement of such features and the landscaping of the site; b. will not have an unreasonable impact on important open space; natural or built features, including Policy NE 4 'Trees, woodland and boundary features'; and Proposal 3 'Wildlife corridor designation'; c. will not unreasonably affect the character and amenity of the area, having specific regard to the character of the coast and countryside (Coastal National Park and Green Zone) and the built environment.

The Island Plan here provides a very real context for the consideration of the proposals as a whole. There is no doubt that the existing buildings are a blot on the landscape, but it is essential that any approved replacement does not quickly become a new blot within the Coastal National Park. Section 2 of GD 1 is quite explicit.

The Coastal National Park was introduced by the 2011 Island Plan. There is no doubt in our minds that had the existing Holiday Camp not been on the site, the headland as a whole would have been included in the Coastal National Park. Any proposals should therefore be considered on that basis. The test which should therefore be applied to any proposal for this area should NOT be is it better than the existing as clearly almost anything would be; rather the test should be, would this development be suitable in the Coastal National Park.

We accept that the existing buildings mean that it would be unreasonable to prevent any redevelopment. However, the proposed development as a whole risks "unreasonably affecting the character and amenity" by its overall plan, the widespread nature of the three clusters, surrounding an area which is proposed to be public, but will quickly become private open space. The north east cluster of the tallest and largest individual houses are proposed on the highest and most prominent part of the site, and will create unacceptable skyline development in contradiction to the 2011 Island Plan GD5 which clearly states that skyline development will not be permitted. The north east cluster will inevitably dominate and overlook the surrounding area of the coastal park, creating an unreasonable impact. The north east cluster, therefore, creates significant issues in contradiction of the 2011 Island Plan and should not be permitted.

#### Hamlet - to be or not to be ?

The notion that Jersey has traditional hamlets as suggested is absurd. The form of buildings proposed takes its cue from completed farm re-developments that do exist but are far from traditional. There is a very subtle but important difference in converting traditional farm complexes which have developed organically over generations, which having fallen into disuse and are then reasonably changed for residential use. To parachute in developments of this form, and calling them hamlets, is a disingenuous attempt to create small estate developments, a form expressly rejected by the then Planning Committee which accepted that it would be reasonable to allow redevelopment of the Holiday Camp. The proposals are more suburban in character than rural. It is clear from the nature of all the existing buildings from Portinfer to Plemont Beach, that all the buildings are distinct, detached and individual. The attempt to suggest that these are traditional hamlets is an attempted slight of hand to create a development which is too dense for its location, too crammed for its location and too urban in character for its location. Previous planning advice was that an estate would not be acceptable, quite correctly. Three small estates are also not acceptable.

#### Over-development

The three small estates represent an over-development of the site because, although in an absolute sense an area of this size could be developed in this way – this particular area – next to the Coastal National Park must not be developed in this way. The grain of development in this area must be maintained if the re-development at the Holiday Camp is not to have an unreasonable impact on the character and amenity of the area, in accordance with 2011 Island Plan.

The proposals will create many urban and sub-urban related issues, such as car parking (there are no villages or estates in Jersey which do not have significant car and parking issues), property boundary treatment (i.e. fences) and the inevitable clutter of estate development such as conservatories, sheds, extensions, garages and attic conversion. All these 'reasonable' changes over time will increase the density of the development, increase the impact it will

have on the neighbouring green zone and Coastal National Park. All are predictable and inevitable from the proposed form of development. There are precedents in Jersey for the development of individual homes, rather than estates, as appropriate re-developments of disused commercial premises which would avoid all of the above, for example, the permission given for three detached houses on the site of the Fantastic Tropical Gardens.

### Threats to the natural environment

Whilst the EIS plays down the environmental impact of the proposals, there can be no doubt that such a large scale development will prevent this area reaching its environmental potential. Whilst there is reticence to attribute serious environmental degradation to the domestic cat, the killing of an estimated 55 million birds by cats in Britain each year must contribute to some of the species at risk. The Plemont headland has the potential to extend the biodiversity of the internationally important heathland of Les Landes along the north coast. The Holiday Camp has always been a blot and a barrier to potential of the wider area of the Parish. This proposal threatens to maintain that blot for many years to come. The domestic cat is just one of the many threats to the natural environment which these proposals present; the predatory nature of the domestic cat is perhaps the most potent symbol of this proposed development.

