



Plémont 30 House Development - Non Technical Summary
November 2009- Planning Application



NON TECHNICAL SUMMARY

**The complete Report is
available for inspection at
BDK Architects or
Planning Department**

PLÉMONT BAY HOLIDAY VILLAGE
ST. OÜEN, JERSEY

**Plémont
30 House Development**

**ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT
STATEMENT**

Report submitted to:
Plémont Estates Ltd

Report produced by:
Michel Hughes Associates
33 Fore Street
Chudleigh
Devon
TQ13 0HX

author: Michel Ragody Hughes
May 2009

Michel Hughes Associates disclaims any responsibility to the Client and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of this report. This report has been prepared with all reasonable skill, care and diligence, within the terms of the Contract with the Client. The report is confidential to the Client and Michel Hughes Associates accepts no responsibility of whatever nature to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, may be made known. No part of this document may be reproduced without the prior written approval of Michel Hughes Associates.

Michel Hughes Associates is the trading name of MHA Consulting Ltd
Registered in England & Wales No. 6811610

© Michel Hughes Associates 2009

**Plémont 30 House Development
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**

Non-technical Summary

1. The proposed development is identified not to comprise a class of development specified in Schedule 1 by reference to Article 2(1) of the Planning and Building (Environmental Impact) (Jersey) Order 2006 (the EIA Order) and as such is not deemed to constitute *prescribed development*. However, Article 3(c) of the EIA Order permits the Planning Minister to indicate if an EIS is required because of other factors such as nature, size or location of any proposed development. In pursuance of necessary procedures, the Applicant submitted an EIA Scoping request, letter dated 24 March 2009, to the SoJ Environment Department who assessed it does constitute a project requiring an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to be carried out by virtue of the nature and sensitive location of the proposal. To that end this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), taken together with the identified accompanying supporting reports, examines all potential environmental impact issues arising as a result of the development. The EIA has been carried out generally in accordance with current good practice and has been informed by guidance provided by the States of Jersey, the UK Government and professional bodies. The findings from a number of complementary disciplines that have contributed to the EIA have additionally served to inform the process.
2. For the purpose of this EIS the assessment of the redevelopment proposal has considered both the Plémont Holiday Village site (the *Core Survey Area*) and also the wider geographic context (the *Extended Survey Area*). The process has, in the light of the redevelopment proposal and the findings of the surveys and evaluations detailed within the supporting reports, given consideration to: i). the baseline context of the site at a local and European level; ii). the potential environmental effects of the development; iii). the environmental design of the development with a view to identifying potential mitigation measures which may be incorporated in the proposals where environmental effects have been identified; and iv). the implications of any identified residual effects further to proposed mitigation measures.

Planning Policy & Land Use Aspects

3. Further to the Jersey Countryside Character Appraisal (SoJ, 1999) the *Agricultural landscapes of the north coast* have been afforded a level of protection through inclusion in the *Green Zone* Countryside Planning Zone of the Island Plan. The Plan recognises that the Zone comprises a *landscape largely created by human intervention* and that it would be *unreasonable to preclude all forms of development, with exceptions to the general presumption against development but only where this does not serve to detract from or harm the distinctiveness of the landscape character type of this zone*. Of particular relevance, the redevelopment of commercial buildings may be approved where there are *substantial environmental gains and a significant contribution to the character of the area*, particularly where this may result in *changes in the nature and intensity of use and careful consideration of siting and design*.
4. The proposal would produce substantial environmental gains from massively increasing the amount of natural landscape within the site with the ensuing benefits to the natural environment identified in this EIS, and a significant contribution to the character of the area through demolition of the derelict holiday camp (recognised to be a significant eye-sore in a highly valued landscape area) and design of replacement houses reflecting the traditional form of development within the surrounding area of St Ouen. The design proposal demonstrates respect for the objectives of this policy and the Planning Department has confirmed this scheme complies with objectives of the Green Zone policy.
5. This EIS together with the supporting studies and reports show the proposal (i) will improve the character of the area by replacing existing buildings alien to the location with more appropriate

design; (ii) will reduce impact on neighbouring uses and the local environment as a result of improved ecological and natural environment conditions, mitigation of existing impacts on ecology and the natural environment, reduction of visual intrusion, and accompanying amenity improvements; (iii) will not have any adverse impact on a site of Special Interest, Building of Local Interest, or a Conservation Area but will improve the setting of the SSI listed German WWII bunker; (iv) compared to the existing authorised use of the site will reduce traffic generation; (v) will be accessible by pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users including those with mobility impairments; (vi) is not appropriate or practical to re-use existing buildings; (vii) is appropriate in scale, form, massing, density and design to the site and its context; (viii) takes into account the need to design out crime and facilitate personal safety and security; and (ix) is in accordance with other principles and policies of the Jersey Island Plan 2002.

6. The Planning Department's Case Officer's report of April 2008 determined this proposal constitutes *"a significant environmental and visual improvement compared to the existing situation and, as such, would be in accordance with the requirements referred to under Island Plan Policy C5 (Green Zone) to justify an exception to the presumption against development in the Green Zone vis-a-vis redevelopment of existing commercial buildings. The recommended reduction in the scale / extent of development would result in a (total) 45% reduction in built floorspace area compared to existing."*
7. His report went on to confirm *"The resultant floorspace area would be 57,758sq.ft, which equates to 55% of the existing built floorspace (i.e. 45% reduction). Within the context of Policy C5, this is a 'significant' reduction."*
8. The Planning Case Officer's report concluded *"It is considered preferable in planning terms to 'move' any replacement development further away from the headland. Whilst this results in encroachment into the playing fields area (albeit within the same planning unit), it is considered reasonably justified, as a suitable exception to policy, on the basis of the wider environmental gain; indeed the whole rationale under C5 for allowing redevelopment of commercial buildings in this zone is to secure an environmental gain."*
9. The redevelopment proposal is considered to be compatible with the aims, objectives and policies of the Jersey Island Plan 2002 by reference to Policies G1 (Sustainable development), G2 (General development considerations), G3 (Quality of design), G4 (Design Statements), G5 (Environmental Impact Assessments), G12 (Archaeological Resources), G15 (Replacement buildings), G16 (Demolition of buildings), G20 (Light pollution), C2 (Countryside Character), C3 (Biodiversity), C4 (Zone of Outstanding Character), C5 (Green Zone), C10 (Walls, Fosses, Banques and Hedgerows), M1 (Marine Protection Zone), WM1 (Waste Minimisation and Recycling) and WM2 (Construction and Demolition Wastes Plan).

