



PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

Draft Island Plan – White Paper
Proposals Map
Minister's Response to consultation
27th May 2010

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
Proposals Map											
DP1017		Mr Andrew Morris		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Just want to make a representation to the draft island plan for the rezoning of Oak Lane farm, St Brelade, which we recently submitted for development with the relocation of an SSI building, but was refused due to another site being more suited. We appreciate that the site is countryside zone, but this is a perfect development site and already the area is being substantially developed.	During the Planning panel meeting, Sean Power and other panel members agreed that this would be a very good site for development and didn't see any reasons another development could not be passed on this site. Adding to this, the neighbouring residences want the site to be developed to enhance the character of the area, and for these reasons we would like to request a review of the sites zoning. If you get time to visit the site, you will be able to get a better understanding of the general planning gain the rezoning would provide.	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The policy regime imposed by Policy NE7 would not prevent proposals to restore and thereby enhance the character of the undeveloped area. Indeed it is important that proposals to further develop and intensify activities in this location need to be considered in relation to their potential impact upon the character of the area and thus the application of the Green Zone policy is considered to be appropriate.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP1038		Mr MJ Smth	J Design Limited	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	On behalf of the owner of Field 836 we have been instructed to write to yourselves to request the reconsideration of this site for inclusion for rezoning for housing in the new Jersey Island Plan. The area of Field 836 under consideration for rezoning is the southern part of the field as indicated on the attached Ordnance Survey extract. This section of the field which is approximately trapezoidal in shape measures some 3172 sq.metres 10.783 acres in area. Our client would like to offer this site for rezoning specifically for the construction of homes for the over 55's. It is calculated that the site would accommodate 14 - 18 such dwellings together with appropriate amenity space, gardens and parking.	In support of this request for rezoning we would request that the following is taken into consideration :- The part of the site in question is of poor quality agricultural land which has not been cultivated for many years. The site would form a natural infill between the Talana Hotel complex and housing to the south west, and the Bagot Manor Road / Les Serres housing to the north east. The site has direct vehicular access to La Route de Longueville. The site is on the local bus network with excellent bus links to St Helier and to Gorey Village. The site is within pedestrian walking distance of local shops and other amenities. All main services are available in Longueville Road. We are aware that this site was previously considered during the Island Plan review which took place in 2007 - 2008 and that it was then decided not to proffer this site for rezoning due to an objection raised by Parish Deputies concerning the storm water catchment area, together with the apparent conflict with the existing bus lay by and landscape impact. With regard to the concerns as to the storm water catchment area, the part of the site under consideration is actually some 2.0 - 3.0m above the small stream which	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>originates some 50.0m to the north west in field 836, and to the west of the water catchment area in field 846. There is no reason to suspect that a development in the higher part of field 836 will give rise to any adverse impact on the water catchment area or the stream, nor will it lead to any greater amount of surface water being discharged to these areas. Regarding the existing bus lay by it is feasible for this to be reconfigured to safely accommodate a vehicular access to the site and for visibility lines to be observed in both directions on La Route de Longueville. In addition the proposed development would incorporate a bus shelter for the protection of waiting passengers. Concerns as to "landscape impact" are subjective. The site is flat and is unremarkable in terms of its landscape quality, hence it is not subject to the higher levels of protection afforded by Green Zone or Zone of Outstanding Character Policies. The site is located in the Countryside Zone within which it is recognised that there is no room for restoring landscape character. It is considered that the rezoning of this site would comfortably fall within four Island Plan strategies defined in chapter 3.4 of the current Island Plan, The development of this site would also meet the six key elements of the Spatial Strategy contained in the current Island Plan in that it would: - Integrate comfortably within the existing Built Up Area Be able to make efficient use of the land Enable opportunities for using alternative means of transport other than the car Be designed to reduce environmental impacts Utilize the existing infrastructure Ensure an adequate distribution of housing development in the Parish Accordingly we request that further consideration be given to the rezoning of the southern part of this field to permit the construction of homes for the over 55's.</p>			
DP105 5	Mr George De Sousa	Mr & Mrs Carrow		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	<p>We would appreciate if the field 269 (which has a total area in excess of two vergées) and possibly the adjoining field 267 would be considered for rezoning for Category A housing. Location Field 269 is currently zoned for agricultural use and located on the fringe of the built up zone in Trinity. The field is accessed via La Rue de Cambrai on the north boundary, which also serves the existing housing developments of Les Croix Close and Clos de la Ponte on the west boundary of field 269. The current usage of the field has been</p>	<p>Justification and Proposal As stated above the field benefits from its location due to being sited between an existing built up area and an access road, with the required level of services available to sustain a natural extension of the built up zone. Under the current draft Island Plan the rezoning has already taken into consideration part of the adjoining field located to the south-east. Our proposal would be to provide much needed category A housing with an initial feasibility study showing</p>	Reject	<p>he proposed sites do not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for incremental development opportunities. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other</p>	<p>The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan</p>

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							limited to pasture due to the installation of a public sewer by the States of Jersey without consultation running across the field with access manholes compromising the use of the field. Therefore, since the introduction of the sewer and due to the size of the field, what little interest shown by farmers has now evaporated.	a provision of between 8-9 houses on field 269. These houses would have gardens and parking in excess of the minimum requirements to maintain the existing rural aspect within Trinity and with the added possibility of improving the infrastructure such as providing footpaths to Rue de Cambrai leading towards Rue du Tas de Geon. We would therefore welcome the Department's consideration of extending the rezoning to incorporate field 269 and field 267 for housing.		sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land. Policy H5 (housing in rural areas) supports the provision of new housing as part of village plan proposals put forward by the constable and this is the policy where such housing sites may be considered in the future, provided they are required to support the vitality of the village.	
DP108 2		Douglas Creedon		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field No. 622 in St. Ouen	Thank you for meeting with us recently and as discussed and agreed, please find enclosed herewith a document prepared by residents bordering Field No. 622 in St. Ouen. This document details the objections, the reasons for the objections and presents alternative solutions to the project being proposed by the Connétable of St. Ouen, which requires the rezoning of Field 622, currently designated as 'Green Zone'. The manner in which the Connétable and Parish authorities have expedited and presented the case for re-zoning, has caused us much concern. These concerns are also highlighted in the document. We would very much appreciate it if you would consider the enclosed and at a suitable time present it on our behalf to the Minister of Planning and Environment so that he is made fully aware of our objections and concerns and can raise these issues during any meetings etc., appertaining to the re-zoning of Field No. 622. We are also delivering copies of the attached document to various members of the States so that they in turn are made aware of our objections and our concerns at the way in which the Parish has progressed this matter. Should you or the Minister wish to meet or discuss any aspects of our documents, the objections or facts surrounding the preparation of the document, please do not hesitate to contact us. Once again we thank you for taking the time to meet with us and thank you in advance for your assistance in passing the enclosed document to the Minister and his committee members. Why Field 622 is not appropriate 1. Pierre Le Saux stated at the Parish Assembly that the cast boundaries of fields 622 and 623 were declared in 1973/4 to be the end of the building line of the St Ouen's village development by the first ombudsman panel ever held with reference to	Support for zoning Field 622, St Ouen Green zone noted.	Field 622 St Ouen is zoned as Green Zone and not proposed for Category A development in the draft Island Plan.	The Minister notes the support for zoning Field 622, St Ouen Green zone

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>planning and development, States members. IDC, Parish officials and other parties formed the panel. They declared that no development would be allowed westwards beyond this line because it would be classed as an extension into the countryside and that the area was to be classed as a very sensitive area due to the close proximity and importance of the marsh. Therefore it was deemed appropriate to create a 'buffer zone'. The Marsh has not moved so the buffer must remain. 2. Rue de la Croute is a very narrow green lane and access onto the main roads at either end is extremely hazardous. The Constable referred to a traffic island as a calming measure to assist in this respect this is simply not feasible. This also means very poor access for emergency services. The impact of additional traffic on such a small narrow lane is also in appropriate. In case reference 20 07 / 03, a field was not considered appropriate for rezoning on these grounds. 3. Impact on the environment. Drainage is an issue as the water table is high and this will result in flooding in the surrounding area affecting the Marsh and wildlife. Further, this will prove expensive to deal with. 4. The field is higher than the road. The development would require extensive excavations, proving costly and potentially problematic for surrounding properties in close proximity. 5. The rezoning of a field of this scale, 9 verges 23 perch, is unnecessary for the likely scale of development given likely funding (as supported by Trinity development referred to above). 6. The Island Plan policy allows for the consideration of rezoning only when there are no other alternatives. This is not the case here. We have demonstrated that there are alternative sites more suitable than the Field proposed. 7. Please refer to the enclosed correspondence with Jersey Heritage? which supports and endorses the argument for the site being of historical interest'. 8. As with Field 621 in Noirmont, the Field provides a 'valuable break in the existing built-up area'. 9. The loss of agricultural land (which is leased and used all year round)" and the potential impact of traffic (as supported by the decision not to progress the rezoning of sites referenced 2007/01 - and 2007/02). Patrick Holden, director of the Soil Association has stated that governments need to consider very carefully the potential loss of agricultural land</p>			

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>to development and that the subsequent loss of food production on a global scale is a serious threat. The Jersey Royal potato is 'owned' by Jersey and is extremely important to our island, its production must not be compromised by the loss of Green Field sites to development . Field 622 is used annually for the production of the Jersey Royal potato. The proximity of the largest worked Agricultural Unit in the Parish. 11. The Island Plan provisions of e13 & 5 serve to safeguard agricultural land. This field is of a size and scale that makes it incredibly valuable and therefore worked agricultural land. This is not the case for the alternatives. We are also confident that the Department of Agriculture would have to agree with the argument for retaining this Field as green zone given it's year round use and value. 12. One of only two reasons for which planning case reference P/2008/0540 was refused in August 2008 in the same location was on the grounds that it is 'an area of open and natural land within an environmentally sensitive location the creation of a new residential curtilage around the structure would result in the creeping domestication, and permanent loss, of an area of this open land which would be harmful to the natural character of the immediate vicinity. Par this reason, it is considered that the application fails to satisfy the requirements of Policies G2 and C5 of the Jersey Island Plan'." In further consideration of the C5 policy in the context of La Rue De La Croute, the same case cited that the 'area has a high level of protection and there is a general presumption against new development' It was acknowledged that the policy docs allow for the conversion of existing buildings to non-intrusive residential use, mindful of the need to keep the loss of agricultural land to an absolute minimum. These statements clearly endorse our argument. 13. What will the future hold for the western element of Field 622 and indeed the Field numbered 623 in front of it? Both very well utilised large expanses of green zone of great agricultural and environmental value and significance. Our countryside simply cannot be carved up and abused in such a reckless and cavalier manner. Having demonstrated that: - 1. There remains uncertainty in respect of the determination of funds likely to be available; 2. If this is so; is it</p>			

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								appropriate to seek rezoning of 5 verges 22 perch? 3. The scale of the development proposed is not relative to the funds likely to be realised and the Parish Assembly were not made aware of how the highly probable significant shortfall will be met. 4. There appears to be some confusion as to whether we are considering rezoning land for a development of sheltered housing for the elderly or Lifelong dwellings for the over 55's. Perhaps this needs clarification. 5. We believe that there are alternatives which may be more appropriate in terms of scale, use and access considerations. Also that are within countryside zone rather than green zone; 6. We are of the opinion that Field 622 is not appropriate for this development or indeed rezoning at all. We consider rezoning such a large, well used agricultural field which has such historical significance and environmental sensitivity simply cannot be justified. At the November Parish Assembly, parishioners were asked to approve the undertaking of a feasibility report for the purpose of expenditure. To our knowledge, no such request has been placed before the Parishioners for development of Field 622. For all these reasons and supported by your Minister's speech at a recent Institute of Directors meeting, your department's rejection of other sites on common and fewer grounds, we remain hopeful that you will share our concerns and conclude that Field 622 is simply not appropriate or viable for such a proposal or indeed rezoning for development of any kind.			
DP1099		Mr Mark Le Boutillier	GR Langlois	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 1368, St Helier (H3/2) The site is just over an acre in size and is isolated in the corner of a built up area surrounded by residential development to the north and west and roads to the south and east. The site has not been worked since Field 1370 to the north was developed for social housing some 3 years ago. As part of the development of Field 1370 there was a requirement from Planning to form a road leading to Field 1368 to serve future development. The development of this site would complete the natural extension of the 'Mon Sejour village' which was clearly intended by Planning at the time in identifying the site on the 2002 Plan. All mains services are available to serve the site. The site would yield approximately 16 family houses.	There is still a big demand for first time buyer housing and we believe that appropriate sites will still need to be found outside of the town to accommodate family homes. Sites already identified on the 2002 Island Plan for this purpose would we assume be high on any revised list of potential sites as they have already passed through a thorough planning procedure in identifying them for future development. In this regard we would request that further consideration be given to including the following 2 small sites indicated for Cat A housing on the 2002 Plan for rezoning on the new Plan.	Reject	The proposed site is undeveloped and therefore does not meet the revised spatial strategy and with the planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. In addition sufficient supply of category A homes has been identified by the draft plan.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP110		Mr Mark	GR	Map .1	Proposals	Objecting	Field 1404, Trinity (H4/19) The site is just over an	There is still a big demand for first time buyer	Reject	The proposed site is undeveloped	The Minister is

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
0		Le Boutillier	Langlois		Map		acre in size and surrounded on 3 sides by a mix of commercial and residential development. There is a bus stop directly adjacent the site and the local convenience store is only a short walk away to the north. Certain food items are also available at the garage shop adjacent the site. There were previous potential access issues with this site which have now been resolved. Adequate access has been formally approved in a separate planning application to develop the bungalow 'Fairways' located between the site and the main road. The development of field 1404 would form a natural extension to 'Sion village' with additional families in the area helping to support the local shop etc. All mains services are available to serve the site. The site would yield approximately 16 family houses.	housing and we believe that appropriate sites will still need to be found outside of the town to accommodate family homes. Sites already identified on the 2002 Island Plan for this purpose would we assume be high on any revised list of potential sites as they have already passed through a thorough planning procedure in identifying them for future development. In this regard we would request that further consideration be given to including the following 2 small sites indicated for Cat A housing on the 2002 Plan for rezoning on the new Plan.		and therefore does not meet the revised spatial strategy of the 2009 plan and the Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. A sufficient supply of category A homes has been identified by the draft plan from Brownfield sites.	not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP1114		Richard Morin		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	La Maison Des Pointes, La Mont Cambrai, St Lawrence, JE3 1JN I am grateful for the opportunity to comment on the draft Island Plan, and would be grateful if you could assist me with the following. I wrote earlier in the year to request that the anomaly with my property sitting within the green zone be addressed. The property - La Maison Des Pointes, La Mont Cambrai, St Lawrence, JE3 1JN - sits within but on the edge of the green zone, but is adjacent to a built up area to its north and east. I believe this to be an anomaly which has existed since the north part of the corner of that field was purchased and the property built. To my mind it should fit within the built up area boundary that encompasses the adjacent properties, and not the green zone. Although it is of course quite proper that the fields to the south and west are within the green zone. To resolve this anomaly therefore, I would be grateful if, within the new Island Plan, the property could be removed from the green zone as it seems unfair that it should be treated differently to its neighbouring properties.		Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The previous zoning anomaly has been rectified inline with the Countryside Character Appraisals evaluation of the overriding character of the area as being 'interior agricultural land' and therefore Green Zone.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP1115		Gary Le Quesne		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Query on the Proposed Island Plan - Land east of Portelet Heights Further to our meeting at your offices in November last year with Julian Skelley (co-owner of the Land) and Jason Dodd (architect) following on from the pre application letter (PAI200911245 from Lawrence Davis to Mr J Dodd) I have spent some time reviewing the planning policy and am very keen to draw your attention to the details of the site. I recently visited the consultation presentation for the proposed Island Plan at St Lawrence Parish Hall and am concerned that the whole area of Portelet Heights (where Julian lives) which is a large two storey dwelling of		Reject	Portelet Heights and the associated undeveloped land and contribute towards the general character of this area which is deemed as being Cliffs and Headlands by the Countryside Character Appraisal. Any proposals to further develop activities in this location need to be considered in relation to their potential impact upon the character of the area and thus the application of the policy	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							6 flats +4 garage block and our land that we wish to develop (diagram 1 - areas market yellow and red) is proposed to be in the new Coastal National Park zone. The coast is in fact a greater distance away from our property compared that of the Dandara Portelet development. It is also proposed our property be boarded on one side by Green zone, but we would prefer it to be included in this zone as it is a substantial cluster of buildings. I would therefore like you to take this letter as an official comment to the proposed new Island plan. With reference to our proposed plot (shown in red) there are a number of points we feel add merit to our request to use the site for residential purposes, obviously with a construction which clearly meets the planning requirements of Coastal or Green zone, in that it would "not seriously harm the amenities. character or biodiversity of the area because of its construction disturbance, siting, sea/farm . appearance, materials. noise or emissions. The proposed plot: (see attached) 1. The land is not agricultural land and has no field number. 2, Has been shown in previous Island maps over the years to have had a large unit on it and has a well and foundations evident on the property. 3. Has not reverted to a natural condition (as stated in Mr Davies letter) but has a vast amount of building materials on the area, including concrete, cement and general building rubble . This stands approximately 10ft high in places. 4. Based on point 2 and 3 could reasonably be assumed was used for residential purposes. I strongly believe that an appropriately constructed dwelling (low impact, eco friendly) would in fact seriously enhance the area of land to that of its existing state. I feel it would be very beneficial to meet you on the site, not only so you can give further consideration to the zoning of the Portelet Heights (where Julian lives), but also to the request of Julian and myself to use some of the land to the east of Portelet Heights to rein state a building for residential purposes (a revised planning application is currently being finalised by Jason).			regime imposed by Policy NE6 is considered to be appropriate.	
DP111 6		Michael Gould		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Fields 756 & 756a, St. Saviour Following the recent piece in the Evening Post relating to the need for land for the building of houses, may I commend to you Fields 756 & 756a, St. Saviour. These are in the ownership of the company Bagatelle Farm Developments Limited, and lie to the South and East of Palace Close. Plans were submitted as long ago as 1982 which would have provided for the		Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							erection of 47 houses, and I remain completely unable to comprehend the reasons which have been advanced against such a development. The more so when I consider the many beautiful fields which have been lost to the Island in the years since.				
DP112 1		Mr Barry Masefield		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Request for Field 287, St. Peter to be included in built up area for over 55's development	Support stated from past and present Constables of St. Peter (see attached)	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP112 2		Mr David Anderson		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Application to develop Field 189 - La Rue De L'Eglise, St Peter	I am writing further to our recent meeting at St. Peter's Parish Hall during the Island Plan Road Show. As requested by yourself, I am writing to document the conversation we had with St Peter Deputy Collin Egre that evening regarding our previous applications to build retirement homes on the above field. During our conversation Mr Egre volunteered his support of our application citing the following reasons: 1. St Peter required more retirement accommodation specifically constructed to meet the Island Plan review requirement for "Lifetime Homes". 2. The proposed development is within the boundary of an existing built-up area and doesn't "jump" the road boundary as in other applications. 3. The field is not of a high quality or of a size to be economically viable. 4. The proposed development is close to existing Parish amenities and public transport. I have also spoken with the Constable on a previous occasion, who has also indicated their support of this application. OAs per our conversation, we would like to accept your invitation to meet with the various planning concerned and parish officials to discuss the proposed development and review any issues which may arise. To assist I have attached copy of a previous application and a print out of the Island Plan Map showing the location.	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP112 3	JS Carney	Mr & Mrs D Cole		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	To provide an extended domestic curtilage on the east side of Craigie Hall, to incorporate the lower portion of the subject Field 151, and use the balance, to the north, as grazing for a horse.	The client maintains he has established through the Environment Division that the Field and in particular the raised area in question is of no agricultural value. Furthermore the zoning of this part of the Field under Island Plan II as C5 Green Zone was extremely harsh at the time and inappropriate considering it had been used for decades previously as a quarry and/or commercial purposes. We are mindful of the concise comments contained in John Nicholson's letter on the subject of 17th September, 2007 (copy	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								enclosed for our information).			
DP112 4		R Treseder -Griffin		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	<p>Trinity Grange La Rue du Presbytere, Trinity, JE3 518 Further to my recent conversation with Kevin Pilley, Assistant Director, Planning and Building Services and the exchange of emails with him, I would comment as follows: The property in question is Trinity Grange, La Rue du Presbytere, Trinity, JE3 518. This belongs to my father, Mr. HOT Treseder-Griffin, and on 22 August 2009 there was a serious fire resulting in his injury and very extensive damage to the house. He was in intensive care and is now in a Residential Home. Trinity Grange will have to be rebuilt. As I have my father's power of attorney, I am dealing with his insurers regarding the insurance claim. The insurers will of course only pay to rebuild the property as near as possible to what was there before the fire. It makes no sense to me to just reinstate the property as it was very old, poorly designed, with only two bedrooms and one bathroom. With careful and sympathetic design the property could be brought up to a specification and standard that we all take for granted today. It could easily incorporate four bedrooms as the footprint of the property is substantial. There will obviously be a great deal of upheaval during this rebuild process . Turning now to the site plan - trinity grange.pdf that Kevin Pilley kindly sent me and the Proposals Map on your website I can see the following: This site plan shows the buildings and the garden as 569. There are roads to the West, North and East and the Southern boundary adjoins the neighbouring site marked 570 on the plan. There are trees on the Western, Northern and Southern boundaries with the Eastern boundary mainly stone wall. There has been considerable storm damage to the trees on the western boundary in the recent years. The 'Proposals Map' shows a Green area described as Field No.569 and a White area covering the existing property, which has been extended to the North East site corner. I am objecting to the Green zone area marked Field No.569 under your policy NE7 and the Built-up area boundary under your policy H6 being curtailed to the North and East of Trinity Grange. This White zone boundary could be extended to incorporate Field No.569 for the following reasons: 1. The area described as Field No.569 was to my knowledge last used for agricultural purposes to grow potatoes well before my grandparents purchased this property back in the mid fifties. From the time they moved into the property and as long ago as I can</p>		Reject	<p>Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities.</p>	<p>The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan</p>