We respectfully request that the Inspector rejects the whole application.

Nigel & Judith Queree

In reference to the Plemont headland; I have made my views known on this subject, in no uncertain terms. In my opinion, as a Jersey lady who cares passionately about our beautiful Island; on no account must planning permission be given to this ill conceived idea; of putting houses on another one of our headlands. It is audacious, to say the least, thinking that we the islanders are willing to sacrifice, ever more of our green land, to houses. Vociferous architects use their voices ad infinitum, trying to persuade ,with silky words , why permission should be given. MONEY, MONEY. MONEY. Pound signs ,rolling up in front of their eyes, while rubbing their hands together, of huge amount they will get.

They may well influence some people, and make them believe; that it is all for the benefit of the public, in need of houses. Rubbish! The island will be spoiled forever. If permission is granted, don't ever bother trying to close the flood gates, because you will have left them permanently wide open, to all and sundry. You will never be able to stem the tide, not ever. For there will be too many mistakes to be overcome. Too many horses have been allowed to gallop through Too many arguments in favour, because of dubious permission, to build, on our beautiful Headlands. When the land is all used up, what then? We need more houses? Yes we do need some,. I wrote an open letter to the JEP some years ago, giving them a solution. It would have worked too, if there were not so many pig headed politicians without fore sight. The town is what should be built up. And I do mean Upward. The plan and idea in the letter I sent to the JEP would have made the town very attractive, and given ample room and attractive spaces for everyone to see and use. The only people who will benefit, if planning permission is given, to this proposition to the detriment of most islanders, will be the owner who speculated his cash, in buying the holiday camp ,in the hope of making a killing,

The architect and developers. As far as they are concerned, nobody else counts. They just want the cash!

The old 'Beauties Naturelles' committee of many years ago, refused point blank to grant permission the Sir Leonard Matchan, to replace the old Bouley Bay Hotel. With a bigger one of luxury standard, they did not want our beautiful north coast to have a massive house on top of the coastline. Oh, he tried a few times I believe, but those tough, astute old Jersey men, said NON, in no uncertain terms. Result? Sir Leonard Matchan said ' right the damn thing can stay as it is, till it falls down,' and left to live in Sark. Yes, it did go to wrack and ruin, eventually the States pulled it down, and grassed it all over. Today go take a look at the legacy of those astute men on the Beauties Naturelles committee.

The coast line is preserved, and the area is used for picnics, and simply enjoying the calm serenity of green beauty, while looking across to France. As a Jersey lady who cares passionately about our island;

I ask, for the future; do not grant permission to build on this headland, or indeed any other.

Yours Faithfully Dr. Freda Ruderham. Letters To The Editor.

#### 20 -02- 2008

Mr Editor.

With reference to the recent photo of the Plemont headland in the JEP, and the old holiday camp, one is again reminded of how precious our landscape is. This headland must not be lost to concrete, I say to our politicians," Demolish that ugly carbuncle.

One should never ever speculate ones cash, unless one is prepared and can afford to lose it. If this speculator had speculated his cash on the stock market, and lost it, that is the risk he was prepared to take in the hope of making a killing, we must not be held responsible for his /their speculation. **Tough!!** 

Fortunately, money was not the God it is today; otherwise we would not have inherited so much of a rich landscape tapestry; Certain politicians with delusions of their own grandeur, and greedy developers, who don't give a tinker's tuppeny damn about our island, are hell bent on building everywhere. For sure, we do need houses but not to the demonic driven extent, that is being spoken of.

There has always been a demand for houses, and the story of young couples not being able to buy a starter home has been around since the year dot, nothing has changed, for as long as I can remember that has always been said, yet look how prosperous most of those same people have become through their property, and so will the ones starting their journey through married life; the ones behind them and so on ad infinitum.

**Suggestion**! There is plenty of land in the already made town, use compulsory purchase if and where necessary, just look around at some of the tatty old stuff, demolish all the tat and rebuild, upwards, with lots of green open spaces for people to enjoy, put balconies on every possible one, roof gardens, so people who have a yen to do a spot of gardening can do so.