Biodiversity and Nature Conservation Aspects

6. The supporting Biodiversity and Nature Conservation specific study report (Hughes, May 2009) identifies the *Core Survey Area* supports only a limited diversity of essentially common and widespread habitats and species, reflecting the intensive use of the site as a holiday village over a long period of time.
7. The coastal sections of the *Extended Survey Area* were identified in the same report to support an outstanding assemblage of vegetation communities, flora and breeding sea birds. The redevelopment proposal is identified not to impinge directly on the *Extended Survey Area*.
8. The supporting Atlantic Puffin and other Seabird specific study report (Young, January 2008) expresses concern over the long-term viability of the declining breeding puffin colony on the cliffs below the existing holiday village. Specific causes of the decline are not known but various factors may be implicated including sea-based activities in proximity to the cliffs and brown rats widespread across surrounding countryside and within the holiday village buildings and site. Within the holiday village site prior to demolition of the buildings a programme of rat eradication and control is proposed through to the end of the construction phases. An outright

ban on cats is considered not feasible or enforceable and it is recognised that control of any species outside of the proposal site is beyond the control of the site's owner and applicant.

9. The biodiversity and nature conservation appraisals, evaluations and assessments have informed the design process, identifying areas where potential negative change needed to be addressed or designed out of the scheme and where positive change to the local environment could be reinforced.
10. The proposal is identified not to result in direct impact on local wildlife features and species. The fully mitigated redevelopment proposals, including significant habitat enhancement measures, are considered capable of supporting and maintaining a balanced, integrated, adaptive community of species.

Landscape and Visual Aspects

11. The supporting Landscape and Visual Assessment specific study report (Leithgoe, May 2009) concludes this redevelopment proposal will have immediate positive impact on the *Extended Survey Area* environment through the removal of large, unsightly buildings from the highly valued landscape of the Island's north coast. Integration of open areas of the site into the wider countryside are identified as important contributions to the enhancement of this sensitive coastal locality.
12. There are no negative indirect or cumulative effects. Overall the redevelopment is considered to have substantial positive impact on the existing physical landscape setting and a substantial positive impact on the existing visual setting in the locality.
13. The redevelopment proposal demonstrates the potential to improve the integration of the built and natural environments and further demonstrates that a well designed high quality scheme can be acceptable in the countryside.

Traffic, Transport and Access Aspects

14. The supporting Transport Assessment specific study report (Parsons Brinkerhoff, May 2009) concludes traffic flows from the new development will not significantly vary from the traffic flows previously recorded during peak periods. Traffic volumes are predicted to be low with no significant adverse impact on the network. There would be a reduction in commercial vehicle movements. The road junction at Portinfer provides greater capacity than will be imposed by existing traffic added together with traffic from the proposal site. La Route de Plémont is assessed to contain adequate passing places for maximum traffic flow and a new passing place will be created along the final lane leading to the development. It is concluded in terms of transport impact the proposal is acceptable.

Noise and Vibration Aspects

15. It is recognised demolition works will be conducted outside of the breeding season to avoid disturbance to wildlife. During construction it is considered wildlife are unlikely to be overtly affected by noise associated with this phase of the proposal providing noise is limited by use of mufflers on mechanical equipment. Full details are found within the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (BDK Architects, May 2009). It is considered less noise will emanate from the new buildings than the existing building when in use due to improved sound insulation from modern, tightly sealed external walls and roofs compared to the un-insulated building fabric of the existing holiday village.

Water Resources Aspects

16. The proposal site is currently served by a modern SoJ maintained foul pumping station that has more than adequate capacity to dispose of foul drainage from the site. Replacement of the old drainage system with modern sealed pipework will reduce risk of contamination from accidental leakage. Surface water will be filtered in two reedbed ponds, providing enhanced vegetation and wildlife habitats within the site, and this water reused within the development. No groundwater or hydrogeological impacts are predicted.

Ground Conditions / Contamination Aspects

17. The supporting Site Contamination Report (Strata Surveys, December 2008); comprising a Phase 1 preliminary risk assessment in accordance with the criteria detailed in Planning Advice Note 2 – Development of Potentially Contaminated Land; establishes there is a risk of contamination from an historic oil leak, oil distribution pipes within the site; asbestos within the existing buildings; an existing electrical sub-station within the site and old sewage tanks. It is considered these contaminants can be successfully remediated during the re-development phases.

Waste Management Aspects

18. The supporting Site Waste Management Plan (BDK Architects, May 2009) concludes 100% of all materials arising from demolition can be either re-used on site or removed from site for re-cycling with the exception of hazardous materials. During construction the objective will be to salvage 75% of site generated waste for re-cycling or re-use.

Archaeological Aspects

19. The supporting Archaeological Assessment specific study report (MOLAS, August 2006) concludes the proposals do not impact on any Sites of Special Interest. There is a high potential to for archaeology dated to the prehistoric period in the southern half of the site but construction of holiday camp buildings in the 20th century is likely to have damaged, or completely removed, any archaeological remains within the northern half of the site. An area of prehistoric flint-manufacture was first identified in the centre of the site in the early 20th century, although its exact location is uncertain. There is an uncertain but probably low potential to contain previously unrecorded archaeology dated to the Roman and early medieval periods. The site's peripheral location on the Island, above steep cliffs, suggests that it was not a focus of settlement. There are extant German WWII structures on the site which are SSI listed and will be unaffected by the development.
20. Further investigation by archaeological trenching evaluation is recommended in order to clarify the likely impacts of any development. The aim of this evaluation would be to assess and define the presence or nature of any archaeological remains within the site.

Sustainability Considerations

21. The Sustainability Appraisal concludes that this proposal comprises sustainable development because it will realise:
 - i). Major to moderate positive Economic and Social impact;
 - ii). Major positive Environmental impact; and
 - iii). Major positive Landscape and Visual impact.

Construction Environmental Management Plan Aspects

22. The supporting outline Construction Environmental Management Plan *CEMP* (BDK Architects, May 2009) provides the link between mitigation measures identified in this Environmental Impact Statement, together with the other supporting reports, and implementation of these mitigation measures during the construction phases of preparation, demolition / site clearance and construction. This requires the Contractor appoint a Site Environmental Manager who will be responsible for the final CEMP co-ordination, implementation and compliance with good environmental practice. The applicant will be required to appoint an Environmental Verification Manager who will undertake monthly environmental inspections to monitor and audit compliance by the Contractors with requirements of the CEMP. The mitigation works to be undertaken identified during the EIA and listed within this EIS are taken forward into mitigation activities detailed within this Plan.