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							remember, but certainly when I lived in the Island as a child, it was and always has been extensively laid to lawn areas with some borders and flower beds. 2. Several years ago my father was advised that this area had been rezoned as a White area and he had plans draw up for the development of a number of houses on Field No.569. However he decided not to put these plans forward to be implemented. 3. He was again approached in 2000 by J Gallichan, Connétable of Trinity, with a view to building retirement or affordable housing on Field No.569. At that time my father again decided he did not want to go down that route. 4. The area to the North and East of the property is already zoned White. Field No.568 to the West is farmland and so is Green, as is Field No.570 to the South. 5. I believe Field No.569 could serve a more constructive use by building a number of low density, high quality houses in keeping with the surrounding area and without loss of habitat/trees. This proposition would not have any adverse effect on the local community in terms of amenities or traffic flow and would conform to policy GO I . 6. As extensive rebuild work will have to be carried out on the site to reinstate the burnt out property then it makes sense to carry out any additional work at the same time to limit upheaval and disruption. 7. This field area has changed from an Important Open Space prior to 2002, through an Important Open Space Contraction, to a Green Zone. 8. Trinity Grange is not registered as a building of local interest or indeed a site of special interest. There are past precedents to show that consideration has already been given to develop Field No.569. For the above mentioned reasons, I object to Field No.569 being considered as a Green Zone.				
DP112 5		P J Thomson		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	I am writing to you on behalf of the owners of Field 125 in St Clements, namely Mrs R Surcouf, Mr C Butler, Mr G Butler and myself. We would like to have our field incorporated into the Island Plan for residential housing. We would like you to note that we have the authority/from Mr M Cottillard to inform you that there is road access to our field with sufficient splay to the coast road through the recently developed field 126. Water and drainage services have also been laid to our field boundary. I also refer you to a letter dated as far back as January 1989 (ref 1/01/17/2) when we were asked by the IDC if our field was available for residential housing development and if we had access to the main coast road. Field 125 now has housing development on both the east and south		Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							boundaries.				
DP1126	Mrs Janet Wilson	Mr Roland Osbourn-Smith		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 707, La Route de Noirmont, St Brelade We were interested to note that the consultation period for the new Island Plan had been extended for a period of three months and during that time representations from the public would be entertained by the Planning Department. We were disappointed that, when the Draft Island Plan was made available, no recommendation was given to include the above field and the field adjoining it which is Field Number 706, owned by Mr Roland Osborn-Smith, as suitable for residential development. A brief visit to Field 707 and Field 706 will demonstrate it's suitability as it abuts an existing built-up area and has access to services already provided in Route de Noirmont. In fact, in the opinion of this company and Mr Osborn-Smith. Fields 706 and 707 lend themselves more easily to residential development than some of the fields identified in the Draft Island Plan produced recently. We should be most grateful if you would consider Field 707 and indeed Field 706 regarding which Mr Osborn-Smith will, I understand, write to you under separate cover. for inclusion in the Island Plan.		Reject	Site does not comply with the revised spatial strategy of the 2009 plan and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan identifies a sufficient supply of Category A and B homes, therefore there are considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP1130		Mr Robert Le Quesne	St Clement's Growers (Jersey) Limited	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Thank you for meeting us with our architect, Lawrence Philips, on 2 November. I write to ask that the boundary between the built up zone and countryside zone currently running west to east to the north of our farm buildings at Slate House, St. Clement be moved further north to the boundary between us and our neighbour Mr Wismuller, a distance of some 20 metres. To help us develop our business we wish to apply to build an agriculture shed/store on this small area which currently is waste ground. We are establishing orchards around our property and will need facilities to aid us with fruit production and storage. We also have several excellent hay meadows and prospective customers for the hay, but need to be able to store the hay undercover during the autumn and winter. The shed would also enable us to keep our costly tractors and equipment under cover.		Reject	The policy regime imposed by NE7, Green Zone permits development on an "existing agricultural holding which is essential to the needs of agriculture and which is in accordance with Policy ERE 6 'New Agricultural Buildings, Extensions, And Horticultural Structures.'" The proposed zoning amendment to Built Up area does not comply with the spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP1131		Mr Robert Le Quesne	St Clement's Growers (Jersey) Limited	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Fields 252 and 253 St Clement I also wish to draw your attention to another area of land in our ownership, namely fields 252 and 253. These fields have three areas of disused glasshouses on them and would be ideal for development, possibly for sheltered housing or first time buyers.		Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							The site is next to Clos de Corvez and has all the infrastructures, services and access to a new road already in place. We have sought the advice of an experienced developer and if this site could be included in the built up zone I am sure that a very worthwhile scheme could be achieved.			boundary, into the countryside, to allow for incremental development opportunities. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including extensions to the built up area.	
DP113 2		Conneta ble K Vibert	Comite des Conneta bles	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 622, St. Ouen I write to ask you to include in the new Island Plan, the eastern part of Field 622, St. Ouen, which the Parish wishes to develop as Senior Citizens Sheltered Housing. Please find enclosed the two copies of the location plan, two copies of the proposed drawings, the extract from Parish Assembly minutes of 17th November, 2009 as well as the minutes of the meeting held with residents on 6th February, 2009. As will be seen from the enclosed, the Parish can confirm the actual need for further sheltered accommodation and further confirm that the Parish has consulted with the neighbours and Parishioners. Should you need any further information, please contact the Parish Hall office.		Reject	Site does not comply with the spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. The plan identifies a sufficient supply of category A homes. Policy H5 of the plan states that "in exceptional circumstances the Minister will support the provision of small-scale housing to support the viability and vitality of Jersey's smaller rural settlements", which includes St Ouen's Village.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP113 9	Mr Michael Stein	Mr G Fraser		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	East Grove, La Route du Mont Mado, St John, JE3 4DS Notwithstanding that the above site is zoned as Green Zone on the Draft Proposals Map, the attached submission sets out a reasoned case why it would be reasonable and appropriate to re-zone the site as Built Up Area so that it creates an opportunity to provide new Category B Housing to help satisfy the demand for 4000 homes over the lifespan of the new Island Plan.	It is considered that the already developed site to the south of East Grove, because of its unique site characteristics and its location in this part of St John, would be ideally suited for re-zoning into the Built Up Area to allow windfall category B Housing to meet the well-documented demand for this type of housing. See attached report for full appraisal of site	Reject	The site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with the planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP114 1	Mr Michael Stein	Mr G Woods		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Booster Station, Le Chemin des Pietons, St Brelade Notwithstanding that the above site is zoned as Green Zone on the Draft Proposals Map, the attached submission sets out a reasoned case why it would be reasonable and appropriate to re-zone the site as Built Up Area so that it creates an opportunity to provide new Category B Housing to help satisfy the demand for 4000 homes over the lifespan of the new Island Plan.	It is considered that the Booster Station site (and cluster of surrounding existing development), because of its unique site characteristics and its location on the edge of the Built Up Area forming part of the St Aubin's Village, would be ideally suited for re-zoning into the Built Up Area to allow windfall category B Housing to meet the well-documented demand for this type of housing.	Reject	The Countryside Character Appraisal's evaluation is that the overriding local character of the area forms an 'Enclosed Valley' and not a Built Up area. This designation remains consistent with the 2002 Island Plan Island plan designation of the land as Green Zone. Designating this built	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								See attached report for full appraisal of site		up area would contradict the established policy. The Spatial Strategy states that there is a strong desire to protect the Island's countryside, prevent the further loss of greenfield land to development, and the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary. Any development proposals put forward within in this location need to be considered in relation to their potential impact upon the character of the area. The application of the policy regime imposed by Policy NE7 is considered to be appropriate given the Countryside Character Appraisal evaluation of local character. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land by expanding the built up area boundary.	
DP114 2	Mr Michael Stein	Mrs B Cornilissen		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 797, La Rue des Sauvalleries, St Peter Notwithstanding that the above site is zoned as Green Zone on the Draft Proposals Map, the attached submission sets out a reasoned case why it would be reasonable and appropriate to re-zone the site as Built Up Area so that it creates an opportunity to provide new Category A or B Housing to help satisfy the demand for 4000 homes over the lifespan of the new Island Plan.	It is considered that Field 797, because of its unique site characteristics and its location in this part of St Peter, would be ideally suited for re-zoning either into the Built Up Area to allow windfall category B Housing or, alternatively, re-zoned as a site for Category A Housing to meet the well-documented demand for this type of housing. See attached report for full appraisal of site	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. In addition sufficient supply of category A homes has been identified by the draft plan. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										land.	
DP114 3	Mr Michael Stein	Mr & Mrs P Richards on		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Sunnymeade, Le Mont Cochon, St Helier, JE2 3JB Notwithstanding that the above site is zoned as Green Zone on the Draft Proposals Map, the attached submission sets out a reasoned case why it would be reasonable and appropriate to re-zone the site as Built Up Area so that it creates an opportunity to provide new Category B Housing to help satisfy the demand for 4000 homes over the lifespan of the new Island Plan.	It is considered that the scrubland to the south of Sunnymeade, because of its unique site characteristics and its location on the edge of the built Up Area forming part of the Town of St Helier, would be ideally suited for re-zoning into the Built Up Area to allow windfall category B Housing to meet the well documented demand for this type of housing. See attached report for full appraisal of site	Reject	Not only are the buildings within the proposed extension to the Built up area boundary dispersed and significantly detached from the established built up area, the Countryside Character Appraisal's evaluation is that the overriding local character of the area is 'Interior Agricultural Land'. Therefore, it is clear that this is not a built up area. Development of the site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP114 5	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Charles Prouten		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 783 to be re-zoned to built up area	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper in connection with the above site which I consider justifies being re-zoned into Built Up Area (as a natural extension to the existing Small Built Up Area) or re-zoned as a Category A Housing site (as has happened to the adjoining Field 785, St Ouen, which abuts to the south west), as presently the site is zoned as Green Zone (and as Green Zone in the White Paper) which precludes any new residential development taking place. This represents a missed opportunity to provide additional residential development on edge of Built Up Area sites such as this which may, because of site characteristics, be capable of accommodating more development without being harmful to the character of the area. Alternatively, the new Green Zone Policy needs to be re-drafted to enable such sites to be developed, as an exception to the	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. In addition sufficient supply of category A homes has been identified by the draft plan. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								presumption against development, to enable the provision of much needed Category B Housing. For instance, the site has existing development in the Built Up Area to the south and west, and Field 785 to the south west is proposed as a Category A Housing site in the White Paper. Therefore, the notion of developing this site would seem to be reasonable as it would not have an adverse impact on the landscape character of the proposed Green Zone and result in a sensible "rounding-off" of the existing Built Up Area .		housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	
DP114 6	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Glasshouses at, Field 79, Broadfields, St Lawrence Re-zone redundant glasshouses into Built Up Area As is evident from the Location Map in Appendix 1, the redundant timber frame glasshouses on Field 79, St Lawrence are located within a small settlement formed around La Rue de la Frontiere, La Chanolles de Six Rue, Broadfields and La Rue des Varvots, and which reasonably could be regarded and, therefore, re-zoned as a Small Built Up Area, not unlike those at Le Mont Felard , St Lawrence and La Verte Rue/Clos des Ormes, St Lawrence. However, unlike these two settlements, this settlement was not zoned in the Island as a Small Built Up Area, notwithstanding its closer proximity to the Key Rural Settlements at Carrefour Selous, St Lawrence Church (see areas highlighted in blue on Map in Appendix 2) or St Mary's Village, which were also all re-zoned into the Built Up Area as part of the Island Plan (2002). Given that the site has not been in horticultural production for over 20 years, as a result of unfavourable market conditions and the escalating cost of fuel, the glasshouses and ancillary buildings are consequently in a state of disrepair and therefore redundant, albeit the site itself is well kept and in a tidy state. Because there is no incentive or assistance to help in the removal of redundant glasshouses, not unlike all other similar sites around the island, there is no reason to remove these and restore the land as this would be at considerable cost to the owner with no prospect of any financial return, Therefore, since becoming redundant, they are gradually worsening in their state of repair and in terms of their appearance. This being the case, I anticipate that the Land Controls & Agricultural Development Section would not resist its loss to development. This is confirmed in the Statutory Services Officer's e-mail dated 24th June 2008 (See Appendix 3). Moreover, derelict or redundant glasshouse sites are now increasingly	It is considered that this redundant glasshouse site, as a brownfield site, together with the adjoining settlement could, because of its site characteristics and its proximity to Carrefour Selous and St Mary's Village, with all their services and amenities, would make it an ideal candidate for re-zoning into the Built Up Area to allow a windfall category B House to meet the well-documented demand for this type of housing. Alternatively, Policy C20 should be revisited to allow exceptions to be made for the redevelopment of redundant glasshouses on the edge of or within existing settlements, hamlets, or groupings of buildings for residential purposes. The Planning Minister is, therefore, respectfully requested to identify this site as worthy of being recommended to the States as a site that can reasonably accommodate new residential development of Category B Housing without causing any harm to the character of the area.	Reject	The Countryside Character Appraisal's evaluation is that the overriding local character of the area is 'Interior Agricultural Land'. It is clear that in no way does this site represent a Built Up area. The few residential properties that are within the proposed 'built up area' are significantly dispersed and detached from one another. This designation remains consistent with the 2002 Island Plan Island plan designation of the land as Countryside Zone. The Spatial Strategy states that there is a strong desire to protect the Island's countryside and prevent the further loss of greenfield land to development. This includes the redefinition, and extension of the built-up area boundary into the countryside to provide smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. In addition the plan makes it clear that there is sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area, therefore there is no need to release additional greenfield land for development. Any development proposals put forward within in this location need to be considered in relation to their potential impact upon the character of the area. The application of the policy regime imposed by Policy NE7 is considered to be appropriate given the Countryside Character Appraisal evaluation of local	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							<p>regarded as brownfield sites, by virtue of already having been developed on, and which, over time, have become increasingly unsightly. They are, therefore, reasonably regarded as better locations to develop than open green field sites. Therefore, even if this derelict glasshouse site, or the wider settlement within which it sits, is not re-zoned into Built Up Area, at least Policy C20 of the Island Plan (2002) should be revisited and revised to enable the development of such glasshouses sites where they form part of a settlement, a hamlet or a grouping of buildings, and new residential development permitted as an exception to the countryside policies relating to the Countryside Zone (Policy C6) and Green Zones (Policy C5). Therefore, at a time of significant pressure in the island for the release of additional land for Category A and B housing, and sheltered housing for the elderly (as evidenced by the recent Jersey's Housing Assessment 2008-2012 publication) it is considered timely to offer this land for re-zoning for these purposes, which under the current policy regime would be resisted, primarily because of the strong presumption set against all new residential development for sites located in the Countryside Zone, notwithstanding the clear planning merits for development. Given the particular characteristics of the site and its surrounding context, it is considered that a lower density of Category B Housing would be most appropriate. Alternatively, Policy C20 should be revisited to allow exceptions to be made for the redevelopment of redundant glasshouses on the edge of or within existing settlements, hamlets, or groupings of buildings for residential purposes, as is the case here. As is evident from the Location Map in Appendix 1, the redundant timber frame glasshouses on Field 79, St Lawrence are located within a small settlement formed around La Rue de la Frontiere, La Chanolles de Six Rue, Broadfields and La Rue des Varvots, and which reasonably could be regarded and, therefore, re-zoned as a Small Built Up Area, not unlike those at Le Mont Felard , St Lawrence and La Verte Rue/Clos des Ormes, St Lawrence. However, unlike these two settlements, this settlement was not zoned in the Island as a Small Built Up Area, notwithstanding its closer proximity to the Key Rural Settlements at Carrefour Selous, St Lawrence Church (see areas highlighted in blue on Map in Appendix 2) or St Mary's Village, which were also all re-zoned into the Built Up Area as part of the Island Plan (2002). Given that the site</p>			<p>character. Whilst there is a presumption against the redevelopment of redundant and derelict glasshouses for other uses unrelated to agriculture; in exceptional circumstances, Policy ERE7, Derelict and Redundant Glasshouses, permits minimal non-agricultural development in order to ensure demonstrable environmental improvement of the site by the removal of the glasshouses and any contaminated material, the reduction in the area of buildings, and the repair to the landscape.</p>	

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							<p>has not been in horticultural production for over 20 years, as a result of unfavourable market conditions and the escalating cost of fuel, the glasshouses and ancillary buildings are consequently in a state of disrepair and therefore redundant, albeit the site itself is well kept and in a tidy state. Because there is no incentive or assistance to help in the removal of redundant glasshouses, not unlike all other similar sites around the island, there is no reason to remove these and restore the land as this would be at considerable cost to the owner with no prospect of any financial return, Therefore, since becoming redundant, they are gradually worsening in their state of repair and in terms of their appearance. This being the case, I anticipate that the Land Controls & Agricultural Development Section would not resist its loss to development. This is confirmed in the Statutory Services Officer's e-mail dated 24th June 2008 (See Appendix 3). Moreover, derelict or redundant glasshouse sites are now increasingly regarded as brownfield sites, by virtue of already having been developed on, and which, over time, have become increasingly unsightly. They are, therefore, reasonably regarded as better locations to develop than open green field sites. Therefore, even if this derelict glasshouse site, or the wider settlement within which it sits, is not re-zoned into Built Up Area, at least Policy C20 of the Island Plan (2002) should be revisited and revised to enable the development of such glasshouses sites where they form part of a settlement, a hamlet or a grouping of buildings, and new residential development permitted as an exception to the countryside policies relating to the Countryside Zone (Policy C6) and Green Zones (Policy C5). Therefore, at a time of significant pressure in the island for the release of additional land for Category A and B housing, and sheltered housing for the elderly (as evidenced by the recent Jersey's Housing Assessment 2008-2012 publication) it is considered timely to offer this land for re-zoning for these purposes, which under the current policy regime would be resisted, primarily because of the strong presumption set against all new residential development for sites located in the Countryside Zone, notwithstanding the clear planning merits for development. Given the particular characteristics of the site and its surrounding context, it is considered that a lower density of Category B Housing would be most appropriate. Alternatively, Policy C20 should be</p>				