Albeit it will all be in tubs, but the pleasure derived would be satisfying. Lifts would be put in so no one would have stairs to climb, plus CCTV. Even the old generation would be able to live high up, with the right facilities. I can not remember where in the UK, but there are or is a high rise/s dedicated to the old people and they love it, for they have such wonderful views. The solutions are there! Who was kidding whom when this was mooted by someone here, and it was talked down. All these ideas are far too simple for some politicians to follow through, they need a good shake!

I for one am heartily sick of the appalling greed there is on our island, it's a disease. All of this could be done, all it needs is attention, so that there is a sufficiency of decent accommodation for everyone, never mind devastating our island till there is no land left; Radical ideas maybe, but not nearly as radical as building on every conceivable piece of land. Lots of the politicians do not see further than the end of their nose. Probably why they do not smell the same smells that a considerable amount of islanders do! Finally, the hitherto, unmentioned by said politicians, or any one else; **WATER**, the life giving commodity; Has anybody else noticed how this has never been mentioned in the great rush to build?

Only a great silence on this subject, did they really think we would not notice it had not ever been mentioned? Well I have certainly thought about it, and have great pleasure bringing out into the open, that, which the politicians concerned, hoped would remain only in their domain. Does anyone realise that if all the

people come into our island, that the politicians concerned say they want to come and live here; that we would have to lose another valley to build yet another reservoir; or another very large tract of land, which will already be built on, so no alternative.

So where will the water to sustain the lives of all these people, come from? I think the said politicians who are hell bent on overcrowding our island, will be walking in very deep smelly stuff indeed, which will offend even their noses. Will common sense prevail? We shall see, but I doubt it, Wake up fellow islanders, keep what is left of Jersey, the Jersey we know and love, do not let the politicians concerned seal its demise.

We have sufficient water at present; imagine having to queue up for a quota of it on a daily basis!

Couldn't happen? Don't bet on it!

Freda Ruderham

## **ANNEX 9**







#### ANNEX 10

- 1 This location is one of finest in the Channel Islands and of huge importance to the people of Jersey. If we spoil this location, then nothing will ever be safe from damaging development. The landscape and environmental reports produced by the applicant claim to mitigate the damage the proposed development will cause to the magnificent setting of the North coast of Jersey
- 2. My objection to what the applicant submit's is a reasonable compromise compared with the development proposals previously submitted by the owner and rejected, is one of principle. I question whether any development should be allowed at all in this wonderful special place, which is worthy of the highest level of protection our Planning law can achieve.
- 3. I believe that no new residential development should be allowed on this site. The applicants submission is based on the mistaken assumption that he is entitled to replace the long derelict buildings which have for too long blighted this beautiful part of Jersey and is able to substitute a new land use, a residential use, which is entirely contrary to the spatial strategy (Policies SP1 SP6) adopted in the Island Plan 2011, which seeks to concentrate all new dwellings in the existing built up areas of the island
- 4. The objective of this spatial strategy is not only to preserve our National Park coastal areas where under policy NE6 no new dwellings are permitted within existing buildings but to protect our Green Zone (NE7) from new residential development. The Plemont application is situated in an elevated area of the Green Zone immediately on the edge of our National Park and is widely visible from sea, and land. The Island map shows just how few isolated dwellings there are in the area. I believe they are either pre planning law which was not adopted into Jersey until 1964, or are converted former traditional or agricultural buildings. This character of a few scattered hamlets in an isolated rural area would be lost for ever if this development is allowed
- 5. To impose 28 new dwellings, creating a new residential estate is entirely inappropriate and damaging for this area. It will overload all community infrastructures. It will lead to major traffic increase in the St Ouens lanes and the main road into St Ouen's Village and town; will put pressure on les Landes School and Les Quennevais schools and the school bus service. The nearest shop is at St Ouens village, several miles away, which is the only base for local shopping, doctors, church and where buses terminate in the evening.
- 6. I have been very fortunate to previously live in St Ouens very close to the application site. I know how peaceful it is. At weekends and summer evenings, it is used by many islanders who walk or cycle in the lanes to access the North coastal path. It is the last of such wild places in Jersey, once it has gone, it is too late.
- 7. It is not an acceptable argument that this location is already despoiled by the buildings and their use as a holiday camp was previously tolerated without damage, so what is proposed must be alright. It is not.
- 8. There is a huge difference between the impact of a holiday camp of the 1960's and of 28 new houses occupied by people with a modern day commuting life style. The holiday camp was summer only, visitors came without cars, the camp provided all their amenities and people were modest in their demands, the impact of the camp was effectively self contained.