Conclusions

23. The overall conclusions of this EIS are that this development proposal will, with implementation of identified mitigation measures, result in a very high positive environmental impact on the *Core Survey Area* and also a moderate positive environmental impact on the *Extended Survey Area*. *These beneficial effects constitute substantial environmental gains and a significant contribution to the character of the immediate and wider areas* by virtue of the following considerations:
- a) Planning Policy & Land Use Aspects – Use of an existing brownfield site for residential purposes with 43% reduction of built floorspace and 71% reduced average occupancy capacity.
 - b) Landscape and Visual Aspects – Very High beneficial effect on landscape character in both the Green Zone and Zone of Outstanding Character.
 - c) Traffic, Transport and Access Aspects – Adequate highway access with low traffic volumes and no significant adverse impact on the network. Beneficial impact from reduction in commercial vehicles, particularly coaches, serving the development.
 - d) Noise and Vibration Aspects – Moderate beneficial impact from replacing poorly sealed buildings with more highly insulated envelopes.
 - e) Water Resources Aspects – Moderate beneficial impact from reduced risk of accidental leakage and ecological benefits of reed bed surface water filtration system.
 - f) Ground Conditions / Contamination Aspects – Remediation of potential historic site contamination from old installations and asbestos.
 - g) Waste Management Aspects – Re-use or re-cycling of majority of materials arising from demolition and construction.
 - h) Biodiversity and Nature Conservation Aspects – Minor to Major beneficial impacts reflecting new and enhanced habitat conditions. Substantial beneficial impact provided mitigation measures from existing rat population during demolition and construction phases are implemented.
 - i) Archaeological Aspects – Limited potential for extant archaeology within the site itself.
 - j) Sustainability Considerations –Major overall positive substantial impacts across the balance of considerations.

PLÉMONT BAY HOLIDAY VILLAGE
ST. OUVEN, JERSEY

**Plémont 30 House
Development**

DESIGN STATEMENT

Statement produced by:

BDK Architects

White Lodge

Wellington Road

St Saviour

JERSEY, C.I.

JE2 7TE

Tel: 01534 768740

Fax: 01534 739115

E: enquiry@bdkarchitects.com

author: Paul W. Harding

May 2009

BDK Architects disclaims any responsibility to the Client and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of this document. This document has been prepared with all reasonable skill, care and diligence, within the terms of the Contract with the Applicant. BDK Architects accepts no responsibility of whatever nature to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, may be made known. No part of this document may be reproduced without the prior written approval of BDK Architects.

ENVIRONMENTAL, AMENITY AND CHARACTER BENEFITS:-

Natural Landscape will Dominate

67.6% of the overall site will become either “nature conservation landscape” – dedicated to nature conservation – or publicly accessible “managed grassland”, both totalling 32,617 m² or 18.13 verges – larger than Howard Davis Park. **At no cost to the Publique of the Island.**

Enlarged Open landscape

Increased by 42%, equalling 67.6% of total site area. Existing 22,990 m² / 12.78 verges -v- Proposed 32,617 m² / 18.13 verges.

Substantially increased Publicly Accessible Land

Increased by 1,278%, equal to 67.6% of total site area. Existing (land to west of Parish lane, NNW of public car park) 2,367 m² / 1.3 verges -v- Proposed 32,617 m² / 18.13 verges.

Substantially increased Nature Conservation Land

Increased by 883.8%, equal to 48.3% of total site area. Existing (land to west of Parish lane, NNW of public car park) 2,370 m² / 1.3 verges -v- Proposed 23,315 m² / 12.96 verges.

Substantially reduced Built Area (building footprint) & hard-standings

Reduction of 72% in building footprint and hard-standings. Existing 24,558 m² / 13.65 verges -v- Proposed 6,847 m² / 3.81 verges.

Reduced Gross Habitable Floor Area

Reduction of 43% in gross habitable floor area and garages / carports. Existing 9,660 m² / Proposed 5,505 m².

Reduced Maximum Possible Occupancy

64% decrease. Existing 548 persons / Proposed 199 residents based on 2 persons per double bedroom and 1 person per single bedroom.

Reduced Average Occupancy

71% decrease. Existing 355 persons (average guests 1991-2000) / Proposed 105 persons based on average 3.5 persons per household.

The accompanying Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) by Michel Hughes Associates concludes that:-

Habitats and flora: The ecological and landscape design proposals for the development will provide considerably enhanced habitat conditions making a significant contribution to the overall ecology of the area. **There will be a Major Positive Effect.**

Birds: The development, ecological and landscape design proposals will provide enhanced habitat conditions of potential value to birds. **There will be a Moderately Positive Effect.**

Bats: The overall design proposal and its setting offers the potential for considerably enhanced habitat conditions for bats. **There will be a Moderately Positive Effect.**

Reptiles and Amphibians: The overall design proposal and its setting offers the potential for enhanced habitat conditions for the species. The brown rat control measures proposed for the

development site will enhance the survival possibilities of reptiles and amphibians. **There will be a Moderately Positive Effect.**

Invertebrates - Butterflies & Formica pratensis: The proposed ecological and landscape design scheme is considered to enhance habitat conditions for these species at this location. **There will be a Minor Positive Effect.**

Topography and landscape: The proposal will produce immediate substantial landscape benefits through demolition of the derelict holiday village, recognised to be a significant eye-sore in a highly valued landscape area. New landscaped public access land will greatly enhance the areas overall amenity. **There will be a Major Positive Effect.**

Roads and transport: The proposal will generate lower traffic volumes than that produced when the holiday village was operating as well as in combination with traffic generated at peak holiday periods by visitors to Plémont Bay. Refer to Parsons Brinkerhoff Traffic Report dated May 2009. **There will be a Moderately Positive Effect.**

The proposal will have immediate positive impact on the local environment through the removal of large, unsightly buildings from the highly valued landscape of the Island's north coast. Restoration of the land and returning it to nature and integrating other open areas of the site into the wider countryside are identified as unique and important contributions to the enhancement of this sensitive coastal locality.



1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Application comprises demolition of all the existing buildings presently on the site, removing all hard-standings and construct 30 new houses in three clusters. This comprises replacing the existing managers bungalow & staff cottage on the site with 2no. four bedroom houses and constructing 15no. three bedroom houses, 9no. four bedroom houses and 4no. five bedroom houses, together with access roads, garden areas next to the houses and landscaping. Proposed buildings will be of traditional style within three traditional clusters, reflecting the pattern of hamlets in the surrounding St. Ouën countryside.
- 1.2 Integral components of the scheme includes **Environmental Improvements**, through converting 32% (8.54 vergées) of the site, on the North and North-West side of the site closest to the North Coast headland, to Nature Conservation Land, **Public Amenity Improvements** from a 42% increase in the open, publicly accessible land, amounting to 18.3 vergées or 67.6% of total site area, **Character Improvements** through removing an existing built form alien to the St. Ouën's countryside and (as well as the Nature Conservation Land / Open Land provisions) replacing with a series of traditional Jersey building groups modelled on the pattern of hamlets within the countryside, and **Visual Improvement** from removing the landscape blight caused by existing buildings dominating the headland from Sorel Point in the East to Les Landes in the West and moving the replacement buildings away from the North Coast headland and north coast cliff-path.