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							revisited to allow exceptions to be made for the redevelopment of redundant glasshouses on the edge of or within existing settlements, hamlets, or groupings of buildings for residential purposes, as is the case here.				
DP114 7	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	<p>Oak Lane Farm, La Route du Petit Port, St Brelade, JE3 8LN Re-Zone Land into Built Up Area As is evident from the Location Map in Appendix 1, the land at Oak Lane Farm (the site) sits within a small cluster of existing development which abuts the western extent of Built Up Area that forms the Urban Settlement Les Quennevais/Red Houses (See map in Appendix 2). Basically, the site has existing development along its northern, eastern, western and, to a lesser extent, along its southern boundaries, and is therefore essentially surrounded by development on all four sides (See Aerial Photo and photos in Appendix 3). Because it is contiguous with the Built Up Area it therefore presents itself as a suitable site for residential development. Therefore, at a time of significant pressure in the island for the release of additional land for Category A and B housing, and sheltered housing for the elderly, it is considered timely to offer this land for re-zoning for these purposes, which under the current policy regime would be resisted primarily because of the strong presumption set against development. Significantly, the owner is only interested in developing the site with a single dwelling but, which, having regard to the immediate character of the area would be in keeping with the character of the area, yet still represent an efficient use of land.</p>	<p>It is considered that the land to east of Oak Lane Farm, because of its site characteristics and its location in this part of St Brelade, forming part of the Urban Settlement of Les Quennevais/Red Houses with all its services and facilities, would make it an ideal candidate for re-zoning into the Built Up Area to allow a windfall category B House to meet the well-documented demand for this type of housing . The Planning Minister is, therefore, respectfully requested to identify this site as worthy of being recommended to the States as a site to be re-zoned into Built Up Area.</p>	Reject	<p>Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land. The policy regime imposed by Policy NE7 would not prevent proposals to restore and thereby enhance the character of the undeveloped area. Indeed it is important that proposals to further develop and intensify activities in this location need to be considered in relation to their potential impact upon the character of the area and thus the application of the Green Zone policy is considered to be appropriate.</p>	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP114 8	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	<p>The Grange, La Rue a Don, Grouville, JE3 9DA Re-Zone Land for Residential Purposes As is evident from the Location Map in Appendix 1, The Grange (and Field 730A) sits on the edge of an existing settlement. However, strangely, unlike three settlements nearby (St Saviour's Hospital, Teighmore Park and Grouville Church) , it was not zoned in the Island Plan (2002) as Built Up Area, notwithstanding its closer proximity to the town of St Helier (See Appendix 2). With much of the site covered by derelict glasshouses and hard standing and with planning permission for alternative commercial use, the site is effectively a brownfield site (See Aerial Photo in Appendix 3) and which, if re-zoned into Built Up Area would</p>	<p>It is considered that the land which forms The Grange (and Field 730A), together with the adjoining settlement could, because of its site characteristics and its proximity to Longueville, Bagot, Georgetown and the town of St Helier beyond, with all their services and amenities, would make it an ideal candidate for re-zoning into the Built Up Area to allow a windfall category B House to meet the well-documented demand for this type of housing. The Planning Minister is, therefore, respectfully requested to identify this site as worthy of being recommended to the States as a site to be re-zoned into Built Up Area.</p>	Reject	<p>The site is significantly detached from the established built up area boundary, furthermore the Countryside Character Appraisal's evaluation is that the overriding local character of the area is 'Interior Agricultural Land'. Development of the site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside,</p>	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							usefully yield a significant number of Category B Houses and thereby reduce the need to re-zone greenfield sites. Therefore, at a time of significant pressure in the island for the release of additional non greenfield sites for Category A and B housing, and sheltered housing for the elderly, it is considered timely to offer this land for re-zoning for these purposes which, otherwise, under the current policy regime would be resisted, primarily because of the strong presumption set against development for sites located in the Countryside Zone			to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	
DP1149	Mr Michael Stein	Mr D Gormley		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 1550, Westmount Road, St Helier Re-Zone Land for Residential Purposes As is evident from the Location Map in Appendix 1, the site subject to this proposal forms part of the western extent of the town of St. Helier, abuts a residential property within the Built-Up Area to the east, and west, and is less than 100m from sizable public and utility facilities including Overdale Hospital and Mulcaster House (Jersey Water), The newly completed Le Clos Vaze (Field 218) Category A Housing site lies to the north. Along the site's northern boundary is the remainder of Field 1550 (not part of this proposal) and Field 1551, safeguarded for Category A Housing lies to the south (See Aerial Photograph in Appendix 2). Given the built-up character of the area, the Folly Field site presents itself as a suitable site for residential development, albeit limited in terms of yield to probably only ten to twelve dwellings. Therefore, at a time of significant pressure in the Island for the release of additional land for Category A and B housing , and sheltered housing for the elderly, it is considered timely to offer this land for re-zoning for the purpose of Category B housing which, because of its present designation as Important Open Space, would be resisted because of the presumption against the loss of these open areas of land.	It is considered that this part of Field 1550 and the extensive garden area of Folley Field, because of its site characteristics and its location in this part of St Helier close to extensive services, would make it an ideal candidate for re-zoning into the Built-Up Area to allow windfall Category B Housing. The Planning Minister is, therefore , respectfully requested to identify this site as worthy of being recommended to the States as a site to be re-zoned into Built-Up Area.	Reject	The site is in a prominent position on the escarpment of St. Helier and any development would cause visual harm to the character and amenities of the area and to the skyline. In addition, the development of this site would not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP1150	Mr Michael Stein	Mr S Buckley		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Fields 741 & 742, New York Lane, St Saviour, JE2 7SU Re-Zone Land for Residential Purposes	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper in connection with the above site which I consider justifies being re-zoned into Built Up Area (as a natural extension to the existing Main Urban Settlement) or re-zoned as a Category A Housing site (as has happened to Longueville Nurseries which abuts to the east), as presently the site is zoned as Countryside Zone (or as Green Zone in the White Paper) which precludes any new residential development taking place. This represents a missed opportunity to provide	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								additional residential development on infill sites such as this which may, because of site characteristics, be capable of accommodating more development without being harmful to the character of the area. Indeed, in recent discussions with the Housing Minister (23 rd November 2009) he agreed that it would make sense to re-zone the site for Category A Housing. Alternatively, the new Green Zone Policy needs to be re-drafted to enable such sites to be developed, as an exception to the presumption against development, to enable the provision of much needed Category B Housing. For instance, the site has existing development in the Built Up Area to the south and west, and Longueville Nurseries, to the east, is proposed as a Category A Housing site in the White Paper, therefore causing this land to be sandwiched between. Therefore, the notion of developing this site would seem to be reasonable as it would not have an adverse impact on the landscape character of the proposed Green Zone.		for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. In addition sufficient supply of category A homes has been identified by the draft plan. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	
DP115 1	Mr Michael Stein	Mr D Hocquard		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Le Pommeraie, Fields 341 & 342, Deloraine Road, St. Saviour Rezoning of land into built up area.	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper in connection with the above site which (together with adjoining existing development) I consider justifies being re-zoned into Built Up Area (as a natural extension to the proposed Main Urban Settlement), as presently the site is zoned as Countryside Zone (or as Green Zone in the White Paper) which precludes any new residential development taking place. This represents a missed opportunity to provide additional residential development on infill sites such as this which may, because of site characteristics, be capable of accommodating more development without being harmful to the character of the area. Alternatively, the new Green Zone Policy needs to be re-drafted to enable such sites to be developed, as an exception to the presumption against development, to enable the provision of much needed Category B Housing. For instance, the site at La Pommeraie has existing development in the Built Up Area on three sides and is located within an existing enclave of development. Therefore, the notion of developing this site would seem to be reasonable as it would not have an adverse impact on the landscape character of the proposed Green Zone. As indicated in proposed policy SP1, it would also contribute	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								to the supply of 4000 homes that are required over the Plan Period and which for various reasons detailed below, will not be able to be accommodated within the town of St Heller as predicted in the White Paper.			
DP115 2	Mr Michael Stein	Mr D Langlois		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	La Maisonette, La Rue de Haut, St Lawrence JE3 1JZ Re-Zone Land into Built Up Area	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper in connection with the above site which (together with adjoining existing development) I consider justifies being re-zoned into Built Up Area (as a natural extension to the proposed Secondary Urban Settlement), as presently the site is zoned as Green Zone (and as Green Zone in the White Paper) which precludes any new residential development taking place. This represents a missed opportunity to provide additional residential development on infill sites such as this which may, because of site characteristics, be capable of accommodating more development without being harmful to the character of the area. Alternatively, the new Green Zone Policy needs to be re-drafted to enable such infill sites to be developed as an exception to the presumption against development, to enable the provision of much needed Category B Housing and which, as stated above, can be delivered without harm to the character of the area. For instance, the site at La Maisonette has existing development in the Built Up Area abutting on three sides and is located within an existing enclave of development. Therefore, the notion of developing this site would seem to be reasonable as it would not have an adverse impact on the landscape character of the proposed Green Zone. As indicated in proposed policy SP1, it would also contribute to the supply of 4000 homes that are required over the Plan Period and which for various reasons detailed below, will not be able to be accommodated within the town of St Helier as predicted in the White Paper.	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP115 3		Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Ocean View, Petit Port Close, St Brelade Re-zone land into Built Up Area	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper in connection with the above site which (together with adjoining existing development) I consider justifies being re-zoned into Built Up Area (as a natural extension to the existing Urban Settlement), as presently the site is zoned as Countryside Zone (or as Green Zone in the White Paper) which precludes any new residential development taking place. This represents a missed opportunity to provide additional residential	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								development on infill sites such as this which may, because of site characteristics, be capable of accommodating more development without being harmful to the character of the area. Alternatively, the new Green Zone Policy needs to be re-drafted to enable such sites to be developed, as an exception to the presumption against development, to enable the provision of much needed Category B Housing . For instance, the site at Ocean View has existing development on three sides and is located within an existing enclave of development. Therefore, the notion of developing this site would seem to be reasonable as it would not have an adverse impact on the landscape character of the proposed Green Zone. As indicated in proposed policy SP1 , it would also contribute to the supply of 4000 homes that are required over the Plan Period and which for various reasons detailed below, will not be able to be accommodated within the town of St Helier as predicted in the White Paper.			
DP115 4		Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Glasshouses at, La Guilleaumerie, La Rue de la Guilleaumerie, St. Saviour Re-Zone Land into Built Up Area As is evident from the Location Map in Appendix 1, the redundant and derelict glasshouses at la Guilleaumerie, St Saviour are located within a small settlement formed around La Rue de la Guilleaumerie, La Rue du Pont and La Rue du Vieux Menage and which reasonably could be regarded and, therefore, re-zoned as a Small Built Up Area, not unlike those nearby at St Saviour's Hospital, St Saviour, and Teighmore Park, Grouville. However, unlike these two settlements, this settlement was not zoned in the Island Plan (2002) as a Small Built Up Area, notwithstanding its close proximity to the Key Rural Settlements of Maufant and St Martin's Village and to the Small Rural Settlement of Victoria Village, which were, therefore, also all rezoned into Built Up Area as part of the Island Plan (2002) (Appendix 2). Given that derelict glasshouses to the south of the site have not been in horticultural production for many years, and the intact glasshouses are outmoded in terms of their construction and their useful life has come to an end because of unfavourable market conditions and the escalating cost of fuel, it is clear that these glasshouses are no longer commercially viable and are, therefore, redundant. Because there is no incentive or assistance to help in their removal, there is no	It is considered that this redundant glasshouse site, as a brownfield site, together with the adjoining settlement could, because of its site characteristics and its proximity to the Key Rural Settlements of Maufant and St Martin's Village and the Small Rural Settlement of Victoria Village, with all their services and amenities, would make it an ideal candidate for re-zoning into the Built Up Area to allow a windfall category B House to meet the well-documented demand for this type of housing. Alternatively, Policy C20 should be revisited to allow exceptions to be made for the redevelopment of redundant glasshouses on the edge of or within existing settlements, hamlets, or groupings of buildings for residential purposes, as is the case here. The Planning Minister is, therefore, respectfully requested to identify this site as worthy of being recommended to the States as a site that can reasonably accommodate new residential development of Category B Housing without causing any harm to the character of the area.	Reject	The proposed sites do not comply with spatial strategy. The Countryside Character Appraisal's evaluation is that the overriding local character of the area is 'Interior Agricultural Land'. The few residential properties are both, significantly detached from the built up area and dispersed. It is clear that in no way does this site represent a Built Up area. This designation remains consistent with the 2002 Island Plan Island plan designation of the land as Countryside Zone. The Spatial Strategy states that there is a strong desire to protect the Island's countryside and prevent the further loss of greenfield land to development. This includes the redefinition, and extension of the built-up area boundary into the countryside to provide smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. In addition the plan makes it clear that there is sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area, therefore there is no need to	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							reason to remove them and restore the land back to its former state, especially given the considerable cost that would be incurred to the owner with no prospect of any financial return. This being the case, the Land Controls & Agricultural Development Section would not resist its loss to development. This is confirmed in the Statutory Services Officer's email dated 24th June 2008 (See Appendix3). Moreover, derelict or redundant glasshouse sites are now increasingly regarded as brownfield sites, by virtue of already having been developed on and which, over time, have become increasingly unsightly. They are, therefore, reasonably regarded as better locations to develop than open green field sites. Therefore, even if this derelict/redundant glasshouse site, or the wider settlement within which it sits, is not re-zoned into Built Up Area, at least Policy C20 of the Island Plan (2002) should be revisited and revised to enable the development of such redundant glasshouses sites where they form part of a settlement, a hamlet or a grouping of buildings, and provision be made to allow them as an exception to the countryside policies relating to the Countryside Zone (policy C6) and Green Zones (Policy C5). Therefore, at a time of significant pressure in the island for the release of additional land for Category A and B housing, and sheltered housing for the elderly (as evidenced by the recent Jersey's Housing Assessment 2008-2012 publication) it is considered timely to offer this land for re-zoning for these purposes, which under the current policy regime would be resisted, primarily because of the strong presumption set against all new residential development for sites located in the Countryside Zone, notwithstanding the clear planning merits for development. Given the particular characteristics of the site and its surrounding context, it is considered that a lower density of Category B Housing would be most appropriate. Alternatively, Policy C20 should be revisited to allow exceptions to be made for the redevelopment of redundant glasshouses on the edge of or within existing settlements, hamlets, or groupings of buildings for residential purposes, as is the case here.			release additional greenfield land for development. Any development proposals put forward within in this location need to be considered in relation to their potential impact upon the character of the area. The application of the policy regime imposed by Policy NE7 is considered to be appropriate given the Countryside Character Appraisal evaluation of local character. Whilst there is a presumption against the redevelopment of redundant and derelict glasshouses for other uses unrelated to agriculture; in exceptional circumstances, Policy ERE7, Derelict and Redundant Glasshouses, permits minimal non-agricultural development in order to ensure demonstrable environmental improvement of the site by the removal of the glasshouses and any contaminated material, the reduction in the area of buildings, and the repair to the landscape.	
DP115 5		Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Panorama, Land to the south of, Les Fonds du Longueville, Grouville Re-Zone Land To Built Up Area As is evident from the Location Map in Appendix 1, the land to the south of Panorama sits at the centre of an existing settlement. However, strangely, unlike the two settlements nearby (Grouville Arsenal and Le Clos du Roncier),	It is considered that the land south of Panorama, together with the adjoining settlement could, because of its site characteristics and its Urban Settlements of the Town of St. Helier, St. Clement Coast and Longueville, with all their services and amenities, would make it an ideal candidate	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							or similar settlements such as Teighmore Park , this settlement was not zoned in the Island Plan (2002) as a Small Built-Up Area, notwithstanding its closer proximity to the Urban Settlements of the Town of St. Helier and St. Clement Coast (See Map in Appendix2). Given that the site is surrounded by houses, has planning permission for a domestic use (car parking Reference P/2008/21 30) and does not display the characteristics of the Green Zone, it is essentially a brownfield site (See Aerial Photograph in Appendix 3). Within this context, it is unreasonable therefore that the current H3 designation of the site means that it is not presently favoured for development. Therefore, at a time of significant pressure in the Island for the release of additional land for Category A and B housing, and sheltered housing for the elderly (as evidenced by the Jersey's Housing Assessment 2008-2012 publication) it is considered timely to offer this land for re-zoning for these purposes, which under the current policy regime would be resisted , primarily because of the presumption set against all new residential development for sites located in the Green Zone, Countryside Zone, and the constraints of PolicyH3, notwithstanding the clear planning merits for development.	for re-zoning into the Built-Up Area to allow a windfall category B House to meet the well-documented demand for this type of housing. The Planning Minister is, therefore, respectfully requested to identify this site as worthy of being recommended to the States as a site to be re-zoned into Built-Up Area.		countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes sufficient provision for the supply of Category B homes and therefore, there are considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional undeveloped greenfield sites	
DP115 6	Mr Michael Stein	Mr & Mrs Hordiern e		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Land at Brook Farm, Mont Nicolle, St Brelade, JE3 8DN Re-Zone Land to Built Up Area	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper in connection with the above site which (together with adjoining existing development) I consider justifies being re-zoned into Built Up Area (as a natural extension to the existing Built Up Area) , as presently the site is zoned as Countryside Zone (or as Green Zone in the White Paper) which precludes any new residential development taking place. This represents a missed opportunity to provide additional residential development on infill sites such as this which may, because of site characteristics, be capable of accommodating more development without being harmful to the character of the area. Alternatively, the new Green Zone Policy needs to be re-drafted to enable such sites to be developed, as an exception to the presumption against development, to enable the provision of much needed Category B Housing. For instance, the site at Brook Farm has existing development in the Built Up Area abutting on three sides. Therefore, the notion of developing this site would seem to be reasonable as it would not have an adverse impact on the landscape character of the	Minded to reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								proposed Green Zone. As indicated in proposed policy SP1, it would also contribute to the supply of 4000 homes that are required over the Plan Period and which for various reasons detailed below, will not be able to be accommodated within the town of St Helier as predicted in the White Paper.			
DP115 7	Mr Michael Stein	Mr & Mrs Ashplant		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	<p>Les Sapins, La Rue de la Guilleaumerie, St. Saviour As is evident from the Location Map in Appendix 1, the redundant and derelict glasshouses at Les Sapins, St Saviour are located within a small settlement formed around La Rue de la Guilleaumerie, La Rue du Pont and La Rue du Vieux Menage, St Saviour and which reasonably could be regarded and, therefore, re-zoned as a Small Built Up Area, not unlike those nearby at St Saviour's Hospital, St Saviour, and Teighmore Park, Grouville. However, unlike these two settlements, this settlement was not zoned in the Island Plan (2002) as a Small Built Up Area, notwithstanding its closer proximity to the Key Rural Settlements of Maufant and St Martin's Village and to the Small Rural Settlement of Victoria Village, which were, therefore, also all re-zoned into Built Up Area as part of the Island Plan (2002) (Appendix 2). Given that the glasshouses have not been in horticultural production for at least two years, and are now out moded in terms of their construction and therefore past their useful life and, finally, because of unfavourable market conditions and the escalating cost of fuel, it is clear that these glasshouses are no longer commercially viable and which are, therefore, effectively redundant. Because there is no incentive or assistance to help in their removal, there is no reason to remove them and restore the land back to its former state, especially given the considerable cost that would be incurred to the owner with no prospect of any financial return. This being the case, the Land Controls & Agricultural Development Section would not resist its loss to development. This is confirmed in the Statutory Services Officer's e-mail dated 19th November 2008 (See Appendix 3). Moreover, derelict or redundant glasshouse sites are now increasingly regarded as brownfield sites, by virtue of already having been developed on and which, over time, have become increasingly unsightly. They are, therefore, reasonably regarded as better locations to develop than open green field sites, especially where they are surrounded by existing residential development. Therefore, even if this redundant glasshouse site,</p>	<p>It is considered that this redundant glasshouse site, as a brownfield site, together with the adjoining settlement could, because of its site characteristics and its proximity to the Key Rural Settlements of Maufant and St Martin's Village and the Small Rural Settlement of Victoria Village, with all their services and amenities, would make it an ideal candidate for re-zoning into the Built Up Area to allow a windfall category B House to meet the well-documented demand for this type of housing. Alternatively, Policy C20 should be revisited to allow exceptions to be made for the redevelopment of redundant glasshouses on the edge of or within existing settlements, hamlets, or groupings of buildings for residential purposes, as is the case here. The Planning Minister is, therefore, respectfully requested to identify this site as worthy of being recommended to the States as a site that can reasonably accommodate new residential development of Category B Housing without causing any harm to the character of the area.</p>	Reject	<p>Does not meet the spatial Strategy The Countryside Character Appraisal's evaluation is that the overriding local character of the area is 'Interior Agricultural Land'. The few residential properties are both, significantly detached from the built up area and dispersed. It is clear that in no way does this site represent a Built Up area. This designation remains consistent with the 2002 Island Plan Island plan designation of the land as Countryside Zone. The Spatial Strategy states that there is a strong desire to protect the Island's countryside and prevent the further loss of greenfield land to development. This includes the redefinition, and extension of the built-up area boundary into the countryside to provide smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. In addition the plan makes it clear that there is sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area, therefore there is no need to release additional greenfield land for development. Any development proposals put forward within in this location need to be considered in relation to their potential impact upon the character of the area. The application of the policy regime imposed by Policy NE7 is considered to be appropriate given the Countryside Character Appraisal evaluation of local character. Whilst there is a presumption against the redevelopment of redundant and derelict glasshouses for other</p>	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							or the wider settlement within which it sits, is not re-zoned into Built Up Area, at least Policy C20 of the Island Plan (2002) should be revisited and revised to enable the development of such redundant glasshouses sites where they form part of a settlement, a hamlet or a grouping of buildings, and provision be made to allow them as an exception to the countryside policies relating to the Countryside Zone (Policy C6) and Green Zones (Policy C5). Therefore, at a time of significant pressure in the island for the release of additional land for Category A and B housing, and sheltered housing for the elderly (as evidenced by the recent Jersey's Housing Assessment 2008-2012 publication) it is considered timely to offer this land for re-zoning for these purposes, which under the current policy regime would be resisted, primarily because of the strong presumption set against all new residential development for sites located in the Countryside Zone, notwithstanding the clear planning merits for development. Given the particular characteristics of the site and its surrounding context, it is considered that a lower density of Category B Housing would be most appropriate. Alternatively, Policy C20 should be revisited to allow exceptions to be made for the redevelopment of redundant glasshouses on the edge of or within existing settlements, hamlets, or groupings of buildings for residential purposes, as is the case here.			uses unrelated to agriculture; in exceptional circumstances, Policy ERE7, Derelict and Redundant Glasshouses, permits minimal non-agricultural development in order to ensure demonstrable environmental improvement of the site by the removal of the glasshouses and any contaminated material, the reduction in the area of buildings, and the repair to the landscape.	
DP115 8	Mr Michael Stein	P Mossop		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 190A, La Grande Route de St. Clement, St. Clement Re-Zone Land into Built Up Area	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper in connection with the above site which I consider justifies being re-zoned into Built Up Area, as presently the site is zoned as Green Zone (and as Green Zone in the White Paper) which precludes any new residential development taking place. This represents a missed opportunity to provide additional residential development on infill sites such as this which may, because of site characteristics, be capable of accommodating more development without being harmful to the character of the area. Alternatively, the new Green Zone Policy needs to be re-drafted to enable such sites to be developed, as an exception to the presumption against development, to enable the provision of much needed Category B Housing. For instance, the site abuts the existing Built Up Area and has existing development to the west and south. Therefore, the notion of developing this site would seem to be reasonable as it would not	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								have an adverse impact on the landscape character of the proposed Green Zone. As indicated in proposed policy SP1 , it would also contribute to the supply of 4000 homes that are required over the Plan Period and which for various reasons detailed below, will not be able to be accommodated within the town of St Heller as predicted in the White Paper.			
DP1159	Mr Michael Stein	Mr R Amy		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 1017A, la Rue du Moulin du Ponterrin, Trinity Re-Zone Land for Residential Purposes	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper in connection with the above site which I consider justifies being re-zoned into Built Up Area, as presently the site is zoned as Countryside Zone (or as Green Zone in the White Paper)which precludes any new residential development taking place. This represents a missed opportunity to provide additional residential development on infill sites such as this which may, because of site characteristics, be capable of accommodating more development without being harmful to the character of the area. Alternatively, the new Green Zone Policy needs to be re-drafted to enable such sites to be developed, as an exception to the presumption against development, to enable the provision of much needed Category B Housing . For instance, the site has existing development on three sides abutting the existing Built Up Area. Therefore, the notion of developing this site would seem to be reasonable as it would not have an adverse impact on the landscape character of the proposed Green Zone. As indicated in proposed policy SP1, it would also contribute to the supply of 4000 homes that are required over the Plan Period and which for various reasons detailed below, will not be able to be accommodated within the town of St Helier as predicted in the White Paper.	Reject	The site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP1160	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Le Quesne M		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 1017A, la Rue du Moulin du Ponterrin, Trinity Re-Zone Land for Residential Purposes	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper in connection with the above site which I consider justifies being re-zoned into Built Up Area, as presently the site is zoned as Countryside Zone (or as Green Zone in the White Paper)which precludes any new residential development taking place. This represents a missed opportunity to provide additional residential development on infill sites such as this which may, because of site characteristics, be capable of accommodating more development without being harmful to the character of the area. Alternatively, the new Green Zone Policy needs to be re-drafted to enable such sites to be developed, as an	Reject	The site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								exception to the presumption against development, to enable the provision of much needed Category B Housing . For instance, the site has existing development on three sides abutting the existing Built Up Area. Therefore, the notion of developing this site would seem to be reasonable as it would not have an adverse impact on the landscape character of the proposed Green Zone. As indicated in proposed policy SP1, it would also contribute to the supply of 4000 homes that are required over the Plan Period and which for various reasons detailed below, will not be able to be accommodated within the town of St Helier as predicted in the White Paper.		There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	
DP1168		Kevin Pilley		Map .1	Proposals Map	Neither	Key on Town Proposals Map needs amendment: should change 'Potential Pedestrian Priority Street (Proposal 17)' to 'Pedestrian Priority (Proposal 18)'	To correct an error	Amend error		Minister minded to amend error
DP1171		Mr and Mrs Lees-Baker		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 622, Rue de la Croute, St Ouen, should not be rezoned for sheltered housing. (Objecting)	With regard to field 622 we have set out our particular concerns in a letter already submitted to your department. Generally, sheltered housing should be considered on an Island wide basis taking into account the needs of the elderly in all Parishes as a demonstration of joined up Government thinking.	Support for zoning Field 622, St Ouen Green zone noted.	Field 622 St Ouen is zoned as Green Zone and not proposed for Category A development in the draft Island Plan.	The Minister notes the support for zoning Field 622, St Ouen Green zone
DP1183		Mr Ralph Buchholz		Map .1	Proposals Map	Neither	Remove area to the east of Mont Nicolle school and north of Vue du Vallon from built up area to green zone. See attached map.	There is a clear boundary change where the dominant landscape form changes from built up area to the east of Mont Nicolle from the northern boundary of the properties Vue du Vallon. The error in the hardcopy version of the map was not spotted until after they had been released for public consultation.			Minister minded to amend error on hardcopy version of proposal map as published on 26th September 2009
DP1184		Mr Ralph Buchholz		Map .1	Proposals Map	Neither	Include fields 236 & 237 in St. John into important open space zoning boundary.	These fields are zoned in the 2002 Island plan as H3 sites and following a review of all sites were not included in the draft plan as they were not required (in terms of numbers) and did not meet with the Minister's stated aim of protecting green field sites. It is noted however that they may come forward in the future as part of potential village plan proposals brought forward by the parish. Therefore the area should be designated important open space to extend the area, which has the same landscape value, currently zoned for this purpose to the immediate east. The error in the hardcopy version of the map was not spotted until after they had been released for public consultation.			Minister minded to amend error on hardcopy version of proposal map as published on 26th September 2009
DP141	Mr James Naish	Jim Naish	Biarritz Hotel	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Our Client, the owner of Seafield House, Milbrook, would like the land to the east of Seafield House rezoned out of 'Protected Open Space' as it is his garden and is entirely separate to the gardens of	The Eastern part of the Seafield House garden should not be zoned as 'Protected Open Space' because: 1. It is not part of the Listed building 2. It cannot be seen from the public roads at	Reject	The extent of land to the east of Seafield House that is objected to is not made explicit in the representation. It is considered,	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							Seafield House itself (A listed building).	either end of the land. 3. It is not a rational or logical area of zoning and appears to have been done by guessing from the ordnance survey or aerial map rather than see what is sensible in reality. 4. It has been subject to several planning permission enquiries over the recent years and is deemed to form an integral part of the commercial viability of the estate. 5. Peter Thorne and Peter Le Gresley both felt that the land did not deserve the zoning in the current island Plan of 'Important Open Space' and would even merit some limited development. 6. The field number allocated (F 882) has been wrongly applied. Prior to the previous Island Plan it was wrongly designated as it has never been agricultural land since the building was built (prior to any planning laws!). The land was taken out of the incorrect agricultural designation and now seems to have slipped back into it.		however, that the area of open space associated with Seafield forms a contiguous area of mature trees and parkland that is characteristic of other parkland and the settings of large houses in the locality (Coronation Park and Millbrook Manor) and as such contributes towards the visual amenity and character of the area. These aspects, are thus considered to be relevant material considerations that ought to be taken into account in any consideration of a development proposal at Seafield and that, in this context, Policy SCO4 remains pertinent.	
DP146		Mrs J Egre		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 739 St Peter I am writing to you as the owner of the above field in light of the recent publication of the draft Island Plan. I note with some distress that one of the sites proposed for re-zoning is Samares Nurseries in St Clement. I live in St Clement and can confirm that it is without doubt completely unacceptable for St Clement to suffer any further large scale development such as the one proposed. However I do recognise that new homes are still required and would therefore ask that the above field be considered for re-zoning. I enclose a copy of the location plan which shows the site to be adjacent existing development. This field is without doubt far more suitable for development than the suggested St Clement site; it is close to the village and all the amenities which that affords. I would be prepared to consider a partnership with the Parish for either first time buyer or sheltered housing. Whilst this is currently within the countryside zone it is across the road from a recently approved development which was also within the countryside zone. The site could be developed almost as soon as any permission was granted. I ask that this request for consideration be presented to the independent inspector so that it can be considered alongside other sites during the examination in public. Specifically objecting to development of Samares Nursery site and proposes instead the development of field 739 St. Peter for first time buyer or sheltered housing.		Reject	Field 739 St Peter does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP237		Elizabeth O'Conno		Map .1	Proposals Map	Supporting	I am writing in support of the proposed Built Up Area Boundary for St Mary. I live to the north of		Noted	Support for the designation of the extents of the Built Up Area of St	Support is noted by the Minister

