

37

PP1 | 23 01 2012 / Radcliffe

AC

30 JAN 2012

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
St. Ouen,  
[Redacted]  
Jersey, C.I.  
Tel. [Redacted]

2011/1673

23<sup>rd</sup> January 12

Planning & Environment

Reference: Plemont holiday Village/ New housing Estate

COPY SENT: LAPP/LAG  
30 JAN 2012

Dear Sir or Madam:

There have now been so many plans and refusals, we are not completely sure which plans they are 'going back to', but fairly certain that these objections are quite relevant.

With reference to the above application, we should like to object in the strongest possible terms to yet another application in this area. Now they are getting on the 'eco green band wagon,' which is very commendable, except that in this case it is, we are sure, is purely a sales pitch to try and get their own way. The idea of eco housing is to work with the elements; this exposed location is a contradiction to the idea.

Just over 10,000 people sign a petition against development, 7,000 people stand on St. Ouens 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.

This new development plan seems to be for a green field, in a green zone, no doubt because the architects have realised that the present position would be extremely exposed to the wind.

The proposed position is still exposed and no doubt if it were passed all the houses would in time want conservatories with the resultant glare on a sunny day or greatly increased light pollution at night-time.

The idea that this is in any way similar to a 'Jersey farmhouse hamlet' is quite ridiculous as a Jersey farmhouse in this size area, may have a barn and outhouses, not 28 houses. It is an insult to our intelligence. It is basically a housing estate and not suitable for this location.

We are further concerned of the linear type development alongside the road, and the whole proposed housing estate looks like it has been designed for infill.

Also, what restrictions would there be on extensions?

28 houses would mean at least 60 cars, in various colours, parked in what is now a green field.

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 make the site value of each house an average of around £500,000, without any building works; or perhaps they will be sold at a loss as a philanthropic gesture?

The value of the site is certainly not £15 million without building permission, and this advert of theirs was 'bullying', how dare they tell us what 'the only options are!'

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.

Could a land swap deal not be brokered between the disused swimming pool at Fort Regent and the Pontins site?

Why does the owner not even come to public meetings over this?

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

Mr and Mrs Radcliffe