2.0 PLANNING CONTEXT

- 2.1 This proposal is based exactly upon the Planning Case Officer's recommendation in his report of 29th April 2008 on the 2006 application for 36 houses, where he recommended a reduction to 30 houses should be approved due to it involving *"a significant environmental and visual improvement compared to the existing situation and, as such, would be in accordance with the requirements referred to under Island Plan Policy C5 (Green Zone)"*. This revised scheme for 30 houses mirrors this recommendation including retention of the existing roadside banque on the western side of La Route de Plémont and omission of the mound on northern edge of the site. At the same time opportunity has been taken to incorporate further environmental and landscape character benefits which comprise:-
- a) Incorporating a reed bed filtering system for recycling 'grey' water (collected from roofs and hardstandings after being taken through interceptors) for use in the houses toilets. This will reduce water usage in the houses and provides enhanced habitat provision for wildlife within the site.
 - b) Retention of the existing roadside walls and banques along La Route de Plémont and along the final approach road serving the site, except two restricted openings for accessing the South-West cluster. The existing width of the final approach road will be retained apart from a passing place formed on the eastern side (within Field 48 in same ownership as the site) half way along length of this road.
 - c) Incorporating public footpath behind existing roadside wall along La Route de Plémont, between Public car park and junction with site approach road. The South-East housing cluster has been moved approx. 4m to north and 2m to west to facilitate items (b) and (c).
 - d) New public footpath link to north coast cliff-path on eastern side of site, from end of site approach road going to east down existing access track to Field 48 then north along western edge of Field 48 to link with north coast cliff-path with branch footpath accessing existing WWII German observation bunker which will be retained and refurbished.
 - e) Public footpath across Nature Conservation Land and new public footpath link to north coast cliff-path (above) will be informal routes mown into the grassland, similar to those around Grosnez headland – refer to Michael Felton Associates Landscape Management Plan.

- f) Enclosures around the three housing clusters will be either indigenous hedging or principally dry jointed granite walls providing new habitat opportunities for green lizard and other species.
- 2.2 The Planning Officer noted in his April 2008 report *“Most importantly, this site is not a greenfield site but comprises a large unsightly building complex with an existing authorised commercial/tourism accommodation use.”* and that *“The issue of the potential ecological impact of the proposal, particularly with regard to the breeding sea birds and puffin colony in this area, is a difficult issue, but on the basis of the submitted evidence (EIA and further expert opinion) and the views thereon of the Environment Department, it is considered that there are insufficient grounds to refuse permission on grounds of potential adverse material impact in this respect. This matter also needs to be viewed in the context of the relative degree of impact compared to that associated with reactivation of the existing authorised tourism use and/or possible alternative types of tourism use (for example holiday self catering units with associated long term winter lets).”*
- 2.3 His report further noted *“The situation remains that, within the context of the existing site circumstances and planning policies ... **permission could not reasonably be refused for any residential development on the site. The issue then is one of quantum and what is considered appropriate on the site in the context of the existing policies and constraints and the achievement of environmental gain.**”*, going on to advise that *“It is considered preferable in planning terms to ‘move’ any replacement development further away from the headland. Whilst this results in encroachment into the playing fields area (albeit within the same planning unit), it is considered reasonably justified, as a suitable exception to policy, on the basis of the wider environmental gain; indeed the whole rationale under C5 for allowing redevelopment of commercial buildings in this zone is to secure an environmental gain.”* and concluding *“**in the context of the current application scheme (and subject to the aforementioned recommended reduction in the scale and extent of development – which would result in a total number of 30 units) the sustainability objection becomes less tenable and is outweighed by the associated environmental improvements.**”* Based on these material considerations and in view of the environmental improvements that would be realised the Planning Officer recommended, under the Planning Law and policies, a reduced scheme for 30 houses should be approved.

The McCarthy Case (March 2007 JLR 167)

- 2.4 Reliance has been placed on this judgement by respondents who claim this sets a precedent for giving substantial weight to the interests of society as a whole to the detriment of individual property owners interests. Examination of the McCarthy case, who wanted to build two houses on an undeveloped Field in Grouville, and the case judgement shows this reliance to be fundamentally flawed due to substantial material differences between the Planning position relating to Plémont Holiday Village and McCarthy’s Field:-
- a) McCarthy started with a undeveloped Field and ended up with a Field - c/v - Plémont Estates purchased a heavily developed site with substantial buildings thereon.
 - b) McCarthy’s Field was zoned as Important Open Space in the Island Plan - c/v - Plémont Holiday Village is not classed as such in the Island Plan being a developed “brownfield” site in the Green Zone.
 - c) McCarthy had been given indications by the previous Planning Committee without any formal application having been lodged or advertised - c/v - the previous Planning Committee have given indications regarding Plémont Holiday Village following a formal application having been advertised.
 - d) McCarthy had not acted to his detriment in relying on previous Planning Committee’s indications, nor had he purchased the Field based on such reliance - c/v - Plémont Estates

relied on previous Planning Committee's indications in arriving at their decision to purchase Plémont Holiday Village.

- e) McCarthy's application was not in accordance with the Island Plan - c/v - Plémont Holiday Village application for 30 Houses is in accordance with the Island Plan as recorded in the Planning Officers April 2008 report.

2.0 SITE PLANS AND SCHEDULE OF ACCOMMODATION

- 3.1 To identify the land involved with this proposal refer to the following drawings forming part of this Planning Application:

- 1) BDK Architects Drwg. No. 1812/8/01 – Existing General Arrangement Site Plan; showing existing development on the land and site boundaries.
- 2) BDK Architects Drwg. No. 1871/8/02/D – Proposed General Arrangement Site Plan; showing the proposed development of 30 houses including land returned to nature and indicating landscaping treatment.

- 3.2 The Schedule of Accommodation, listing each house as numbered on the site GA plan 1871/8/02/D, together with footprint area, gross internal floor area, number of double and single bedrooms, parking, garaging and study provision follows.