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
		r					field 502 which is adjacent to a property called Plaisance, La Rue de la Vallee. Having lived in St Mary for over 36 years, I have an intimate knowledge of Plaisance and believe that this farm, which has recently been designated as a Site of Special Interest, together with the fields which surround it, contribute to the historic interest of St Mary as one of the least developed of the rural Parishes. I note that the fields surrounding Plaisance have been excluded from the built up area on the proposals map, and I am writing to support this. I would also like to suggest that they be zoned as Protected Open Space.			Mary's village is noted. Field 502 falls outside of the Built Up Area and is designated Green Zone, the field is afforded a high level of protection, accordingly therefore the additional zoning of Protected Open space is unnecessary.	
DP243		Mr Mike Alexandre		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	The draft Island plan indicates that field 641 is to remain in the urban area. This we believe is wrong and we have petitioned against it. Please return field 641, St Peters, to the green zone.	Field 641 is not suitable for building on and should never have been moved from agricultural land to urban in the 2002 Island plan. the land to the west of La Rue de La Pointe must remain for farming.	Minded to not amend the established boundary of the Built Up Area.	The site in question was zoned by the 2002 Island Plan as part of the St Peters village Built Up area. The thick hedgerow along the western boundary of the site provides a clear distinction between the Countryside Character Appraisals' evaluation of the land as forming part of the villages the built up area, not as part of interior agricultural land of the Western Plateau beyond this boundary. The site fits the spatial strategy preference for locating development within the built up area and not in open countryside and therefore minded to not amend the boundary of the established built up area.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP244		Mr John Jackson	Environment Division	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 641 St peter should be zoned in the green zone (NE7) and removed from the Built up area	To preserve the current boundary of St Peter along la Rue de la Pointe Preserve the landscape and amenity of the area Maintain an important environmental habitat Preserve high quality agricultural land for crop production Uphold and conserve planning sub committee decisions "that field 641 should never be built on" Field 641 was erroneously zoned in the built up area in 2002 against previous planning decisions.	Minded to not amend the established boundary of the Built Up Area.	The site in question was zoned by the 2002 Island Plan as part of the St Peters village Built Up area. The thick hedgerow along the western boundary of the site provides a clear distinction between the Countryside Character Appraisals' evaluation of the land as forming part of the villages the built up area, not as part of interior agricultural land of the Western Plateau beyond this boundary. The site fits the spatial strategy preference for locating development within the built up area and not in open countryside and therefore minded to not amend the boundary of the established built up area.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
DP245		Gill Morgan		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	The re zoning of field 641 (from SP1) back into the green zone (NE7), where it was erroneously put in the 2002 Plan. It is clearly in the countryside zone and it has been commented on by the last 2 planning committees, which have met to refuse planning permission on it that it should never be built on. field	As previously explained above. + important wildlife area: toads, pipistrel bats, etc. To preserve the character and amenity of the area and retain the natural boundary of the countryside along La Rue de la Pointe.	Minded to not amend the established boundary of the Built Up Area.	The site in question was zoned by the 2002 Island Plan as part of the St Peters village Built Up area. The thick hedgerow along the western boundary of the site provides a clear distinction between the Countryside Character Appraisals' evaluation of the land as forming part of the villages the built up area, not as part of interior agricultural land of the Western Plateau beyond this boundary. The site fits the spatial strategy preference for locating development within the built up area and not in open countryside and therefore minded to not amend the boundary of the established built up area.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP246		Mr Alan Le Rossignol		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	That field 641 be returned to the green zone (NE7) - It seems this may have been a mistake or perhaps it was a "slip of the pen" to include it previously.	Rue de la Pointe is the obvious boundary between the built up area and the countryside. Developments have so far been rejected by the planning panel unanimously, and it has been stated that building should never be allowed in that field. Any development here would seriously spoil the neighbourhood. Until recently this field was used for growing - the soil is good quality and it is a viable size for agricultural use.	Minded to not amend the established boundary of the Built Up Area	The site in question was zoned by the 2002 Island Plan as part of the St Peters village Built Up area. The thick hedgerow along the western boundary of the site provides a clear distinction between the Countryside Character Appraisals' evaluation of the land as forming part of the villages the built up area, not as part of interior agricultural land of the Western Plateau beyond this boundary. The site fits the spatial strategy preference for locating development within the built up area and not in open countryside and therefore minded to not amend the boundary of the established built up area.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP248		Elaine Le Rossignol		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 641 should be removed from the built up area and re-zoned in green zone (NE7)	The development proposed has already been turned down unanimously by 2 different planning panels. It has never been suggested that this would be a good field to develop. If any building were to be undertaken, it would be to the detriment of amenities presently enjoyed by the community and a great detriment to the flora and fauna who have populated the area. The field has always been agricultural land and should continue to be so, and it would appear that a mistake in zoning was made in the first place.	Minded to not amend the established boundary of the Built Up Area.	The site in question was zoned by the 2002 Island Plan as part of the St Peters village Built Up area. The thick hedgerow along the western boundary of the site provides a clear distinction between the Countryside Character Appraisals' evaluations of the land as forming part of the villages the built up area, not as part of interior agricultural land of the Western Plateau beyond this boundary. The site fits the	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										spatial strategy preference for locating development within the built up area and not in open countryside and therefore minded to not amend the boundary of the established built up area.	
DP249		Bill Jones		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Adamant that field 641 is placed back in the GREEN ZONE (NE7). Fact that it was placed out of the green zone in the 2002 Island plan is a DISGRACE	Why? Rue de la Pointe forms a natural boundary in St. Peter's Parish! St. Peter's has more than it's share of housing provision - new buyers, retired and family homes. There should be NO MORE development to the west of La rue de la Pointe. PLEASE !!	Minded to not amend the established boundary of the Built Up Area.	The site in question was zoned by the 2002 Island Plan as part of the St Peters village Built Up area. The thick hedgerow along the western boundary of the site provides a clear distinction between the Countryside Character Appraisals' evaluations of the land as forming part of the villages the built up area, not as part of interior agricultural land of the Western Plateau beyond this boundary. The site fits the spatial strategy preference for locating development within the built up area and not in open countryside and therefore minded to not amend the boundary of the established built up area.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP250		Sue Jones		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Suggestion : Field 641 is placed back in the green zone (NE7) where it deserves to be. Island plan of 2002 placed it inappropriately out of its natural status i.e. Green Zone.	St. Peters Parish has made generous provision for additional housing FACT! Rue de la Pointe forms a natural boundary between green zones and built up area FACT! Observation of the draft Plan 2009 indicates that field 641 stands out in isolation FACT! Development on west side would be detrimental to wildlife, e.g. toads, bats & flora. FACT! Rue de la Pointe is a busy, bust road. Safety of all road users, especially pedestrians is of prime concern! Development on field 641 would imply exits and entrance at narrowest part of la Rue de la Pointe FACT!	Minded to not amend the established boundary of the Built Up Area.	Field 641 is not zoned for the purposes of providing additional Category A homes. The site in question was zoned by the 2002 Island Plan as part of the St Peters village Built Up area. The thick hedgerow along the western boundary of the site provides a clear distinction between the Countryside Character Appraisals' evaluations of the land as forming part of the villages the built up area, not as part of interior agricultural land of the Western Plateau beyond this boundary. The site fits the spatial strategy preference for locating development within the built up area and not in open countryside and therefore minded to not amend the boundary of the established built up area. The natural environment section of the plan sets a series of policies that protect the Islands biodiversity. Should Field 641 or	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										any other site west of La Rue de la Pointe contain wildlife and habitats for species scheduled in accordance with The Conservation of Wildlife (Jersey) Law 2000, the policy regime imposed by Policy NE2 is considered to be appropriate to protect such species. The width of la Rue de la Pointe at the entrance to Field 641 is approximately 6 metres. The narrowest part of La Rue de la Pointe measures a width of approximately 3.5 metres.	
DP251		Jayne Jackson		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	I would like to suggest that field 641 (La Rue de la Pointe, St. Peter) is rezoned from Building zone to Green Zone	Because of the environmental importance that field 641 has within the community of St. Peter and given the fact that on 3 occasions the planning committee has rejected any applications to build on their plot of land, in addition that this committee has commented that "...this land should never be built on" It is therefore vital to protect these types of field so that the land is preserved for future generations and that the environment is maintained enhancing the nature and boundary of the Parish.	Minded to not amend the established boundary of the Built Up Area.	Field 641 is not zoned for the purposes of providing additional Category A homes. The site in question was zoned by the 2002 Island Plan as part of the St Peters village Built Up area. The thick hedgerow along the western boundary of the site provides a clear distinction between the Countryside Character Appraisals' evaluations of the land as forming part of the villages the built up area, not as part of interior agricultural land of the Western Plateau beyond this boundary. The site fits the spatial strategy preference for locating development within the built up area and not in open countryside and therefore minded to not amend the boundary of the established built up area.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP252		Mr Michael Holley		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Re-zone field 641 into Green Zone.	I believe any building on field 641 would be a precursor to further ribbon development along west side of La Rue de la Pointe, which already forms the natural boundary between the existing built up area of St. Peters' village and the countryside. Field 641 has been used as an allotment to grow vegetables, and is good potential site for small scale market gardening or allotments.	Minded to reject amendment to built up area boundary, support for use of site as allotments noted.	1. The site in question was zoned by the 2002 Island Plan as part of the St Peters village Built Up area. The thick hedgerow along the western boundary of the site provides a clear distinction between the Countryside Character Appraisals' evaluation of the land as forming part of the villages the built up area, not as part of interior agricultural land of the Western Plateau beyond this boundary. The site fits the spatial strategy preference for locating development within the	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										built up area and not in open countryside and therefore minded to not amend the boundary of the established built up area. 2. Proposals Policy SCO6 permits the development of allotments that are within the built up area and not on land safeguarded for agriculture.	
DP264		Kevin Pilley		Map .1	Proposals Map	Neither	Error on key on Proposals maps (both): safety zones on key refer to Policy NR6, whereas reverence should be to NR5.		Noted and amend Plan as suggested		Minister minded to amend Plan
DP32		Bill Sarre	CBRE	Map .1	Proposals Map	Neither	I have reviewed the Draft Island Plan in relation to a family holding at Bel Royal and enclose a plan outlining this holding. My suggestion is to amend the Built Up Zone, as presently drawn, as this fails to take into account buildings adjoining the Built Up Zone, but does include a grassed area to the north.	I also enclose copy plans of the existing buildings and greenhouses and in light of their existence and their proximity to the new housing estate, it would seem sensible for the boundary to be slightly amended to include these buildings. see attached letter	1. Reject extending the boundary of the built up area to include 'The Gables' 2. amend the draft Plan to address minor anomalies and inconsistencies, as follows: (a) the lawned play area sites and the southernmost car park (intended in large part to serve the wider community / public amenity area) should be excluded from the built-up area and included in the Green Zone and the Protected Open Space designation; (the other 2 car parking areas and	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The land immediately to the east of the housing at La Providence, has been granted planning permission for the road entrance to the development, a community building, car parking and play areas. The play areas have subsequently been laid to grass and the community building will shortly be under construction. In the current IP this land did not form part of the zoned housing site (H2(1)). In fact, it was in the 'Countryside Zone' (C6) and was also designated as 'Important Open Space' (BE8). There is another anomaly to the west of the housing site. Some landscaped peripheral amenity areas and a large part of the landscaped berm has been included in the built-up area. The developer was unable to acquire Field 862 to include within the required public amenity area, because of the unwillingness of the owner to sell. Nevertheless, the field is an important part of the natural wetland and warrants the same degree of protection as the surrounding fields. The	1. The Minister is minded to reject extending the boundary of the built up area to include 'The Gables'. 2. The Minister is minded to amend the draft Plan to address minor anomalies and inconsistencies, as follows: (a) the lawned play area sites and the southernmost car park (intended in large part to serve the wider community / public amenity area) should be excluded from the built-up area and included in the Green Zone and the Protected Open Space designation; (the other 2 car parking areas and community building site should remain in the built-up area); (b) the track and the landscaped areas to the west of the community building site