- 9. 28 houses impose 24/7 activity. They are likely to generate 100 cars plus visitors, additional vehicle movements could be about 500 to 600 a day. The houses will produce more children, impact on local schools and all other local infrastructure.
- 10. Others will make submissions on these important policy issues in detail. My submission is that the existing use of a holiday camp has been abandoned and should be disregarded in considering whether this application should be approved.
- 11. Published sources indicate the existing buildings were built in the 1960's on the footprint of a former pre war wooden hutted camp which was occupied by the German troops and later used as a holiday camp during Jersey's early post war years. Their construction, which probably predates the 1964 Planning Law, would have been allowed in the interests of post war recovery from the aftermath of the occupation. Such a decision to allow the development of a holiday camp on this site would never be made six decades later, in vastly different circumstances.
- 12. I further submit that a use that has been abandoned cannot be restored without a further Planning application being approved. I am certain the Policies of the Island Plan 2011 would not permit the construction of a Holiday camp in this special location
- 13. Therefore this application which seeks approval for replacement of a previously abandoned use of building to be replaced by another use, and seeks to justify this by a planning gain, should be considered entirely on its merits under the policies of the Island Plan, without taking into account the abandoned use.
- 14. This application fails the Island Plan Spatial Strategy (Policies SP1-6) and policies of National Park (NE6) and Green Zone (NE7) and approval would be entirely contrary to the Island Plan.
- 15. I submit, that the four legal tests of abandonment of use in UK case law should be applied to this very special site which is vital for Jersey as follows :
  - The length of time the buildings have been occupied and unused The last holiday season the buildings were occupied was the summer of 2000, leaving a few staff on site who had left by 2006. UK case law indicates that abandonment can take place in as little time as 4-6 years. In this case it is 12 years.
  - The condition of the buildings.

There is extensive photographic material publicly available from 2003 through 2011 which shows the extent of dereliction of the buildings which has been allowed to take place .The site is an eyesore and a blot on Jersey's landscape. Clearly the dereliction of the buildings is so advanced that the buildings could not be used without their reconstruction, requiring consent.

• The interim uses which have taken place whilst vacant.

There is no evidence to demonstrate that the buildings have been used since 2000. On the contrary the buildings have been fenced off and secured against any access whilst they have lain vacant.

• The intentions of the owner

The evidence is overwhelming that the owner's intentions are speculative redevelopment of the site for maximum financial gain. The owner is reported to be a very wealthy man in the Sunday Times Rich list with assets of £500 Million. According to Pontins history sources, the present owner acquired a part interest in Pontins holiday camps through a management buy out in 1987, sold the business to Scottish and Newcastle Brewery in 1989 and bought the business back in 2000.

Under the present ownership the Plemont Holiday camp buildings were immediately put out of use, allowed to go derelict over 12 years, and all the owners efforts have been focused on securing re-development gain. The owner has shown absolutely no intentions of restoring the existing use.

16. I submit the case for abandonment of the existing use is irrefutable and the inspector is under a duty to consider this argument, and reach a conclusion on it. If the applicant wishes to challenge the abandonment, the proper place is the Royal Court not the Inquiry. I submit the Inspector should consider the application strictly on its merits, entirely under the Policies of the Island plan 2011, without taking into account the physical existence of buildings on the site, without making any assumptions about entitlement to replace them or taking into account any submission from the applicant to that effect or planning gain. Hence the applicant's arguments of improvements from the existing dereliction should not be considered.

17. The applicant's case for allowing the residential development as an exception to the policies of the Island Plan 2011 is therefore fundamentally flawed.

The application should be recommended for rejection. Deputy John Young