Plémont Accommodation Schedule - 30 Houses (inc voids) Date 15/5/09 Refer to Site Plan Drwg. Nos. 1871/8/02/D (As recommended for Approval by Planning Officer April 08)										
Unit	Footprint Area (sqm)	Footprint Area (sqft)	Total No. of Beds	Allocated Parking Spaces	Garages	Garage Area (sqft)	Double Beds	Single Beds	Study Room < 7.5m ²	Total Gross Internal Area (sqft)
1	89.20	960	4	3	Separate Carport	151	3	1	Yes	1,633
2	89.20	960	4	3	Separate Carport	151	3	1	Yes	1,633
3	75.16	809	3	3	Integral Garage	151	2	1	No	1,383
4	73.98	796	4	4	Integral Garage	323	2	2	Yes	1,545
5	88.53	953	4	3	Integral Carport	700	2	2	Yes	1,577
6	77.62	835	3	3	Integral Carport	264	3	0	Yes	1,400
7	77.62	835	3	3	Separate Garage	275	3	0	Yes	1,400
8	73.93	796	4	4	Integral Garage	323	2	2	Yes	1,590
9	87.93	946	4	3	Separate Carport	151	2	2	Yes	1,577
10	79.32	854	4	4	Separate Carport	292	3	1	Yes	1,488
11	76.76	826	4	4	Integral Garage	305	4	0	Yes	1,832
12	87.24	939	3	4	Integral Garage	334	3	0	Yes	1,541
13	65.36	704	4	3	Separate Carport	151	3	1	Yes	1,626
14	67.62	728	4	3	Separate Carport	151	3	1	Yes	1,740
15	75.29	810	3	3	Separate Carport	151	3	0	No	1,382
16	161.40	1,737	5	6	Separate Garage	277	5	0	Yes	3,390
17	170.50	1,835	5	4	Separate Carport	410	5	0	Yes	3,772
18	176.71	1,902	5	4	Integral Garage	316	5	0	Yes	3,270
19	64.14	690	3	3	Separate Carport	165	2	1	No	1,150
20	63.53	684	3	3	Separate Carport	165	2	1	No	1,193
21	66.75	718	3	3	Separate Carport	165	2	1	No	1,193
22	74.00	796	3	3	Integral Garage	323	2	1	Yes	1,545
23	77.73	836	3	3	Integral Carport	240	3	0	Yes	1,567
24	77.70	836	3	3	Integral Carport	246	3	0	Yes	1,400
25	76.81	827	3	3	Integral Garage	396	3	0	Yes	1,831
26	87.17	938	4	4	Integral Garage	340	4	0	Yes	1,540
27	74.44	801	3	3	Separate Carport	146	3	0	No	1,383
28	69.00	743	3	3	Separate Carport	146	2	1	No	1,287
29	77.31	832	3	3	Separate Carport	146	3	0	No	1,400
30	130.00	1,400	5	4	Separate Garage	275	5	0	Yes	2,370
TOTAL	2,631.95	28,326	109	102		7,629	90	19		51,638

Existing Gross Footprint Area (sqft) including First access balcony 69,153

Scheme is 48% reduction off Existing Gross Footprint Area including Garage / Carport areas

Existing Gross Internal Floor Area (sqft)

103,983

Scheme is 50.3% reduction off Existing Gross Internal Floor Area excluding Garage / Carport areas

Scheme is 43% reduction off Existing Gross Internal Floor Area including Garage / Carport areas

Total Number Of 3 Bedroom Units: 15

Total Number Of 4 Bedroom Units: 11

Total Number Of 5 Bedroom Units: 4

Total Number of Residents Parking Spaces Required: 91

Total Number of Visitors Parking Spaces Required: 10 (1 space / 3 dwellings)

Total Number Of Parking Spaces Provided: 113



4.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 4.1 The proposal site is located on the north-west side of La Route de Plémont at Plémont, Cueillette de Vinchelez, in the Parish of St. Ouen, Jersey. The property, which is centred on NGR WV/564565, extends to some 4.59ha (25.5 verges or 45,857 m²) and is situated between 67m and 75m above mean sea level. There is a further area of land on west side of La Petit Route de Plémont some 0.23ha (1.3 verges or 2,366 m²) also in the same ownership but outside of the proposal site boundary.
- 4.2 The solid geology of the site comprises coarse-grained granite of the St. Mary's type (BGS, 1989). The granite occurs close to the surface in the northern part of the site and is exposed in a number of places in proximity to the coastal path to the north. The drift geology comprises generally thin loess, with soils becoming deeper southwards away from the coast.
- 4.3 The site is approached via the C105 secondary road forming part of the eastern site boundary and which today terminates at the north-east site boundary. The western site boundary is defined by a narrow 'Parish road', metalled for the most part, and identified as the Rue de Petit Plémont, which extends to a small informal car park (12 parking places) and turning area at Plémont Headland at the north-western margin of the proposal site. The lane was established and the land ceded to the Parish of St. Ouen in the late 1960s, by the site owner at that time, to enable the part closure of the C105 for redevelopment of the site.
- 4.4 The site has been used as a visitor or holiday resource since 1874 with the opening of the Plémont Hotel, in proximity to the headland. It was still used as a hotel until at least 1934 but the buildings (then used for storage and as a hostel) were destroyed by fire a few years later (an aerial photo seen by the author dated 1947 shows the building destroyed). In 1935 the 'Jubilee Holiday Camp Hotel' was built on the site of the present buildings. The facility was considerably damaged by fire in 1937 but was rebuilt and re-opened in 1946 as the Parkin's Holiday Camp, after the hiatus of the war years. In 1961 the site was acquired by Pontin's and re-developed in the late 1960s. Although such 'holiday camp' venues started falling out of fashion in the late 1970s-early 1980s, it struggled to continue, was re-branded as the 'Plémont Bay Holiday Village' in 1998, but finally closed in September 2000.
- 4.5 The holiday village was able to accommodate up to 488 guests in 200 rooms in 8 residential blocks (Rozel, Bouley, Gorey, Sorel, Grosnez, Grouville, Brelade, Corbière). Up to 60 staff were accommodated in 60 rooms in 2 residential blocks (A and B), as well as a staff cottage and Manager's bungalow. The site also comprises a large Amenity building rising up to three stories high with kitchen, dining hall, ballroom and bar, a shop, swimming pool, and a number of ancillary buildings. The built floorspace totals 9,660 m² across the 10 residential blocks, the main Amenity building, managers bungalow and staff cottage.
- 4.6 Externally two tennis courts, lawns, a play ground and large playing field were also provided for visitors (for details of site layout refer to BDK Architects Drawing No. 1812/8/01). The holiday village has been disused as a public facility since its closure, although the bungalow remains occupied by a site manager and the grounds and buildings have at times been used for training Jersey police dogs.
- 4.7 An SoJ official public car park is located to the south-west margin of the site and provides up to 39 parking places for visitors to the beach at Plémont Bay and the coastal path. Abutting the northern boundary of the Parish car park is a parcel of unmanaged grassland extending to 2,370 m², nearly 1.32 verges, in the same ownership as the holiday village site. The coastal path, which was opened in 1981, extends around the northern margin of the proposal site, only abutting the site boundary along a section of the 'Parish Road' and an informal car park. The north coast footpath was established by permission of the site's owners across their land and is subject to a Licence expiring on 31st December 2016.