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
									community building site should remain in the built-up area); (b) the track and the landscaped areas to the west of the community building site should be excluded from the built-up area and included in the Green Zone; (c) to the west of the housing site part of the landscaped peripheral amenity areas and a large part of the landscaped berm has been included in the built-up area. This area should be excluded from the built-up area and included in the Green Zone and the Protected Open Space designation. (d) Field 862 should be designated as Protected Open Space as well as Green Zone.	assertion is made that there remains a significant degree of scepticism concerning the La Providence development: in response, it is relevant to note that the application process was subject to an unprecedented amount of public consultation; the developers had to address numerous and demanding planning requirements arising from the identified issues; and the decision to grant planning consent was the subject of a Committee of Inquiry, which considered all outstanding points of concern. The purpose of the Island Plan consultation process has been to be open and transparent and provide people with an opportunity to comment: the Minister will consider and respond to any such points raised with a view to amending the draft Plan, where necessary.	should be excluded from the built-up area and included in the Green Zone; (c) to the west of the housing site part of the landscaped peripheral amenity areas and a large part of the landscaped berm has been included in the built-up area. This area should be excluded from the built-up area and included in the Green Zone and the Protected Open Space designation. (d) Field 862 should be designated as Protected Open Space as well as Green Zone.
DP349	Mr	Mr		Map .1	Proposals	Objecting	On behalf of our Client, Mr Lambert Caree, owner	On the draft Island Plan the green zone/built	Minded to	Given that planning approval has	Minister is

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
	James Naish	Lambert Caree			Map		of the above Fields, we write to ask if the boundary of the built-up zone and green zone can be adjusted to a more logical line at the field boundary.	up area is drawn through Field 616/617 at the edge of the agricultural sheds as shown on the O/S. However, the most southerly shed has recently been extended as the attached photograph shows, but the O/S has not been updated yet to indicate this. As the BUA boundary is supposed to reflect the existing buildings/development, it would seem sensible for the built-up zone to be extended to the field boundaries which would also enable our client to be able extend his other shed more easily in the future. See attached letter	amend	been granted and that construction to extend a pre-existing shed has since been completed, it is reasonable to extend the Built-Up Area boundary to reflect the development that has taken place on this site.	Minded to amend
DP351		Mr David Bisson		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	I question why the Inland Coastal Park does not extend to the SE corner of the Island?		Reject	The importance of the inter-tidal area of the Island's South East coast is well established. The area between Gorey Pier and seaward edge of the tanker berth was designated by the States in 2000 as a Ramsar, a wetland of international importance. The Ramsar designation places clear obligations on the States to conserve the area and ensure wise use. The intention of the Coastal National Park policy is to afford the highest level of planning protection to the Islands most sensitive and valued natural landscapes and areas above the mean high water mark. The Countryside Character Appraisal provides an assessment of Jersey's environment and identifies clear character areas. The Appraisal evaluates these areas in order to determine environmental importance and identify levels of protection. The Appraisal does not identify the St Clement-St Saviour Coastal Plain, as one of the Islands most sensitive environments. According the designating this area Coastal National Park, would be inappropriate given the character and sensitivity of the environment.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP356		Mr John Scally	Beaulieu Convent School	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	On behalf of the Trustees of Beaulieu Convent School I wish to raise objection to the inclusion of land at Beaulieu Convent School as protected open space. There are two reasons for this objection: 1. It is the Schools intention over the coming years to develop this area for use as a	1. The land will be required for the construction of a Sports Hall 2. In the unlikely event that the School should cease to operate an alternative use such as residential use will be sought and this protection could therefore severely diminish the value of the land.	Reject points 1 and 2	No plan of the site is provided but it has been assumed that this would affect existing open space/ playing pitches around the existing school. Proposed development of a sports hall: any	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan as the matters raised are dealt with by the

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							Sports Hall. This is an urgent necessity for the School's curriculum as the existing facilities are completely inadequate. Fund raising for this important project is underway. 2. In the unlikely event that the School should close it may be necessary to consider an alternative use for this site, such as residential use. The retention of this area as a protected open area would severely impact upon the value of the land. John Scally Chair of Trustees Beaulieu Convent School			proposal to replace outdoor sports facilities with indoor sports facilities could be considered and assessed in relation to SCO4 (1) and (4) where its impact could be considered in terms of the overall benefit to the school in terms of the quality and access to sports facilities. Redevelopment of the school site, including open space: the potential closure of the school and redevelopment of the whole site is a matter that can be considered under Policy SCO1, which does not preclude redevelopment, but only in demonstrably exceptional circumstances. Dependent on the type of open space, Policy SCO4 need not preclude the redevelopment of open space on the site (i.e. if it can be demonstrated that there are school sports facilities that are no longer required as a result of the loss of the school, then SCO4(1) would not preclude development for other uses). The impact of planning policy on the value of the land is not a material consideration	draft Plan.
DP361		Mr David Killip		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Further to our comments on 23/11/09 we would like to add that we believe that Field 236 should be retained in the proposed Island Plan as a site to be safeguarded for Category A Housing.	Field 236 is just 0.7 of an acre excluding the banks & hedgerows so is ideally suited for such a development for the following reasons: All mains services are available. It is less than a 5 minute walk down a country lane from the heart of St John village and all amenities. It is within a built up area and the St John Village settlement zone. Situated off a quiet lane, La Rue du Cimetiere where safe vehicle access & egress could be provided with good lines of vision. The field is too small to be of any value for agricultural use and has not been used as such for at least 33 years. Public transport is close at hand. The field is already bordered with established trees which would help screen it from general view and is situated where there would be limited impact on the area. It was identified as a suitable site for Category A Housing in the 2002 Island Plan. We understand there are no other sites to be safeguarded for Category A Housing in St John and currently there are no homes under	Reject	The proposed sites do not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for incremental development opportunities. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land. Policy H5 (housing in rural areas) supports the provision of new housing as part of village plan proposals put forward by the constable and this is the policy where such housing sites may be considered in the future, provided they are	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								construction, pending or reserved specifically for first time buyers in the Parish. It is not directly overlooked by neighbouring properties so should not raise objections.		required to support the vitality of the village.	
DP368		Mr Howard Snowden	Jersey Water	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Coastal National Park Ideally, we would request that the boundary of the Park be changed to exclude the Val de la Mare Reservoir.	Coastal National Park We note that the proposal for a Coastal National Park includes the area where Val de la Mare Reservoir is located. This reservoir is the second largest surface water storage reservoir on the Island and is essential for the maintenance of adequate water supply for the Island. In October 2009, Jersey Water completed its Water Resource Management Plan (WRMP), which sets out how the company will supply water during the next 25 years. This report was undertaken by international water and environmental consultants, Montgomery Watson Harza Ltd. The report identifies that by 2032, if we do not reduce demand and increase water resource capacity, there could be a shortfall of 26% between water available and demand. This forecast is based on a 1 in 50 year drought with mid climate change and population increases over this period. A contribution to the cost of producing the WRMP has been made by the States Planning & Environment department and its conclusions have been supported by its officers (Water Resources Section). There are two water resource projects which are planned to be undertaken. The first project, which is planned to be progressed in 2010, will be to increase the water abstracted from the sand aquifer in the St Ouen's Bay area. It is estimated that the existing 5 borehole sources operated by Jersey Water abstract 20% of the water that is potentially available. The proposed expansion of water abstraction will require a planning approval and a licence under the Water Resources (Jersey) Law 2007. A much larger and future project will be the expansion of the Val de la Mare Reservoir, from its existing storage capacity of 900 ML to 2,100 ML. It is proposed to achieve this by raising the height of the dam by nine metres. Jersey Water owns sufficient land around the reservoir to accommodate the new higher top water level. The expansion will require abandonment of the existing peripheral footpaths and new footpaths to be created at a higher level. The timescale for expansion of the reservoir is not yet determined, but at the present time it is felt that it could be required between 2015	Reject	Should proposals to increase the capacity of Val de la Mare Reservoir come forward within the plan period, the Coastal National Park designation would be unlikely to 'seriously hinder and delay the extension of the Reservoir'. As well as the Reservoir's zoning designation, development proposals of this nature would be considered with regard to a range of Plan Policies, this includes Policy SP2 Efficient Use of Resources; Policy SP3 Sequential Approach to Development, and Policy SP 4 Protecting the Natural and Historic Environment.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								and 2020. This will be reviewed in 2014, when it is planned to update and review the WRMP. Some preliminary design work will commence in 2010, to allow construction timescales and costs to be determined. The geology in Jersey does not support adequate volumes of ground water needed for a public water supply. Therefore, we are reliant on the collection and storage of surface waters for the majority of our natural fresh water resources. The only alternative being desalinated water which is energy-intensive to produce and is not an environmentally sustainable proposition, other than as a standby resource. Given our limited natural water resources, we would request that the project to expand Val de la Mare Reservoir, which will be essential in providing a secure water supply in future years, is noted in the Island Plan. Ideally, we would also request that the boundary of the Park be changed to exclude the Reservoir. Whilst the project will require planning permission and an Environmental Impact Assessment to be undertaken, the inclusion of the Reservoir within the boundary of the National Park could seriously hinder and delay the extension of the Reservoir. This could impact on the ability of the Company to implement its WRMP and therefore has the potential to affect the long-term security of Island's water supply.			
DP378		Mr Nigel Perree		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Propose that the (hardcore) area to the North of the farm shed (Homestead, St John - West of field 166, South of field 165) is incorporated into the built up area. Secondly, that the area to the north of the hardcore is considered for gardens	This area in question is hardcore The area was used to store farm implements That the area is of no agricultural use The grassy area has not been cultivated since the farm shed was built and was used to store farm implements and potato boxes.	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP381		Mr Andrew Lewis		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Propose that the (hardcore) area to the North of the farm shed (Homestead, St John - West of field 166, South of field 165) is incorporated into the built up area. Secondly, that the area to the north of the hardcore is considered for gardens this is to allow a young local family who's family have farmed this land for many years but it is no longer in agricultural use or has any meaningful benefit to the agricultural sector. The area has always been hard standing and there seems no logical reason why it cannot be incorporated within the landscaping of the proposed development which would be designed in keeping with the rural	This area in question is hardcore · The area was used to store farm implements · That the area is of no agricultural use The grassy area has not been cultivated since the farm shed was built and was used to store farm implements and potato boxes.	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							environment. In making such an amendment this will have a positive impact on the area by improving what is otherwise a derelict open space.				
DP382		Mr Robin Troy		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Boundary to Coastal National Park I object to the inclusion of field 125 St John and the triangular grassed areas to the East of the Loop Road as part of the Coastal National Park.	Field 125 St John has a bank along its eastern and northern limit towards the Loop Road and is hidden from general view from the east by the trees and general vegetation, from the west by the Ronez quarry and block yard and from the South by a bank. The plan should be redrawn so that the limit of the Coastal National Park follows the east side of the southern section of the Loop Road and then follows to the east of the small triangular area of land to the east of the Loop Road. The inclusion of field 125 and the triangular area of land to the east of the eastern arm of the Loop Road in the Coastal National Park would affect the use of that area by the Jersey Kart & Motor Club during its various events. The youth of this Island are, year in year out, more and more disaffected by the indifference show towards them and their interests. This Island needs to support its youth and the leisure facilities and sports which are primarily enjoyed by them, which must be allowed to develop in a sensible and appropriate way. Sport and Leisure facilities, by their very nature, often necessitate large/open areas and are unsuitable to the Built-up Zone. Many promises have been made to find the Jersey Kart & Motor Club a site for a permanent track by politicians and the States of Jersey not least by the Vice President of Planning and Environment Committee in his speech to the States Assembly on the 23rd July 1996 as follows: "...the Planning and Environment Committee is conscious that the States wish to find a suitable site for the Kart Club and will endeavour to assist the Sport, Leisure and Recreation Committee and the Jersey Kart Club to find a suitable site." The Loop Road should be designated as a special development area for the development of a permanent kart track by the Jersey Kart & Motor Club and as a leisure facility.	Reject	Field 125 and the associated land are undeveloped and contribute towards the general character of this part of the coast. Any proposals to further develop leisure activities in this location need to be considered in relation to their potential impact upon the countryside character of the area and thus the application of the policy regime imposed by Policy NE6 is considered to be appropriate.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP386		Mr Andrew Lewis		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	That consideration be given to the designation of field 525 in St John, for Community use only. This field is the only piece of land that has direct access to St Johns School without the need for pedestrians to cross a road. This in turn would ease traffic circulation, particularly at school pick up times and ensure safe access to the facilities.	If field 525 is not preserved for such a purpose, there is no other stretch of land in St John that is better situated for community use. I would therefore urge you to give this request your favourable consideration.	Reject	Field 525, St John is not being proposed by the Minister in the draft Island Plan for development. Policies SC7 will enable the Minister to determine such proposals.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							This field is the only piece of land that is attached to the St Johns school enabling access to open space without crossing a main road the strategic importance of this land for the possible future development of community facilities in the parish should not be underestimated. I also attach a report produced in 2006 which outlines a possible solution to dramatically improving the facilities at the school and community facilities at no cost to the public purse. Such a solution could not be achieved without this piece of land. Although for the time being the proposed asset swap with the Butlin Trust is not progressing. Alternative methods of funding are being explored but would be more difficult to achieve without field 525 being rezoned for community use only.				
DP408		Mrs Christine Gill		Map .1	Proposals Map	Neither	I am unable to find the specific area in the document so will comment here about proposals to rezone the Jersey Steel site in Goose Green Marsh. This area is traditionally wetland, of great importance both as a sink for excess water and as a resource for wildlife (e.g. visiting geese and many other species of bird in the surrounding area). It has already been severely impacted by the La Providence development. Any further development must be strongly resisted. The roads are already completely inadequate for the current volume of traffic and the access to the Jersey Steel site is not good. We do not want a road pushed through the Perquage, which is a lifeline for pedestrians and cyclists, leisure walkers, shoppers, etc. If Jersey Steel is to leave, then the land should be allowed to revert to wetland, and to contribute to the 'green lung' in the area.		Noted	There is no proposal to rezone the Jersey Steel site: it is identified and designated as an existing industrial site, and accordingly protected by Policy EIW2, where it is explicitly named. There is, however, an error on the Proposals Map, where the site is identified as not being subject to this policy: this requires amendment	The Minister is minded to correct an error on the Proposals Map to identify the site of Jersey Steel as being subject to Policy EIW2: protection of Existing Industrial Sites
DP409		Mr Steven Harris		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	I write to propose an amendment to the draft Island Plan. I propose that the whole of the Netherlee plot is zoned as Built-up Area . Netherlee is at the edge of Gorey village on Le Chemin des Maltieres. The whole site area is approximately 2625 Square Metres. Attachment A is a map produced by Jersey Mapping showing the full domestic curtilage of Netherlee alongside Field 148. Attachment B is a map of the area produced as part of the draft Island Plan. See Attached Letter	Netherlee was originally built in 1948 in a section of Field 148 by and for the manager of Les Maltieres farm (now Parcq des Maltieres Housing Estate). The house was sectioned off from Field 148 by the creation of a large garden running the full length of the Field 148 boundary. The garden/domestic curtilage has always stretched the full length of the site. Last year the States of Jersey rezoned Field 148, directly adjoining Netherlee, for the construction of 20 lifelong dwellings for the over 55s. The new zoning of Field 148, combined with the existing built-up area zoning of a section of the Netherlee plot, has left the existing countryside section of the Netherlee plot as an anomaly. Planning permission is currently being sought by the owner of Field 148 to build the 20 houses, 5 of	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>which will directly border the Netherlee plot. Netherlee and its garden are in 2 zones - Built-up Area and Countryside Zone. The boundary between the two zones is a line arbitrarily drawn through Netherlee's garden without any consideration or reference to the domestic curtilage of the site (see Attachment C). This straddling of 2 zones is unusual for domestic properties. Approximately one third of the site area is in the Built-up Area and two thirds in the Countryside Zone. The new zoning of Field 148 has created a built-up area bordering the whole length of the Netherlee plot. Our neighbouring houses and gardens on Le Chemin des Maltieres, the houses and gardens less than 30 metres away on Rue Horman and the houses and gardens of the Parc des Maltieres Housing Estate adjoining Field 148 are all in the Built-up Area. The Netherlee plot does not flood and it is not part of the Grouville Marsh flood plain. It is not part of, or bordering the Grouville Marsh Site of Special Interest. The Netherlee plot is not a field or a wetland ; it is just a domestic garden. The Netherlee site was visited on 9 January 2008 by Deputy Anne Pryke in her role as Assistant Planning Minister and Mr T Gottard, Principal Planner. Two months later I was told by the Planning Department that if Field 148 was rezoned for lifelong dwellings the Netherlee plot would be subsequently rezoned to Built-up Area. Grouville Constable Dan Murphy has also visited the site and he fully supports the rezoning of all the Netherlee plot to Built-up Area. Constable Murphy has written a letter to the Island Plan Review team in support of rezoning (see Attachment D). See Attached Letter</p>		the release of additional greenfield land.	
DP411		Mr Robin Troy		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	<p>The Jersey Kart & Motor Club now appeals against the placing of the Site in the 2002 Island Plan as green zone and zone of outstanding character, that the boundary of the green zone/zone of outstanding character should be amended at La Route du Nord to take the Site out of these zones, so that the Site is regarded as white zone and/or that the Site should be rezoned as a tourism and leisure area, in proper recognition of the two above permits and the Club's use of the Site over the last 12 race seasons. See attached letter</p>	<p>In summary, the Jersey Kart & Motor Club considers and requests by way of appeal the following: 1. A review of the zoning for the Site in the 2002 Island Plan; 2. That the Loop Road, Fields 115, 117, 125 and surrounding lands should not have been maintained within the green zone/zone of outstanding character, especially in view of policies relating to development of recreational resources; 3. That by reason of the grant of permits in 1998 and 2002 the Loop Road, Fields 115, 117, 125 and surrounding lands should immediately be rezoned as white zone and/or a tourism and recreational area; 4. That the placing of the Site in the Green zone and zone of outstanding</p>	Reject	<p>Field 125 and the associated land are undeveloped and contribute towards the general character of this part of the coast. Any proposals to further develop leisure activities in this location need to be considered in relation to their potential impact upon the countryside character of the area and thus the application of the policy regime imposed by Policy NE6 is considered to be appropriate.</p>	<p>The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan</p>

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								character (notwithstanding the Vice-President's undertaking to the Sates in 1996) may hamper the Club in its ambitions for a permanent track and the development of its sport and a permanent kart facility; 5. That the rezoned Loop Road be reflected in the amendments to the draft 2009 Island Plan, on it's re-issue after the consultation period has ended. See attached letter			
DP42	Mr James Naish	Jim Naish	Biarritz Hotel	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	The outline of the suggested 'Coastal National Park' encompasses private property on domestic and commercial properties and are clearly not 'National' property. We suggest that the designated Parkland is removed from the gardens of The Biarritz Hotel and is restricted to the undeveloped and uncultivated coastal headlands.	We object very strongly to the inclusion of the Biarritz Hotel gardens as these are not only looked after and cultivated by the Hotel but have also been subject to recent and past planning applications and are intended to be so in the near future as they form an integral part of the developing commercial strategy of the Hotel. To restrict the private use of this land by the tenuous restriction of designated parkland is unreasonable and will be strongly resisted. We note that the National Parklands do not include any of the property on the Plemont Holiday Village despite being far more applicable to that designation. We would ask that consistency be applied and that The Biarritz gardens be removed from the parkland even if the Plemont Village becomes included..	Reject	The intention of the Coastal National Park policy is provide the highest level of planning protection to the Islands most valued and sensitive landscapes and natural areas. The designation does not mean that all areas within this zone will become public parks or open to unrestricted public access. In this instance the designation of Coastal National Park seeks to protect the open nature of the Biarritz Hotel gardens and protect the character and landscape of the headland at Le Grouin from the encroachment of development. It is important to note that whilst the policy seeks to restrict development, expectations are afforded to "proposals for new or extended cultural and tourism attractions are sensitively related to the distinctive landscape character and heritage of the area and are in accordance with Policy NE 8 'Access and Awareness' and Policy EVE 3 'Tourism Support Facilities in the Countryside".	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP43		Mrs Jennifer Holley		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 641 St. Peter I write on behalf of a large group opposed to the development of field 641 [including the application pending at the time of writing (P/2009/1421)} . In March 2009 we were given reason to hope that the field would be rezoned to the Green or Countryside Zone in the course of the Island Plan Review. We were very disappointed to find on inspection of the Proposals Map that field 641 remains in the Built-Up Area. Whether this is due to oversight or intent we do not know. We ask that the draft Plan be amended to include the field within the Green Zone. This letter and accompanying documents explain why we believe this should be done.	On 16 October 2009 two of our group, Mike Alexandre and Bill Jones, visited the Planning Offices at South Hill and spoke to your colleague Kevin Pilley, Assistant Director, Policy and Projects, about Field 641 and the draft Island Plan. Mr Pilley advised that, due to time constraints on the Island Plan Review Team, it would be better to send in a joint letter of representation from neighbouring residents rather than for the residents to send in individual letters as before. That is why we are making such an approach on this occasion. EARLIER IN 2009 19 March 2009 - The Planning Applications Panel met to determine	Minded to not amend the established boundary of the Built Up Area.	The site in question was zoned by the 2002 Island Plan as part of the St Peters village Built Up area. The thick hedgerow along the western boundary of the site provides a clear distinction between the Countryside Character Appraisals' evaluations of the land as forming part of the villages the built up area, not as part of interior agricultural land of the Western Plateau beyond this boundary. The site fits the spatial strategy preference for	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								P/2008/0074 (as amended) and noted that the proposal would have a substantial impact on the character and amenity of the area. A large number of objections from local residents had indicated the amenity value of the field. The Planning Department had recommended refusal on the grounds that the proposed development would significantly alter the character and amenity value of the site, contrary to policies G2(ii) and H8(ii) of the 2002 Island Plan. The Planning Applications Panel endorsed the recommendation and refused the application on these grounds.		locating development within the built up area and not in open countryside and therefore minded to not amend the boundary of the established built up area.	
DP441		deputy rob duhamel		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	I would like to appeal against the proposed BUA Contraction and ask whether I should also submit an in principle planning application to ensure that the whole property stays within the existing zone.	I contacted you and others at the Department in November last year, before and since to enquire into the reasons for an Island Plan Built Up Area Contraction proposal which would affect my property. The range of buildings known as Douro Terrace was envisioned in 1834 as to comprise eight units but circumstances arose that left the terrace unfinished. The developer ran out of funds. The three sites to the east of No.5 were excavated and have formed part of NOS'S domestic curtilage ever since. I bought the property in 1985. Mistakes were made in drawing up the built up area within a past Island plan document and I had the then Committee under the presidency of John Le Sueur rectify the errors and to correctly place Douro Terrace and my garden in the Green Backdrop built up area. The lawn and shared vegetable gardens to the south were also so designated. This designation has continued to present. The new proposal suggests a split zoning which will leave my house in the Green Backdrop Area and my garden in the new Green Zone. I have looked at the zoning changes on the map and have found very few examples of other properties being similarly affected. I am told that the usual practice is to keep the whole of a property in one zone or another and that the proposal for my property is an oversight which did not take into account the walled boundaries and single ownership. There are other large garden areas which form part of the properties on the edge of the built up area for example at Les Varines, St Saviour which are not being split zoned. A policy inconsistency therefore arises should the new designation proceed.	Reject	The site has been included within the green zone in accordance with the Minister's criteria for protecting open spaces and greenfields, and to restrict the opportunities for smaller scale incremental development into the countryside. In defining the extent of the Built up area boundary, consideration is given to development that has taken place. Not to land that was once intended to be built upon. Elevated by the escarpment, the site occupies a prominent position and therefore the impact of development of this site would extend over wide area of below. These characteristics differentiate this site significantly from the properties in Les Varines which sit on top of the plateaux and are hidden on three sides by existing development. The Island Plan Review: Policy and Zoning Amendments Schedule contains a schedule of Built Up Area boundary amendments. Other examples where the policy of amending the built up area boundary in sensitive areas include; - 5 amendments concerning prominent land on the edge of the Built Up Area - 16 amendments concerning open land and fields on the	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										edge of the Built Up Area. - 11 amendments that reflect a more accurate Built Up Area boundary reflecting development.	
DP455		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for Jersey	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	(i) The Trust notes that it is proposed that the National Park boundary embraces all those parts of the Island of highly sensitive and valuable landscape quality, in addition to St Ouens Bay that is vulnerable to change and damage and which warrants the highest level of protection against development. The Trust is of the view that the current proposed boundaries unfortunately fail to achieve this objective especially in relation to the north coast and the land above the escarpment of St Ouen's Bay.	The Trust believes the Countryside Character Appraisal does not indicate that it is simply the north coast heathlands (Character Type A1) that are worthy of protection, as currently designated, but rather the immediate coastal landscape including such unique areas as Crabbé. Please see Character Types and Recommendations for D1, E1, E3, and E4 which fully endorse high levels of protection and therefore support the Trust's recommendation. Visitors and locals alike are familiar with the concept of a national park protecting wider landscape value and it is incomprehensible as to why Jersey should not be adopting a similar approach in terms of its designation. The Trust would therefore like to request that the boundaries are revised as per the attached document, and that our coastline is given the recognition and protection it truly deserves.	Reject	The CCA identifies these areas as being of 'high' landscape value (as opposed to 'very high', applied to those other areas within the CNP) and, whilst sensitive, the proposed policy regime set out in NE7, together with the use of the CCA as a tool, as set out at Proposal 4, would provide an appropriate policy regime for these areas.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP487		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Map .1	Proposals Map	Supporting	The AJA would like to specifically commend the clarity of the Island Plan Proposal Maps accompanying the Plan, which are a distinct improvement on the 2002 Island Plan maps.		Noted		The Minister notes support
DP512		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	We are extremely concerned with an almost unnoticed 'reverse rezoning' in the 2009 Draft Plan that proposes expansion of the Green Zone by contracting the Built-Up area. This only becomes apparent right at back of the accompanying 'Policy and Zoning Amendments Schedule' where it is clarified the Built-Up Area amendments results in "a net reduction of land designated as Built Up Area by 113 acres". This conceivably equates to losing some 3,300 future dwelling capacity at an average yield of 30 houses/acre!! We consider this is a major structural flaw in the 2009 Draft Plan.	The 2009 Draft Plan fails to give any foundation or reasoning behind such a significant reduction of the Built-Up Area. The Strategic Options survey gave no basis for such a change, referring to containing development within the existing Built-Up area as it was defined in 2008, never mentioning it was intended to significantly reduce the Built-Up Area. Subsequent para. 6.51 anticipates that 4,625 homes will be found within the remaining reduced Built-Up Area during the Plan period to meet the projected demand for 4,000 homes over the same period. This anticipation is based on substantially increasing density of housing in St Helier (including the Waterfront) by over 2.500 homes. If this does not transpire the Plans predictions suggest there will be a shortfall in excess of 1,000 homes. Where is the replacement housing to be found? The AJA submits there is no case for reducing the Built-Up Area extent. Rather there is potential for	Reject	The Spatial Strategy clearly states that there is a strong desire to protect the Islands countryside and that there is little support for the "extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities". Furthermore whilst there has been overall a net reduction in the total area of land allocated as Built Up Area, this does not equate to lost of 113 acres of 'developable' land. Table 3 of the Policy and Zoning Amendments clearly sets out the justification for amending the boundary of the Built-Up Area. Of the Built Up Area boundary contractions, a total an area of 66.7 acres, were previously also zoned as Important Open Space	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								rationalising and consolidating the Built-Up area boundary to maintain and ensure future housing provision, without having any adverse impact on the Green Zone and while maintaining the strongest protection of our Countryside.		and therefore protected from development. The other significant reason for the perceived 'net' loss of land within the 2002 Built-Up area boundary can be accounted by the removal of the undeveloped 2002 H3 and H4 greenfield housing sites, (50 acres).	
DP559		Deputy John Le Fondre		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Inconsistency - the document refers to Policy NE 6 whilst the map refers to Policy NE 5		Noted	Amend inconsistency between Policy NE5, NE6 as shown in written document and Proposals Map	The Minister is minded to amend the Proposals Map to deal with the errors identified on the proposals map relating to nomenclature of policies
DP585		Deputy John Le Fondre		Map .1	Proposals Map	Neither	Open Space - specific remark concerning St Lawrence. The development of La Providence (St Peter's Valley) was allowed to encroach into an area of Important Open Space for the purposes of building a community centre and one or two other minor matters. The Community has yet to be constructed, and I note that the area previously earmarked as important open space has now been rezoned to be built up area. This therefore raises the spectre of formally green field, having had the protection breached, now being potentially redeveloped through a 'stealth' rezoning. Hopefully this is just a slip of the pen, however there is still a significant degree of scepticism in St Lawrence and parts of St Peter concerning that development, and this would not assist matters. In my view this area should be redesignated as some form of protected open space, albeit a mixture of hard and soft landscaping In addition I note that the fields immediately below the La Providence development that were originally purchased by the developer have been designated protected open space. However the field that is surrounded on 3 sides by this zoning, has not in itself been zoned as a protected open space. To me this seems to be an anomaly, which I raise purely for consistency.		Amend plan	The land immediately to the east of the housing at La Providence, has been granted planning permission for the road entrance to the development, a community building, car parking and play areas. The play areas have subsequently been laid to grass and the community building will shortly be under construction. In the current IP this land did not form part of the zoned housing site (H2(1)). In fact, it was in the 'Countryside Zone' (C6) and was also designated as 'Important Open Space' (BE8). There is another anomaly to the west of the housing site. Some landscaped peripheral amenity areas and a large part of the landscaped berm has been included in the built-up area. The developer was unable to acquire Field 862 to include within the required public amenity area, because of the unwillingness of the owner to sell. Nevertheless, the field is an important part of the natural wetland and warrants the same degree of protection as the surrounding fields. The assertion is made that there remains a significant degree of scepticism concerning the La	The Minister is minded to amend the draft Plan to address minor anomalies and inconsistencies, as follows: (a) the lawned play area sites and the southernmost car park (intended in large part to serve the wider community / public amenity area) should be excluded from the built-up area and included in the Green Zone and the Protected Open Space designation; (the other 2 car parking areas and community building site should remain in the built-up area); (b) the track and the landscaped areas to the west of the community building site

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										Providence development: in response, it is relevant to note that the application process was subject to an unprecedented amount of public consultation; the developers had to address numerous and demanding planning requirements arising from the identified issues; and the decision to grant planning consent was the subject of a Committee of Inquiry, which considered all outstanding points of concern. The purpose of the Island Plan consultation process has been to be open and transparent and provide people with an opportunity to comment: the Minister will consider and respond to any such points raised with a view to amending the draft Plan, where necessary.	should be excluded from the built-up area and included in the Green Zone; (c) to the west of the housing site part of the landscaped peripheral amenity areas and a large part of the landscaped berm has been included in the built-up area. This area should be excluded from the built-up area and included in the Green Zone and the Protected Open Space designation. (d) Field 862 should be designated as Protected Open Space as well as Green Zone.
DP625		Deputy Rondel		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	I write re Mrs. M.Perree of Homestead St John re the Draft Island Plan 2009. As Parish Deputy I have represented the Family over many years, reference this Area of Land and the farm outbuildings, the last occasion was for change of use as a skip yard for Regs Skips all to no avail. Given the outbuildings and area of Hard standing at the rear of Homestead have been vacant over many years, will the review panel give consideration to including the Hard standing area in the built up area of the draft island plan 2009, so the new dwellings to be put on this site can make full use of this small area, further to this the small paddock to the north of the hard standing be for domestic use of the property.		Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP629	Mark Fauvel	Mr & Mrs B Maindonald		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	I have at the end of last week been instructed by my clients, Mr. & Mrs. B. Maindonald of Cornfields and his mother, Mrs. M. Maindonald, to seek zoning of their land which includes field 652A to be designated as Built Up Area in the Proposed New Island Plan.	Currently, the group of houses that comprise the fairly dense Hamlet along La Ruelle de Faldouet, La Rue D'Aval, La Grande Route de Faldouet, Le Mont Gabard and La Ruelle Gabard are shown as in the Countryside Zone of the 2002 Island Plan, and are proposed as being within the Green Zone of the proposed New Island Plan. Please see the property owned by my client within the dotted red line and the extent of the built area shaded yellow	Reject	The Countryside Character Appraisal's evaluation is that the overriding local character of the area is 'Interior Agricultural Land' and not a Built Up area. This designation remains consistent with the 2002 Island Plan Island plan designation of the land as Green Zone. Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								on the attached 0.5. Map extracts, for your information. New houses have been built within this area during the life of the existing Island Plan and we are puzzled why this hamlet was not originally designated as Built Up Area in the 2002 Island Plan, as clearly the Hamlet constitutes a built up area, as other groups of houses are close by. We believe this particular site could very easily constitute "infill land" to provide much needed housing for parishioners or the wide r island population as well as his own families siblings and my client is keen to pursue the building of a number of houses on this land behind his and his mother's house, which includes field 652A. Please note that due to existing trees and hedges there is minimal overlooking or intrusion into the countryside and with further tree planting this potential site could assist the housing needs of the island without being detrimental to its beauty. In addition, if this site was zoned to assist future housing, I have a developer who has expressed a very keen interest in providing an exemplar development of "Affordable Eco Homes" to a standard not yet seen within the island.		meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. Any development proposals put forward within in this location need to be considered in relation to their potential impact upon the character of the area. The application of the policy regime imposed by Policy NE7 is considered to be appropriate given the character of the local area. Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities.	
DP654		Zelah Limited	Zelah	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Land at Rue du Huquet St Martin I should like to put forward the above land for inclusion as Land for Development in the New Island Plan Review. There is currently a residential commercial Office building on the site, and planning was previously granted for a residential unit. The site is outlined in Red on the enclosed OS Map and a Letter from the Department of Agriculture & Fisheries is also enclosed. Opposite the Site & Coloured Green is a residential care Home- The Ronceray Retirement Home. Might I suggest that the site would be suitable for a single storey Specialist E.M.I. Unit (Elderly Mentally Infirm) which are in very short supply in the Island and for which there is undoubtedly a growing demand.		Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP655		A J Sullivan		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 745 St Saviour Following our discussions recently at St Saviour's Parish Hall, I would be grateful if you would put forward my request that the above field be considered for removal from the Green Zone under the new Island Plan and considered for use for a single residential unit. I have attached a copy of a site plan with the area marked in red. The site has road access, mains water, drainage and electricity. As can be seen from the site plan it is surrounded by developed land, 770A now being in commercial use. It can		Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							only be seen from the upper floors of the high rise blocks at Le Squez, the boundary to the South being a high granite wall. The land has been confirmed as unsuitable for agricultural use. A development of one unit would improve the condition of the eastern boundary giving improved security to the adjacent property in respect of the hillside, which caused severe problems some years ago and has never been fully resolved. A Clearly defined building line to the North could easily be established. Should it be of any assistance I have an enlarged site plan available together with ground sections on a North / South axis, which clearly demonstrate that there would be no detrimental 'overlooking' of adjacent units. Any further information you may require can be provided. The field has been in my possession since the early eighties, having retained it when I sold off the adjacent property , La Freminerie.			period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	
DP669		Deputy James Reed	Education, Sport and Culture	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Rouge Bouillon School The ESC Department is considering possible options in respect of Rouge Bouillon School, and it would wish to be consulted in the event that the Police Station and/or Fire Station sites should become available for redevelopment. These sites adjoin the school, and there may be scope, for example, to acquire part of this area for additional school facilities , e.g. for an outdoor play area. Sites for Educational Use Several sites are currently identified in the Island Plan under Policy SCO 1 as being ' safeguarded for educational use , the alternative development of which will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated they are no longer required for educational purposes '. Three sites are listed under this policy (Field 327, St. Martin ; Field 1219, St. Helier; and the former d'Hautree School site) , and the Ministerial Team recommends that these should be retained under this policy in the new Island Plan for the reasons given below - (i) Field 327. St. Martin : Discussions are currently taking place between the Property Holdings and Planning Departments about the location of the proposed new primary school , with the current preferred location for the new school building being on either Field 327 or 327A, and the Ministerial Team recommends the new Island Plan should allow for either possibility. (ii) Field 1219, St. Helier: This is commented upon in more detail in paragraph 6(i) of the attached report. (iii) Field 525, St. John : This is commented upon in more detail in paragraph 6 (ii) of the attached report. (iv) Former d'Hautree Site, St. Helier: This site is		Noted, and minded to accept proposals to safeguard additional land for educational purposes, where the evidence of need can be demonstrated.	The following comment is made in relation to the specific sites identified: Rouge Bouillon Fire and Police HQ: the Planning and Environment Department is not aware of the proposed relocation of either service from this site during the Plan period and they remain operational. The policy regime provided by Policy SCO1 would, under SCO1(3) enable this site to be used for educational purposes should the evidence of need be demonstrated and the site cease in its current use. As the site is owned by the States, it is considered appropriate for the Dept for ESC to register its interest in the potential release of the site for educational use with Jersey Property Holdings if it hasn't already done so. Field 327 and 327A, St Martin: Field 327 is already safeguarded for educational purposes. Field 327A is protected as Open Space under Policy SCO4. It is considered that the development of Field 327A for the provision of a school would have the potential to adversely affect the character of the village and would prejudice the adequate provision of school	The Minister is minded to amend the draft Plan, at SCO1 and the Proposals Map, to support the further safeguarding of land for educational purposes in the following locations, where there is justifiable evidence of need: part of Field 263A, Grouville; part of Field 782, St. Ouen; part of Field 1533, St. Helier. The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan in relation to: Rouge Bouillon Fire and Police HQ; Field 327A, St Martin.