5.0 PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

- 5.1 Refer to the Schedule of Accommodation (dated 15th May 2009) enclosed herein, listing the built floorspace of each house together with number of bedrooms and car parking provision (excluding visitors parking provided in addition) with built floor area including garaging totalling 5,505 m² for all 30 houses. This constitutes a 43% reduction in built floorspace below that currently extant on the site.
- 5.2 The overall site arrangement is generally shown on BDK Architects Drwg. No. 1871/8/02/D with the new houses being grouped into two principal clusters, conceived as traditional 'hamlets' echoing groupings of dwellings elsewhere in St Ouens countryside. The south-west cluster comprises a group of eleven houses with the south-east cluster containing a group of sixteen houses. There is another small group of three houses towards the north-east of the site, located over the area of the existing managers bungalow. It should be noted this extant managers bungalow sits on a plinth up to 1.8m above ground level and, with a pitched roof across a fairly deep plan, is effectively two stories high. All of the houses are of the highest quality traditional Jersey design frequently found throughout the countryside around this site.
- 5.3 The scheme involves removing all buildings currently extant on the site and drawing back the replacement buildings by an average of 55 metres to south of the northern façade line of existing buildings. This development effectively makes use of already developed brown-field land while recognising the environmental benefits of creating a substantial amount of new open nature conservation land in the northern part of the site closest to the North Coast footpath and seaward cliffs. Over 67% (18.13 verges or 32,617 m²) of total site area will be returned to open land with 48.3% (12.96 verges or 23,315m²) of total site area dedicated to nature conservation land around the northern and western parts of the site plus 19.3% (5.17 verges or 9,302 m²) as open public parkland in the middle of the site. The amount of land reverted to nature and being made publicly accessible exceeds the total size of Howard Davis Park.

Traditional Precedents

- 5.4 Traditional 'hamlets' found within Jersey's countryside are generally arranged around tight farmyard clusters or around road junctions. They are typically constructed in granite and/or rendered walls with pitched roofs covered in slate or pantiles. Generally they comprise groups of farmhouses, cottages and barns between two storey in height or two storey plus accommodation in roofs with dormers, enclosed by granite boundary walls and hedges.
- 5.6 The new buildings reflect existing pattern of development, tight clusters around road junctions, farmyard type courtyards, three and five bay farmhouses, barns converted to houses, granite and rendered walls and buildings. Boundaries are formed with granite/rendered walls, dry walling and planting.

Detailed Layout Description

North East Group

- 5.7 House no. 16 is a traditional style five bay granite farmhouse over two stories plus rooms in the roof with dormers. There is a dower wing that contains the lounge, this room has a vaulted ceiling. There are granite walls across the front boundary and along the access road to the west. A double detached garage is sited in the rear garden which fronts onto the western access road. House nos. 17 and 18 are granite barn style buildings intended to appear as barns that have been converted into houses. These buildings are arranged in a farm type pattern typical of the area. The boundaries to the North, East and West are defined with planting so that it appears less domestic.

South East Cluster

- 5.8 This cluster is arranged as a farm style courtyard sited tight onto the junction of La Route de Plémont with the site approach lane. A large five bay traditional style granite farmhouse faces

east onto the approach lane, being divided into two dwellings (house nos. 13 and 14) with house 13 entered through a door to the southern side elevation and house 14 entered through the main central doorway to the eastern front elevation. The building has a rendered dower wing to the northern side that forms house no. 15.



- 5.9 Along the southern boundary there is a one and a half storey granite barn/stable type building with dormers in the roof (house nos. 1-3) with house nos. 1 & 2 having granite walls and house no. 3 being rendered. The rear gardens are to the south with a granite wall set back a metre from La Route de Plémont giving an area for planting. To the east of this building is a planted/grassed area that takes the building away from the road junction providing visibility for cars exiting the junction and for cars exiting the south-east Cluster.
- 5.10 To the south-west corner of the courtyard there is a long split level barn style building (house nos. 4 – 7) with an arched opening providing a car parking area to house no. 6. To the southern end of this building there is a single storey wing at right angles to the main building backing onto La Route de Plémont containing the entrance and garage for house no. 4.
- 5.11 In order to keep the courtyard area as tight as possible and reduce the amount of car parking within the courtyard small areas have been created off the main courtyard to provide car parking. To the rear of house nos. 7 and 8 there is a small walled car parking area accessed from the courtyard between these houses. To the southern end of this car park there is a double ended garage with one double garage opening onto the car park and another double garage opening onto the driveway for house no. 30.
- 5.12 In the north-west corner of the courtyard is a three bay rendered house (house no. 10) with attached L - shaped granite 2 storey barn (house nos. 8 & 9). To the east of this in the north east

corner there is a two storey rendered barn (house nos. 11 & 12) with lower additions to the west and south which provide the garages on the ground floor with accommodation at first floor level. Running north to south through the central courtyard is a carport with pitched roof intended to make the courtyard appear tighter and restrict views of parked cars from the houses fronting the courtyard. Off La Route de Plémont on the western end of this cluster is a single granite barn style building (house no. 30) with a tall arched opening in the front elevation which is in-filled in glass to provide the main entrance. To the eastern side is a driveway leading to a double garage.

South West Cluster

- 5.13 The south-west cluster is accessed from the new road forming an extension of the existing holiday village access road (C105) over the existing holiday village hardstanding. The first group of houses are arranged around the road leading to a small courtyard parking area to the south enclosed with granite walls forming the stop end to the vista along the road. A three bay granite cottage with rendered dower wings forms the western side of this courtyard. The other buildings to this cluster are barn style granite and rendered buildings with small informal off-road parking/landscaped areas in front of the buildings. A junction is formed across the road by the access to house nos. 19 to 24 and the access to house nos. 25 to 26 incorporating a granite arched access to footpath leading to the west through the new nature conservation beyond. Buildings are positioned around this junction with gables to the buildings fronting the roads. High granite walls separate the landscaped/parking areas from the road as can be seen in many similar hamlets / farms around Jersey.

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Site Waste Management Plan:

- 6.1 Demolition of the existing buildings will, In summary, re-use or re-cycle over 85% of all material arising and include:- a) Separating various types of material on site. b) Storing all hard material on site for grading / crushing and re-using for secondary aggregates during construction - roads / footpath sub-bases, etc. c) Re-cycling of all metals, wood, glass and Bituminous materials. d) Specialist removal of asbestos prior to demolition and removal for SoJ containment facility. e) All topsoil will be stored on site for re-use in forming the land being returned to nature conservation land, the landscaped publicly accessible land and house gardens. f) Construction of the new houses will incorporate re-cycled products (from on site re-used demolition materials as much as possible) and low energy materials Refer to accompanying Site Waste Management Plan (prepared by BDK Architects) for more detail.