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation	
							also commented upon in the attached report (see paragraph 6(iv)). In addition to the above sites, the Ministerial Team recommends the status presently afforded under Policy sea 1 of the Island Plan should be extended to the following - (iv) Field behind Grouville School: The owner of the field between the school playground and La Rue des Pres has expressed an interest in making the southern part of this field available to the school , subject to planning permission being granted for the development of the northern part of the field for housing, and discussions have taken place between the owner of the land and the Property Holdings Department in this connection. The Ministerial Team would welcome the acquisition of this land for use as an outdoor play area for the school, and in this connection would ask for this land to be recognised under Policy SCO 1. (v) Field 782, St. Ouen: Field 782 adjoins the grounds at Les Landes School, and although it is currently used for farming , it is possible that it may become available in future for acquisition for use by the school, e.g. as an extension to the existing outdoor play area and playing field . The Ministerial Team would welcome the designation of the field under Policy SeQ 1, as this would then give the States first option in the event of this land becoming available. (vi) First Tower School. St. Helier: The field at the foot of Tower Road, next to the junction between Tower Road and Bellozanne Road, is currently used for agricultural purposes, but it is understood this land may also become available in the foreseeable future. In this event, the Ministerial Team would welcome the acquisition of the land for conversion to a playing field for First Tower School , and therefore proposes that it be designated under Policy SCO 1.				playing fields; Field 263A, Grouville: this land is protected as open space under Policy SCO4. The redevelopment of the southern part of the site for school play space is not considered to be objectionable on the basis that it represents another form of open space that has a greater community benefit provided that the requirement for additional open space at Grouville School can be justified, particularly when Field 263 has only recently been provided and when the school also has relatively extensive grounds and access to Field 304. Field 782, St. Ouen: the further safeguarding of land to provide appropriate facilities to Les Landes School would be supported where there is demonstrable evidence of need Field 1533, St. Helier: the further safeguarding of land to provide appropriate facilities to First Tower School would be supported where there is demonstrable evidence of need	
DP67		Senator Sarah Ferguson		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	I note on the map for St Brelades Bay that the western boundary for the designated park area includes the path down to the beach owned by the Biarritz Hotel Limited. This is entirely unreasonable. It is in the interests of the company to keep this link to the beach for the convenience of its clients. However, subjecting it to the strictures required for a "reserve" would limit our use of it as well as perpetrating the view that because it is a "park" it is for public use. It is essential for the hotel as our access to the beach and this designation, for example, would prevent our improving the access. If we intend to improve our eco activity, this particular area would be the obvious place for locating a geothermal system. I must protest at this designation of this narrow		Reject	The intention of the Coastal National Park policy is provide the highest level of planning protection to the Islands most valued and sensitive landscapes and natural areas. The designation does not mean that all areas within this zone will become public parks or open to unrestricted public access. In this instance the designation of Coastal National Park seeks to protect the open nature of the Biarritz Hotel gardens and protect the character and landscape of the headland at Le Grouin from	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan	

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							strip of land and ask that it revert to the original designation.			the encroachment of development. It is important to note that whilst the policy seeks to restrict development, expectations are afforded to "proposals for new or extended cultural and tourism attractions are sensitively related to the distinctive landscape character and heritage of the area and are in accordance with Policy NE 8 'Access and Awareness' and Policy EVE 3 'Tourism Support Facilities in the Countryside'".	
DP670		Constable Dan Murphy		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Recommendation to amend the Draft Island Plan for the zoning of Netherlee, Le Chemin des Maltieres, Grouville, JE3 9EB.	Field 148 has been rezoned specifically for the development of 20 lifelong dwellings for some of my Parishioners and other Island residents. Netherlee borders Field 148 along its entire North West border and I would support the rezoning of the Netherlee site to Built up Area. The plot is well out of proportion to the dilapidated 3 bed roomed house that stands on it and I consider the plot would be ideal for new family homes. Netherlee is closer to Gorey Village than Field 148 and all the location reasons for the rezoning of Field 148 apply equally to the Netherlee plot. The current zoning takes no account of the physical characteristics of the plot, or the reality of the new Built up Area of field 148. The Parish would be served by the entire Netherlee plot being zoned as a Built up Area. I therefore recommend that a revision is made to the Draft Island Plan to designate the whole of the Netherlee plot as a Built up Area.	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP671		Mr Patrick McCarthy		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Revision of Island Plan--re. Field 263A Grouville I am writing to you to make a representation regarding the proposed revision of the Island Plan with reference to the above field in Grouville. I am aware that as matters stand, it is intended to designate this small piece of land as Protected Open Space within the area of Grouville Primary School. I am also aware that the Education Department is very keen to acquire a significant portion of my land in order to extend the available amenity space for pupils at the school. In particular, the southern half of Field 263A would make a natural 'bridge' between the existing school playground to the East and the recently created sports field (formerly Field 263) to the West. Furthermore, the acquisition of this land would help the school to alleviate a serious ongoing parking problem that afflicts the		Minded to reject zoning Field 263a for the purposes of providing housing land. Minded to amend the draft Plan, at SCO1 and the Proposals Map, to support the further safeguarding of land for educational purposes of	Site does not comply with the planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. The Plan makes sufficient provision for the supply of Category A homes and therefore, there are considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional undeveloped greenfield sites. In addition the department is minded to accept proposals put forward by the Education Sport and Culture to safeguard land additional land for educational purposes, where the evidence of need can be demonstrated. This	The Minister is minded to reject zoning Field 263a for the purposes of providing housing land. The Minister is minded to amend the draft Plan, at SCO1 and the Proposals Map, to support the further safeguarding of land for educational purposes of part of Field 263a,

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							<p>surrounding roads every day for both parents and staff. Despite having reached an agreement, negotiations to purchase this land on behalf of the public were aborted by Property Services at the last minute some years ago, even though I was (and remain) a willing seller. As a result of this decision, it seems that the land is effectively blighted for the foreseeable future. Thus, if the intention is to provide land for Grouville School via the proposed designation, then it is difficult to see how that might happen. I would like to suggest that the entire field is not intrinsically an important open space, as described in the draft Island Plan (Table 7.1, Typographies of open space in Jersey) especially given that it is hidden from public view and access is via a privately owned driveway. It seems to me that the proposed designation is an inflexible approach to the best use of the land. It might look neat and tidy on the Island Plan map, but in reality, it could result in the field becoming increasingly neglected, overgrown by unsightly weeds, yet surrounded by housing and school boundary fences for years to come. Where is the sense in that? Would it not be better to take a pragmatic approach that could be of real benefit to the whole community in a number of ways? My proposal is as follows: a) The southern half of the field would be gifted to the public for use as amenity space by Grouville School b) The remaining, northern, half of the land would be designated as Category A housing, but with a condition that only a limited number of low-rise retirement homes would be permitted to be built (in such a way as to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties) I would refer you to Policy SC04 of the proposed Island Plan which states that open space will be protected "except where it can be demonstrated that: 1. its loss will have no serious impact on the adequacy, quality and accessibility of provision of the type of open space affected by the proposal; or 2. alternative replacement provision of the same or better extent, quality and accessibility of open space can be provided; or 3. the proposal will be of greater community or Island benefit than the existing open space resource; and 4. its loss would not seriously harm the character and appearance of the locality. On all counts, I believe that my proposal can be seen to be meeting these requirements. Furthermore, I would argue that it would also meet the requirement of Policy SC05, relating to the "enhancement" of open space. Please also bear in mind that my proposal would</p>		part of Field 263a, where there is justifiable evidence of need.	includes part of Field 263a for the use by Grouville School.	where there is justifiable evidence of need.

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							only result in the loss of part of the existing open space, whilst the most significant portion would clearly be enhanced by its usefulness and accessibility to the pupils of Grouville Primary School. I believe that this proposal should find favour across a wide spectrum of opinion: public, political and professional, offering as it does a common sense way out of the current impasse. I trust you will give careful consideration to my representation, and I await your response with interest.				
DP672		J B McLean		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	My representation concerns the requested rezoning of a 9 vergee field (Field 530) which my wife and I own next to our home 5 Welton Way, off Princes Tower Road in St Saviour. It is my opinion, that, taking account of both the wider housing considerations and also the locational and detailed suitability of Field 530 for housing as outlined above, there is a reasonable case for the requested re-zoning of Field 530 for either inclusion in the adjacent built-up area boundary or alternatively it's re-zoning for Category A retirement homes.		Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes sufficient provision for the supply of Category A homes and therefore, there are considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional undeveloped greenfield sites	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP685		Miss M C Pinglaux		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	I am writing with reference to the property named Ocean View, Petit Port Close, St. Brelade JE3 8HJ and field no 398a belonging to my parent s Mr & Mrs Alain Pinglaux. Recently an application has been submitted requesting a change of zone from countryside zone to built up area, as this would bring the zones in line with the neighbours.	The reason for the request is not only so the zones are brought in line with the neighbours either side but also with a view that both my sister and I may be able to build a property on the land. I currently live in a one bedroom flat in Quennevais Parade which is not ideal as I work shifts. On occasions I have to attempt to sleep during the day which at times is very difficult due to the noise surrounding the busy area that I live. I have always been a resident of St. Brelade as have my family . In the future I would like to bring up my own family in the area of which I was brought up in. Due to the development of one of the neighbours who have built an extension on the original dwelling and also added an additional two dwellings on the land. I feel it would only be fair that the areas are all zoned giving the same opportunities to build. The dwellings that both my sister and I have in mind would be to house a small family.	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP686		Mrs Donna Jacklin		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Ocean View, Petit Port Close, La Route du Petit Port. St Brelade, JE3 8HJ - Re-zone land into Built up Area - Field No 398a	I am writing with reference to the above and to request consideration to re-zone part of my parents (Mr & Mrs Pinglaux) land. My parents	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>purchased Ocean-View over 20 years ago, with the hope that they could, in the future provide land for both my sister and I to build on. With the expense of property in Jersey being so very high, this was the only way for my parents to hopefully be able to keep us (my sister and I) housed without being driven away by the expense of the Island. I believe that the planning department are only encouraging the development of the Town area. I currently live in town and it is not a suitable situation for my young family to be brought up in. My husband runs his own business, and the Parish have decided to drive out the working man, by banning any commercial vehicles from the town streets. My children are exposed to drunken behaviour both on the town streets and in the parks. The town parks are not safe for children to play on due to dangers of needles and drunks being present . In addition, I am not able to get a place for my daughter at a school in town, but have been allocated a space at Bel Royal, which is not practical. However should we be granted permission to build, my daughter would be placed at La Moye School which is a short walk away. Prior to my parents applying for the re-zone, I telephoned the planning department and spoke to one of your officers , who, when she looked at our proposed area, did not see any reason why my parents building zone should not be brought in line with the neighbours next door as they have carried out a large amount of development over the past few years (see example No 1). Over the years my parents' neighbours have been granted permission to build quite substantial buildings, when originally the size of the property on the land was the same as my parents. (see example No 2). At present the field (agricultural land) has now disappeared, there are now two large houses, and a large extension on the original bungalow, with swimming pool, pool house and aviaries. The additional main house is considerably larger than the old shed which was demolished to allow the construction of this house, the two bed roomed house has been built on Countryside zone, so has the aviaries, the swimming pool, the pool house and the extension to original bungalow (unfortunately due to t he date of the photograph this does not show the bungalow extension).Therefore</p>		<p>protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities.</p>	<p>Plan</p>

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								we see no reason why our request should not be permitted (see example No 3). As already stressed, my parents wish to make a safe and secure home for both of their daughters, so that we (my sister and I) can raise our families in a safe and secure environment. Taking the above into consideration, and the fact that the building on my parents land will be to house their children (therefore essential), I am sure that you would agreed, that due to the changes permitted to their neighbours (with similar land size originally), that it would be fair and reasonable to allow the re-zoning. I am hoping that you will find my request favourable, as my parents have worked very hard, and deserve to have the same planning rights as the neighbours next door, so that they can provide for their children too. I look forward to hearing from you in due course.			
DP687	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Alan Pinglaux		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Ocean View La Route du Petit Port St Brelade JE3 8HJ Re-zone land into Built Up Area	We have employed MS Planning to help us support our case to re-zone part of our land. After great expense, we feel that the reports issued by MS Planning and sent to you, give full details of why the land should be granted permission to re-zone. However, in order to stress how important this is to our family, we feel it is best to write in to you personally to express our feelings on the matter of re-zoning. We feel justified in asking you to consider our request to re-zone the small part of our land (as outlined by MS Planning) to the Built Up Area category, as this would bring us in line with our neighbour. We are requesting to re-zone in order to accommodate our children , we are a Jersey born family I was born in this parish As you would hopefully understand, it is our worst fears that, should you turn down our request, our children and grandchildren will have no option by to move overseas, as raising a family and purchasing a property is very expensive in Jersey.	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP712		Mr Alistair Coates	Clos du Pressoir Residents' Association	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Request to re-zone Field 588 / 589 (Clinique Pinel) St Saviour to Important Open Space	The Residents Committee has no objection to the principle of designating the built form of Clinique Pinel /Hosewood House as Built-up Area as we appreciate that the Health Department may need to rationalise their assets sometime in the future. However , we strongly believe that the green area that sits immediately to the north of La Route de la Hougue Bie and east of La Ruettes des Ecorvces (Fields 588 /589) should be designated as an Important Open Space similar to the area immediately north of the principal	Reject	Field 603 is zoned as Protected Open Space because it is an active part of the setting, intrinsically linked to the built form of St Saviour's hospital, unlike Fields 588/589. This a very small built up area, surrounded by the green zone it is therefore well served by a wide variety of green and open spaces with opportunities for informal recreation activities. Most	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>St Saviours Hospital directly opposite the site. Attached is a plan showing what we believe to be an acceptable compromise in this in stance and one which will help maintain the rural character of the area, while allowing for some amount of new homes to be built. It will also help consolidate the Built-up Area and prevent the further encroachment of residential development s into the Island's open countryside. Our principal reasons for requesting this Plan amendment are as follows: - - The retention of the green area as an Important Open Space would visually link the two hospital sites and serve as a reminder of the Island's social history. It would also serve to strengthen the area's landscape character which is typified in the upper eastern segment of the island by open, undeveloped land along the roadside, interspersed with relatively small clusters of development. -The road between St Helier & Maufant is a continuous ribbon of development. When the Jersey Dairy site at Five Oaks is developed, this could act as a catalyst for extending a limb of development from Five Oaks, east wards. The road from Five Oaks to La Hougue Ric and beyond to Gouray is predominantly rural in character. Further erosion of this character will be likely to detrimentally impact upon the intrinsic landscape character of this Eastern Plateau. - The development of the whole of the Clinique Pinel site would be likely to give rise to increased levels of private car trip generation owing to the lack of facilities within walking or safe cycling distance and an infrequent bus service. Such a proposal is, accordingly, considered to be contrary to the States' Objectives which seek to support Departments and agencies in developing programs to help achieve a reduction in the need to travel through a land-use strategy and development policies that influence the location of development relative to transport provision. - The retention of the green area would release a valuable asset for families of any new development here, by allowing an accessible amenity space for informal play, or allotment gardens etc. We hope that you will give due consideration to our modest request.</p>		notability this includes Queens Valley Reservoir.	
DP714		Mr & Mrs NJ & J Fromage		Map .1	Proposals Map	Neither	We are writing to ask if you could give consideration to our application being included in the revised Island Plan. We would hope to build two first time buyer homes, (I believe Category B),		Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							in the section of Field 873 still in our ownership. Our plan would be to build these homes adjacent to La Verte Rue thereby enabling the remainder of the field between our selves and the new section of the retirement homes to be used as curtilage. As you will have seen from our previous letters we have access to all services, As mentioned previously, we recently sold a section of Field 873 to the Parish of Trinity thereby enabling them to maximise the 2nd phase of their retirement home development and after being approached by the Parish regarding surface water drainage, we have also agreed to the Parish 's request to take their surface water drains across our land as the facility serving the existing retirement homes will be done away with as part of the new development scheme. Field 873 is surrounded North, East and West by land which has been white zoned. To the East of La Verte Rue is Field 816, to the North is the small triangle piece of land Field 817 and to the West is the new retirement home development. Also part of our Field 873 was changed to domestic curtilage when we bought the property in 1995. I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.			spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	
DP715		Mr John Reynel		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	I am aware that the current Island Plan Which was approved by the States of Jersey in 2002, is now in the process of being reviewed and is available for consultation. I understand that at the moment representations can be submitted to the Planning and Environment Department for consideration of amendment or inclusion into the next Island Plan. On this basis, I should be grateful if you would give your consideration , under the Island Planning Review 2008 - 2023, the proposal for rezoning an area of land for development known as the corner field, adjacent to fields 713 & 715, situated on the east end of La Rue des Caberettes in St. Martin.	The green paper for the revision to the island plan, under section GD1 "General Development Control Policies " 1.6 Sustainable development, asks how a "development can contribute towards a more sustainable form and pattern of development in Jersey". The policy also asks what effects the development would have on the local environment and its effects on the surrounding area, neighbours land and buildings. The policy also seeks to ensure that any new development has some value, and that it fits in with the travel and transport policies. Finally the policy seeks to ensure that development achieves design quality. I believe that a development within this, or similar parcels of land can fit into the policy of sustainable development and would contribute towards a more sustainable form and pattern of development within Jersey. A development within similar areas of land adjacent to existing properties would actually complete these localised developed areas, by forming complete smaller rural residential zones and without having destroyed large workable fields. It is also worthy of mention that areas of land such as the triangular shaped field mentioned above will have many of the major services they require running	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>close by. Some small infill pieces of land, such as in the fields mentioned above, a water borehole and foul drainage, or may be present within adjacent roads again as in the land mentioned above, such as electricity, telephones cables and a possibly even a gas supply. Development proposals of this nature should not automatically be seen as encroachment into the countryside and thus rejected out of hand, particularly when they do not create any major inroads into open spaces or contribute to a loss of good workable agricultural land or wild habitats. They could be regarded as an opportunity to provide additional homes. Over the period of time that I have been endeavouring to obtain planning permission for development within the above mentioned piece of land, (which I was informed by the farming fraternity and the former Agricultural and Fisheries Department), had no agricultural value due to its size and shape, the need for more development land and thus provision of affordable dwellings has become even more urgent. The constant refusal of planning permission on what, in my view, is suitable infill land has continued to exacerbate the problem that the States of Jersey face of not being able to provide family homes for many local residents. Infill developments of this nature need not destroy the aesthetic, commercial or environmental aspects of the country side our quality of life, as minor developments can be sympathetically screened from agricultural and sensitive land by hedgerows and suitable tree planting. Many of these small pieces of land are often separated by other man made features such as roads, houses and even old farm buildings. Development of this nature, if carried out in an aesthetically pleasing way, does need to impact on its neighbour's enjoyment of their own properties. This is the case regarding the corner field, adjacent to fields 713 and 715 in St. Martin, in that the surrounding properties are facing away from the piece of land. With good quality design these smaller developments can be pleasantly, sympathetically and even environmentally screened so as to maintain a good quality of living for any surrounding properties. Over the years, I have witnessed numerous properties being developed in areas on open headlands and in areas of aesthetically and</p>			