Site Contamination:

- 6.2 A Phase 1 site contamination survey has been undertaken in accordance with Planning Advice Note No. 2, Development of Potentially Contaminated Land. Further on-site intrusive investigations will be undertaken to confirm appropriate remediation works. Refer to accompanying Site Waste Management Plan (prepared by Strata Surveys) for more detail.

Drainage:

- 6.3 The site is served with mains foul drainage via. existing adjacent SoJ pumping station which has capacity well exceeding requirement for 30 houses. Surface water drainage from all roads, footpaths and hard-standings (irrespective of area) will be routed through new fuel interceptors and silt traps to reed bed filtration system and tanks for re-use on site as grey water in house toilets. Roof drainage rainwater will be stored for re-use and irrigation.

Energy Efficiency:

- 6.4 Existing buildings are of poor construction quality with inadequate insulation and large window areas, producing an energy inefficient and wasteful complex. The replacement houses will be highly insulated in excess of current standards, with thermally efficient widow systems substantially reducing energy consumption on the site. It is estimated each house will only require 1 Watt of heating capacity, with the heat from occupants providing majority of space heating. Each house will have an efficient air ventilation & heat recovery system

Archaeological Remains:

- 6.5 Neither the site nor immediate coastal land around Plémont Holiday Village have been identified for SSI designation. Expert study by MOLAS has concluded there are no important remains requiring in-situ preservation, but there is an uncertain possibility of pre-historic flint site; which they have recommended is established by trench evaluation and removal of any finds for conservation. Refer to accompanying Archaeological Assessment (prepared by MOLAS) for more detail.

Historic Building Register:

- 6.6 There are no buildings within the site on the Register of Historic Buildings except the WWII German observation bunker and machine gun post base. There is another underground structure, discovered during Strata Surveys site inspection while undertaking their Phase 1 Site Contamination investigations in December 2008, believed to be a German WWII bunker. All these will be retained in the scheme and renovated in consultation with Channel Islands Occupation Society and Planning's Historic Section.

Population Demographics:

- 6.7 Occupancy records from the Holiday Village shows there were an average, for the period 1991 - 2000, of 355 guests, plus estimated 35 staff, resident per week for 22 weeks between May to September - equating to average of 164 residents over a whole year including most of the important puffin & seabird breeding season. The proposal would result in an average of 105 persons permanently resident (based on 3.5 persons / house), an effective reduction of 36% site occupancy.

School Capacity:

- 6.8 Data from 2001 report by Henry Head, States of Jersey Assistant Director of Education 1983 – 1992, interpolated for 30 houses, shows the housing would be expected to contain at total 14-15 children of which 5 would attend States Primary schools and 3 attend States Secondary schools, with the remainder going to fee-paying schools. The report concluded there was adequate school capacity, which was agreed by the States of Jersey Education Department in May 2001.

Traffic & Transport Assessment:

- 6.9 In March 2002 the States of Jersey Highways Engineers advised Planning that a development of less than 40 – 45 dwellings would not increase traffic flow along La Route de Plémont and would produce an acceptable level of traffic. Traffic consultants have reviewed the impact of 30 houses and concluded the road is adequate for 30 houses without any alterations, enabling retention of existing wallside banquets, walls and hedgerows. The site is served by a daily frequent bus service throughout the year, terminating at the Public car park next to the site between 24th May to 26th September and outside these months passing through nearby Vinchelez hamlet. Refer to accompanying Transport Assessment (prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff) for more detail.

Building Heights & Levels

- 6.10 This aspect has to be considered against the overall mass context of the existing two storey, monolithic, flat roofed, guest blocks in combination with the existing Amenity building rising up to three stories high. This central building, located nearest the highest part of the site, is very dominant when viewed from surrounding areas and forms the background against which the houses ought to be compared.

The following Schedule of Existing and Proposed building heights demonstrates the eaves heights of all houses will be lower than the existing buildings (far right column). In the great majority of cases the house ridge heights will also be lower than height of the existing buildings (third from right column), whether compared against the central Amenity block or nearest comparable accommodation block.

In the case of ridge heights it must be recognised the houses traditional form and design results in pitched roofs, rather than the monolithic flat roofs of the existing buildings, reflecting the countryside setting and appearance of surrounding farm type buildings.

1871 Plémont Proposed Building Height Schedule

House No.	AOD Ground	FFL Ground Floor	FFL to Eaves	FFL to Ridge	AOD to Eaves	AOD to Ridge	Extg Block Name (in background)	Extg Ridge/ Verge Height	Ridge Height Difference (m)	Extg Eaves Height	Eaves Height Difference (m)
1	71.7	71.85	3.5	8.45	75.35	80.3	Central Amenity Block	84.65	-4.35	82.375	-7.025
2	71.7	71.85	3.5	8.45	75.35	80.3	Staff Block 2 (east)	83.25	-2.95	83.25	-7.9
3	71.7	71.95	3.2	7.5	75.15	79.45	Central Amenity Block	84.65	-2.95	83.25	-7.9
4	71.6	71.75	4.7	9	76.45	80.75	Staff Block 2 (east)	83.25	-3.8	82.375	-3.8
5	71.6	71.75	- 4.7	9	76.45	80.75	Central Amenity Block	84.65	-3.9	82.375	-5.925
6	72	72.15	4.9	9.7	77.05	81.85	Staff Block 2 (east)	83.25	-2.5	82.375	-2.5
7	72	72.15	4.9	9.7	77.05	81.85	Central Amenity Block	84.65	-3.9	82.375	-5.925
8	72.4	72.6	4.8	9	77.4	81.6	Staff Block 2 (east)	83.25	-2.8	82.375	-2.8
9	72.4	72.6	4.8	9	77.4	81.6	Central Amenity Block	84.65	-3.05	82.375	-4.975
10	72.4	72.6	5.3	9.8	77.9	82.4	Staff Block 2 (east)	83.25	-1.65	82.375	-5.85
11	72.4	72.55	5.2	10	77.75	82.55	Central Amenity Block	84.65	-2.25	82.375	-4.475
12	72.4	72.55	5.2	10	77.75	82.55	Staff Block 2 (east)	83.25	-0.85	82.375	-5.35
13	71.82	71.95	4.9	9.7	76.85	81.65	Central Amenity Block	84.65	-2.1	82.375	-4.625
14	71.82	71.95	4.9	9.7	76.85	81.65	Staff Block 2 (east)	83.25	-0.7	82.375	-5.5
15	71.82	72.05	5.1	9.4	77.15	81.45	Central Amenity Block	84.65	-3	82.375	-5.525
16	75.98	76.13	5.7	10.3	81.83	86.43	Staff Block 2 (east)	83.25	-1.6	82.375	-6.4
17	77.25	77.4	5.6	10.3	83	87.7	Central Amenity Block	84.65	-3.2	82.375	-5.225
18	76.3	76.46	4.9	9.6	81.36	86.06	Staff Block 2 (east)	83.25	-1.8	82.375	-6.1
19	74.42	74.57	4.7	8.8	79.27	83.37	Central Amenity Block	84.65	1.78	82.375	-0.545
20	74.42	74.57	4.7	8.8	79.27	83.37	Staff Block 2 (east)	83.25	3.18	82.375	-1.42
21	74.42	74.57	4.7	8.8	79.27	83.37	Central Amenity Block	84.65	3.05	82.375	0.625
22	73	73.15	4.7	8.9	77.85	82.05	Staff Block 2 (east)	83.25	4.45	82.375	-0.25
23	73.25	73.4	4.9	9.7	78.3	83.1	Central Amenity Block	84.65	1.41	82.375	-1.015
24	73.25	73.4	4.9	9.7	78.3	83.1	Staff Block 2 (east)	83.25	2.81	82.375	-1.89
25	73.2	73.35	5.2	10	78.55	83.35	Central Amenity Block	84.65	-1.28	82.375	-3.105
26	73.2	73.35	5.2	10	78.55	83.35	Staff Block 2 (east)	83.25	3.59	82.375	-0.51
27	72.5	72.63	3.2	7.6	75.83	80.23	Central Amenity Block	84.65	-1.28	82.375	-3.105
28	72	72.13	5	9.9	77.13	82.03	Staff Block 2 (east)	83.25	3.59	82.375	-0.51
29	72	72.13	5	9.9	77.13	82.03	Central Amenity Block	84.65	-2.6	82.375	-4.525
30	71.5	71.64	4.7	8.8	76.34	80.44	Staff Block 2 (east)	83.25	2.27	82.375	-1.93

NOTE:
Extg Eaves Height for
Central Amenity Block =
southern eaves height

NOTE:
Height Difference =
AOD to Ridge of proposed
building MINUS Extg Ridge /
Verge Height of relevant
footprint building = New
Height more than existing

Parking Provision

- 6.11 All houses are provided with car parking spaces to requirements agreed with Planning Case Officer at ratio of 3 spaces / house, total 90 parking spaces. Visitors car parking spaces are provided at ratio of 1 space / 3 houses, total 10 parking spaces. Total parking provision across all three housing clusters comes to 113 spaces, which is 13% in excess of basic provision.

Landscape & Visual Impact:

- 6.12 A comprehensive photographic study has been undertaken from Sorel Point to Les Landes racecourse and photomontages prepared which demonstrate there will be a substantial material visual improvement from removing the existing buildings that dominate the landscape. From Plémont headland and adjacent parts of the North Coast footpath, sight of any buildings will be substantially eliminated. Elsewhere the redevelopment will sympathetically merge into the landscape in the same way as other pre-existing hamlets.

- 6.13 The Landscape & Visual Assessment, by Leithgoe Landscape Architect, concludes the proposals will have a substantial positive impact on the existing physical landscape and visual setting in this locality. Refer to this Report and accompanying montages for more detail.

Topography & Landscape:

- 6.13 Landscaping design involves restoration of the landscape character of the site disfigured by the holiday village complex and integration of the housing clusters with adjoining Nature Conservation and Publicly accessible open land. The existing network of hedgebanks and banques will be restored and extended, aiding transition with semi-natural habitats through creating new areas of grasslands, planting new hedges and areas of native shrubs and limiting domestic curtilage extent. The land being dedicated to Nature Conservation at the western and northern extents of the site will, with appropriate management as detailed in Michael Felton Landscape Architects Landscape Management Plan (that can be made a condition of the Planning Permit), provide new habitats for wildlife, flora and fauna to flourish. Refer to accompanying Michael Felton Landscape Architects Section drawings & Landscape Management Plan for more detail.

Mains Services:

- 6.14 a) Water – Existing 100mm diam. Mains water adequate for proposal. B) Electricity – Old sub-station and mains cable along La Route de Plémont will require replacement. C) Gas – no service. D) Telecoms – Existing duct will be re-used for upgrading cabling.

Planning Policies:

- 6.15 Island Plan 2002 Green Zone Policy G2 states redevelopment of commercial buildings may be approved where there are substantial environmental gains and a significant contribution to the character of the area, particularly where this may result in changes in the nature and intensity of use and careful consideration of siting and design. The proposal produces immediate substantial environmental gains and makes a major contribution to the character of the area and further away along the whole north-west coast.

- 6.16 The Planning Case Officer has previously determined this proposal constitutes ***“a significant environmental and visual improvement compared to the existing situation and, as such, would be in accordance with the requirements referred to under Island Plan Policy C5 (Green Zone) to justify an exception to the presumption against development in the Green Zone vis-a-vis redevelopment of existing commercial buildings. The recommended reduction in the scale / extent of development would result in a (total) 45% reduction in built floorspace area compared to existing.”***

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 It is undeniable the future of this site desperately needs to be resolved. It is further undeniable the Plémont Holiday Village site, despite its existing condition, comprises an existing substantial and extensive building complex with an existing authorised tourism accommodation use, and that this is a material consideration that has to be taken into account in the consideration of this application.
- 7.2 It has been determined the proposals constitute *“a significant environmental and visual improvement compared to the existing situation and, as such, would be in accordance with the requirements referred to under Island Plan Policy C5 (Green Zone)”*.
- 7.3 The proposal will have an immediate positive impact on the local environment through the removal of large, unsightly buildings from the highly valued landscape of the Island’s north coast. Restoration of the land and returning it to nature and integrating other open areas of the site into the wider countryside are unique and important contributions to the enhancement of this sensitive coastal locality.
- 7.4 This scheme provides the best result for the public of the Island by creating a major new public open landscape larger in size than Howard Davis Park, without any cost to the Island, and realises substantial environmental, amenity, visual and character improvements in this location.

ACCOMPANYING REPORTS

Environmental Impact Statement, Michel Hughes Associates – May 2009
Ecological Statement, Michel Hughes Associates – May 2009
Landscape and Visual Assessment, Andrew Leithgoe Landscape Architects – May 2009
Transport Assessment, Parsons Brinckerhoff – May 2009
Site Waste Management Plan, BDK Architects – May 2009
Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan, BDK Architects – May 2009
Landscape Management and Plant Selection Report – Michael Felton Ltd. – May 2009

EIS Reports submitted for previous application also applicable to and submitted with this application

Archaeological Assessment, MOLAS – August 2006
Puffin & Breeding Seabirds Report, Durrell – January 2008
Phase 1 Site Contamination Report, Strata Surveys – December 2008

Any queries please contact.

BDK Architects
White Lodge
Wellington Road
St Saviour
JERSEY, C.I.

T: 01534 768740
F: 01534 739115
E: enquiry@bdkarchitects.com