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								environmentally sensitive land. These areas can only be described as encroachment into green zones and it appears, for no other reason than personal status or financial gain. I, like many people, support Planning and Environment's wishes to prevent undesirable or unsympathetic developments within the green zones and agricultural areas. Arable land and wildlife habitats, such as St Catherine's woods can never be replaced once lost to development. However, there must be some allowances made for small scale developments that do not impose themselves unfavourably on the country side and would go some way towards providing additional valuable housing the Islands population, even if within existing rural areas. May I ask that those officials involved in the current planning review look again at the proposed policies on development within the green backdrop zones. If any housing can be gained by these minor developments, such as in the area of land mentioned above, or other areas of a similar nature and can be shown to provide potential infill development opportunities, without being detrimental to the open country side, then amendments to the Islands development plan 2008 to 2032 should be identified and put forward.			
DP716	Mrs Stephanie Steedman	Lady Sheila Butlin		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Request for Reconsideration -Island Plan Review - Old Garden,Blair Adam House, Les Chenolles, St John KEPlanning has been instructed by the owners of the above site to request your reconsideration of the decision not to include it as suitable for the construction of new development within the new The Jersey Island Plan. A map showing the location of the site is included as Figure 1. The request for consideration dated 5th August 2008 and submitted as part of the Island Plan Review, suggested that the site is suitable for rezoning to allow a limited amount of new housing to be built. The number that was suggested was indicative and the owners of the site have requested that the principle of new residential development only, is considered as part of this appeal. It was proposed in the original submission that allowing the site to be developed for residential purposes offers significant advantages for the local area and results in very little harm to the character of the Island: The site is not open, nor does it involve agricultural land. Building on this site will be seen within the context of the buildings of the surrounding		Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							building group. Building on this site makes the best use of the remnant of an estate which character has been changed beyond recognition. It is hard to see what harm could result from allowing building on this area. Two large and prominent conifer hedges are removed and are replaced with hedges comprising native species. The replacement of two large leylandii hedges with hedges and trees comprising native species, improves the opportunity for habitats for native species to be created at the site. The development of the site does not result in the need for new infrastructure. On the basis of the arguments put forward, the Minister is respectfully requested to reconsider the decision not to include the site at Blair Adam House as suitable for residential development. The site could either be included within the proposed Built-Up Area of the new plan; or, parameters could be set, clarifying that sites such as this, are suitable for residential development under the aims and principles set out in the new plan. One way of doing this could be achieved by expanding the definition of Brownfield sites to include sites such as this which are appropriate to redevelop, taking into account local context and considerations. Thank-you for taking the time to consider this representation and please do not hesitate to contact KEPlanning if there are any queries or points which require clarification.				
DP717		Mr Kenneth Renouard		Map .1	Proposals Map	Neither	The proposed policy for redundant greenhouse sites is currently rather vague. As the glasshouse industries are in decline, I believe there should be more emphasis and incentives to encourage the redevelopment of those sites. I personally own two redundant greenhouses sites in the Boulivot & lounville area. I have spoken to potential developers who have indicated that they would be interested in working with me. I have also spoken with many of our neighbours and the consensus has been that they would all prefer to see a sympathetic residential development in the place of the redundant glasshouses, which are unsightly and currently beyond economic repair. Therefore, I would like to put forward my above mentioned two sites for re-zoning for residential development. The sites are Rainbow Nurseries on le Boulivot de Haut and on Rue de Tapon. I know of similar sites throughout the island, and believe that many of these could also be re-zoned to the benefit of the whole island.		reject	The Spatial Strategy sets out a desire to protect the Island's countryside and prevent the further loss of greenfield land to development. This includes the redefinition, and extension of the built-up area boundary into the countryside to provide smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. In addition the plan makes it clear that there is sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area, therefore there is no need to release additional greenfield land for development. Any development proposals put forward within in this location need to be considered in relation to their potential impact upon the character of the area. The countryside character appraisals	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										evaluation of the land is that it is 'Interior Agricultural Land' and therefore the application of the policy regime imposed by Policy NE7 is considered to be appropriate. Whilst there is a presumption against the redevelopment of redundant and derelict glasshouses for other uses unrelated to agriculture; in exceptional circumstances, Policy ERE7, Derelict and Redundant Glasshouses, permits minimal non-agricultural development in order to ensure demonstrable environmental improvement of the site by the removal of the glasshouses and any contaminated material, the reduction in the area of buildings, and the repair to the landscape.	
DP720		Mr John Payn		Map .1	Proposals Map	Neither	Further to my recent conversation with Mr Roger Corfield, please find my submissions regarding Field No. 803, known as Clos Fondant, Rue des Vignes, St Peter. This field is situated directly east of St Peter's Garden Centre and part of the field is currently used as an unofficial overspill car park. Mrs Elizabeth Ashworth of Planning & Environment has assured me that the ongoing application for car parking will be favourably looked upon. I am writing to request that the entire Field No. 803 be included in the New Island Plan as a designated plot for building either housing or commercial development. I submit that the field is very difficult to work and situated between housing and St Peter's Garden Centre. There are houses to the east and south of the field. The houses to the east are new buildings and ongoing developments. I would be pleased to discuss this with you when you return from vacation.		Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP721		Alison Le Cornu		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 573, Grouville I am writing you as a joint owner of the above-named field in Grouville in light of the recent publication of the draft Island Plan, in which it has been categorised within the Green Zone. We ask that this request for consideration be presented to the independent inspector so that it can be considered alongside other sites during the examination in public of the Island Plan.	I and the other members of my family who jointly own the field (all of whom are resident in Jersey) would like to request that this field be considered for re-categorisation. We understand that fields within the Green Zone are not eligible for development. As we are keenly aware of the shortage of affordable accommodation as well as accommodation for Jersey's aging population, we would like to be in a position to apply to the Planning and Environment Department to develop the field at some point in the not-too-distant future. If	Reject	The does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, provided all of the policies are adopted, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category A homes. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds for the release of	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>it were possible to categorise the field in the Island Plan so that this would be a real possibility we think it would be of real benefit both to the Parish of Grouville and to the Island as a whole. The field has a one-storey construction on it, which is divided into two main sections each of which is subdivided into two and which has a total surface area of approximately 350 to 400 square feet. In the past it was used as living accommodation by French labourers. More recently it has been used by a local farmer to store farming equipment and straw or hay, with the rest of the field being used to graze horses. The building is not appropriate housing for modern life: it has no toilet or washing facilities, no kitchen or clearly designated uses for the individual spaces, although local people who remember it being inhabited say it used to be reasonably well equipped; it is constructed of prefabricated slabs and wood, with a corrugated iron roof; it is now in a very poor state of repair and would need extensive redevelopment work done on it were it to be made habitable. The remainder of the field has always, since it has been in the possession of our family (now at least three generations), been used either for grazing horses or it has been left fallow. To our knowledge, and within our memory, it has not been used for agricultural purposes. The field backs onto a small development of seven houses which were built at the end of the 1980s as part of the newly-constructed Le Clos Mallet. We think that a small section of Field 573 may have been used as part of the development of Le Clos Mallet, which was undertaken by our family in conjunction with North Jersey Construction. It is opposite an individual, occupied, house on the other side of La Rue du Puits Mahaut. The position of both these areas of housing means that the development of Field 573 would not encroach significantly into the surrounding Green Zone, as we demonstrate on the attached digimap plan.</p>		additional greenfield land.	
DP759		Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Map .1	Proposals Map	Neither	AJA Members appreciate the difficult task facing the Planning Department in balancing the competing demands and needs of the Island that can be summarised as - Provision of Housing for residents; Provision of Social, Commerce and Recreational facilities; Protection of the Environment; Protection of the Island's Heritage; and importantly flexibility to accommodate		comments noted	With specific regard to the loss of 113 acres of built up area, this includes all of the protected open space, such as the parks, playing fields, etc that is within in the built up area. Therefore, these areas, even under the previous plan would not be able to be	Noted by the Minister

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							changes in the future circumstances of the Island. Given Jersey's finite land area every square metre is precious and land use presents complex decisions about how Jersey will progress in the future - with the Island Plan setting the framework ? and the AJA considers there are many commendable aspects of the 2009 Draft Island Plan. However there are some major issues and defects that, as we have set out above, need reconsideration. The overall combined thrust and effect of the Policies is unreasonably anti?development, against the Island's demonstrable need to, build ? particularly new housing. Contracting the Built-Up Area by about 113 acres (the summary section on Built-Up area boundary changes needs clarification) while seeking to provide an additional 4,600 homes over the Plan period is doomed to failure. This is unsustainable and fails to learn from previous experience - we have been here before. The Built-Up area deserves consolidation and lateral thinking rather than reduction. There is a need to rethink substantive parts, but not most, of the 2009 Draft Island Plan. We hope the final re-worked Plan will be much more visionary (especially about providing Housing) - creative and liberating rather than restrictive. As the 2009 Draft Plan stands at present commerce will be handicapped and housing provision stifled over the next 10 years. The AJA sincerely hopes this does not occur and implores you to reconsider the approach currently within the 2009 Draft Island Plan and arrange re-drafting of the sections we have highlighted.				
DP762		A H Harris		Map .1	Proposals Map	Supporting	St. Mary - Field 498 should no t be altered as it is a green field coming up to the skirts of a 13th Century Church, and that setting should be maintained. I support Field 498 being protected open space. The cemetery and the amenity land in front of the Old Rectory also form part of this setting.		Noted	Noted	The Minister notes the support for the designation of F498 and land around the Church as protected open space
DP763		A H Harris		Map .1	Proposals Map	Neither	St. Mary - Field 502 - I support this being designated as Green Zone, but would also like to ensure that it is a protected open space. I hope this zoning actually means that the extension of domestic curtilages and gardens will no t be allowed. Field 502 is agricultural land , and any attempt to build upon it or convert it to domestic garden would affect the setting of La Plaisance, a designated SSI, and should be roundly opposed. Important indigenous trees in the area should be		Reject	Field 502 falls outside of the Built Up Area and is designated Green Zone, the field is afforded a high level of protection, accordingly therefore the additional zoning of Protected Open space is unnecessary.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							protected .				
DP764		A H Harris		Map .1	Proposals Map	Supporting	St. Clement - the coast road going eastwards to Le Hocq opens out at that point to magnificent views of the beach, inter-tidal zone and towers and is one of the finest views in the Island. We are all entitled to this view as we pass by! No building should be allowed in such areas.		Noted	This area along coast road through St Clements and into Grouville is designate as Shoreline Zone. Development proposals within this zone that obstruct public views to the foreshore and sea will not be permitted.	The Minister notes the support for the designation of the coast road along St Clements as Shoreline Zone.
DP768		P Le Saux		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	All headlands should be given National Park Status the headlands must be preserved at all costs and extended into Plan 2009 Green Zone as far as possible the Corbiere headland should have a northern boundary line extending Mont Sohier/ Le Mont Arthur. The Noirmont headland should have a northern boundary line extending La Pulente Hill/La Ruelle Sergente/La Blanch Charriere. Northern Headlands should have a southern boundary as defined on the 2002 Plan by the Green Zone.	I think an Open Space/Bufferzone is required to promote the aims of the Coastal National Park Status and form a buffer and bigger corridor for natural beauty and wildlife to succeed. It also gives more protection to headlands, Agricultural Land, Wetland, Marshes, Water Resources, Biodiversity, etc. Building these silly estates in places of Natural Beauty does more harm than good with the introduction of cats and dogs, and pollution. The outcome is nature is being forced out and nesting sites destroyed. People need large open space to get away from it all - wildlife need large open space to mark their territories and their hunting areas and keep away from creeping domestication and predators. What is the point of going for a quiet walk along a coastal path or across a headland when you have got housing estates and eyesores a few feet away. I think we have got to protect our large open spaces now whilst we have still got a chance. Sadly it is too late for the Noirmont and Corbiere headlands but it is not too late to try and salvage what is left of these headlands.	Reject	The definition of the Coastal National Park is based on an objective assessment of the landscape quality and character of the Island, as set out in the Countryside Character Appraisal, and to embrace wider areas as proposed, has no evidential basis in terms of landscape character and quality.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP778	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Caesarean Tennis Club, Les Grand Vaux, St Helier, JE2 4NA Retain Site as Built Up Area in Draft Island Plan	I write in connection with the above site which is presently zoned as Built Up Area in the island Plan 2002. You mayor may not be aware, but the club is considering re-locating to another site because the existing premises at Grand Vaux are no longer appropriate for a club with a growing membership. Also, because its existing facilities, especially the dome (the indoor tennis facility), are coming to the end of their useful life, re-investment in these costly replacement facilities would not make sense if it were to succeed in relocating to another site. Indeed, an in-principle application to develop the site for residential purposes is currently being kept in abeyance because Policy TR4 presumes against the loss of recreational resources and, therefore, permission cannot be granted until permission has been granted for its re-location to another site. We are therefore pleased to see that the site is still proposed to be zoned as Built Up	Reject	The sports facilities provided by the Caesarean Tennis Club make a valuable contribution to sport, leisure and recreation in the Island and, accordingly, warrant protection under the policy regime provided by Policy SCO4. The aspirations of the club to improve its facilities are to be welcomed and would be facilitated by Policy SCO5. Likewise, SCO4 would not preclude the redevelopment of the existing facility, subject to the tests set out in the policy.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								Area in the Draft Island Plan, albeit following correspondence with Mr Pilley, Assistant Director of Policy & Projects, he indicated in an e-mail to me that " we will consider this matter with in the context of the Dr aft Island Plan and consider an amendment to address this matter. " By this, he means proposing to re-zone it as Open Space. However, if this occurs, it will be counterproductive as it will make it much more difficult for the club to progress its plans to re-locate and we will continue to be in the same position as we are in now because the lack of a permit for its existing site effectively prevents it from progressing plans for the alternative site with any degree of confidence or certainty and which, ironically, therefore places the wellbeing of the club in jeopardy because of the inadequacy of the exiting site. Moreover, we are aware that the Draft Island Plan aims to prevent new development on green field sites and seeks to direct most new development into the town of St Helier. Our view, however, is that the town of St Helier will fail to deliver the yield of residential units which has been predicted in the Draft Island Plan for the reasons given in Appendix 1. This, therefore, makes it even more important that sites such as this site at Grand Vaux are not constrained from being able to yield residential developments that will help to address the shortfall of 4000 homes needed over the Plan period. Indeed, in our initial discussions with the planners, this was regarded as an ideal site for residential development. However, if the Caesarean's site at Grand Vaux is re-zoned as Open Space, we will find ourselves in the same situation we found ourselves in now, and the opportunity of re-locating to a larger site, providing improved and modern facilities will be lost, to the detriment of the club and the island. I would therefore be grateful if you would refer this reasoned request to the Planning Inspector so we might be able to address this issue at his Examination in Public.			
DP779	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 530A, Princes Tower Road, St Saviour, Re-Zone into Built Up Area	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper in connection with the above site which I consider justifies being re-zoned into Built Up Area (as a natural extension to the Town of St Helier), as presently the site is zoned as a Countryside Zone (or Green Zone in the White Paper) which precludes any new residential development taking place. This	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								represents a missed opportunity to provide an holistic residential scheme in harmony with the redevelopment of the Jersey Dairy site (which is in the Built Up Area) which it adjoins, that is on the edge of the Town of St Helier and which, because of its site characteristics, would be capable of accommodating more development without being harmful to the character of the area.		scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	
DP780	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 669, La Rue des Grantez, St Ouen, Re-Zone for Residential Purposes	I write further to the White Paper produced as part of the current Draft Island Plan Review. Notwithstanding that the above site is zoned as Green Zone on the Draft Proposals Map, the attached submission sets out a reasoned case why it would be reasonable and appropriate to re-zone the site as Built Up Area so that it creates an opportunity to provide new Category B Housing to help satisfy the demand for 4000 homes over the lifespan of the new Island Plan. I would therefore be grateful if you would refer this case to the Independent Inspector for consideration at his Examination in Public.	Reject	The Countryside Character Appraisal's evaluation is that the overriding local character of the area is 'Interior Agricultural Land' and not a Built Up area. This designation remains consistent with the 2002 Island Plan Island plan designation of the land as Green Zone. Designating this built up area would contradict the established policy. The Spatial Strategy states that there is a strong desire to protect the Island's countryside, prevent the further loss of greenfield land to development, and the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary. Any development proposals put forward within in this location need to be considered in relation to their potential impact upon the character of the area. The application of the policy regime imposed by Policy NE7 is considered to be appropriate given the Countryside Character Appraisal evaluation of local character. The Spatial Strategy states that there is a strong desire to protect the Island's countryside, prevent the further loss of greenfield land to development, and the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary. Any development proposals put forward within in this location need to be considered in relation to their potential impact upon the character of the area. The	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										application of the policy regime imposed by Policy NE7 is considered to be appropriate given the Countryside Character Appraisal evaluation of local character.	
DP788	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 121 9, La Grande Route du Mont A L'abbe, St Helier, Re-Zoning Case to Educational Use and Category A Housing	<p>I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper and to the proposal to re-zone the above site for educational use and for Category A Housing. Because, Haute Vallee School has confirmed that it only requires half the land (rather than the two-thirds proposed to be zoned for these purposes as shown on the Draft Proposals Map), and because the owner is only willing to fund this development on behalf of Haute Vallee School if the remaining half of the site is re-zoned for Category A Housing (rather than the third shown on the Draft Proposals Map) and subject to all the units being 1st time buyer to make the development as a whole economically viable, then he would be happy for it to be put forward on this basis. We are therefore suggesting the removal of the allotments which, in the Development Brief attached as Appendix B to the Draft Island Plan, is also reserved a third of the site. The provision of allotments are not however regarded to be of strategic importance and, given the encouragement for this type of development in the Draft Island Plan, can easily be located elsewhere, unlike the educational and Category A Housing development which rely on each other in terms of delivery. Moreover, the increase in the number of new dwellings that can be provided will help to satisfy the serious shortfall of Category A Housing in the island and on what is, arguably, the most sustainable site given its location on the edge of the town of St Helier and its proximity to local shops and services. I understand this case will be referred to the Independent Inspector and we will be given the opportunity to make representations at his Examination in Public. Please advise me when this is likely to take place and whether we will be able to make our representations to the Inspector in person.</p>	noted and supported	<p>The Minister may consider enlarging the site to increase the capacity for affordable housing in the early years of the Plan, in the light of his intention to recommend removal of Samares Nurseries, Cooke's Nurseries and Longueville Nurseries from Policy H1. In addition it is recognised, following discussions with Education, that the cost of providing the playing fields is in the region of £900,000 and this could affect the viability of the housing area. Educations also stipulate a minimum of 50% of the field is required for sports a field (DP805).</p>	Minister minded to increase the size of the site zoned for housing (to be no larger than 50% of the field 1219) and carry out further consultation.
DP792	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Area of Wasteland to north of Field 681, La Rue de la Bachauderie, St Saviour Re-Zone Land into Built Up Area	<p>I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper in connection with the above site which (together with adjoining existing development) I consider justifies being re-zoned into Built Up Area (as a natural</p>	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								extension to the existing Urban Settlement), as presently the site is zoned as Countryside Zone (or as Green Zone in the White Paper) which precludes any new residential development taking place. I would refer you and the Inspector to the Planning Statement I submitted to you on 23rd September 2009 and which sets out a comprehensive and reasoned case for the re-zoning of this land into Built Up Area (see attached). This represents a missed opportunity to provide additional residential development on infill sites such as this which may, because of site characteristics, be capable of accommodating more development without being harmful to the character of the area. The case has however been strengthened by virtue of the fact that the recently developed Category A Housing site to the north and west is proposed to be re-zoned as Built Up Area.		redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	
DP793	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Bienvenue Farm, La Grande Route de St. Laurent, St. Lawrence Re-Zone land into the Built-Up Area	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper and to the proposal to re-zone the above site into the Green Zone and the adjacent land as a Warehousing/industrial site as an extension to the existing Thistlegrove Industrial Estate. Because Beinvenue Farm is already developed land adjacent to a primary road and served by the public foul sewer, and is surrounded by development including residential uses, it is an ideal candidate for rezoning. The re-zoning would enable the development of much needed family housing on land which will not be viable for commercial agricultural and critically, also protect the amenity of the existing residential property Thistlegrove against the possible future extension of the Industrial Zone onto this land. I understand this case will be referred to the Independent Inspector and we will be given the opportunity to make representations at his Examination in Public. Please advise me when this is likely to take place and whether we will be able to make our representations to the Inspector in person.	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land. The proposed green zone for this site would provide better protection to the property Thistlegrove from any potential further extensions to the light industrial area or indeed other residential development.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP794	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Fields 1551 &1552, Westmount Road, St Helier Re-Zone land for Residential Development.	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper in connection with the above site which I consider justifies being re-zoned into Built Up Area (as a natural extension to the Town of St Helier), as presently the site is zoned as a Site for Further Consideration for Category A Housing for which an application is	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								presently submitted (or Green Zone in the White Paper which precludes any new residential development taking place). I would refer you and the Inspector to the Planning Statement I submitted to you on 17th September 2009 and which sets out a comprehensive and reasoned case for the re-zoning of this land into Built Up Area.		countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	
DP795	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Houguemont, La Rue D'Aval, St Martin, JE3 6ER Re-Zone Land to Built Up Area	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper in connection with the above site which (together with adjoining existing development) I consider justifies being re-zoned into Built Up Area (as a natural extension to the existing Small Built Up Area of Teighmore Park, Grouville), as presently the site is zoned as Countryside Zone (or as Green Zone in the White Paper) which precludes any new residential development taking place. I would refer you and the Inspector to the Planning Statement I submitted to you on 9th September 2009 and which sets out a comprehensive and reasoned case for the re-zoning of this land into Built Up Area (see attached).	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP797	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Neither	Longueville Nurseries, New York Lane, St. Saviour Re-Zone Retail Site for Category A Housing	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper and to the proposal to re-zone half of the above site for Category A Housing. This submission supports the Planning Minister's proposal to re-zone half the site (Policy H2 (4)), for Category A Housing but also advises re-zoning of the remainder of the site to the north for the same purpose to ensure the efficient use of already developed land. The increase in the number of new dwellings that can be provided will help to satisfy the serious shortfall of Category A Housing in the Island and on what is a sustainable site given its location on the edge of the Main Urban Settlement, and its proximity to local shops and services. We are therefore suggesting the removal of the proposal to return of half the site to pasture or woodland to enable much needed Category A Housing which would also enable the remediation of previous development on the site which has included the in-filling of this brownfield site with demolition material. I understand this case will be referred to the Independent Inspector and	Support for zoning Longueville Nurseries for Category A housing purposes noted. Extending the development site north, rejected.	The Plan highlighted a need for 1000 category A homes, the majority of which are planned to be developed within the existing built up areas. A small number of sites (7) were identified to provide around 200 family style Category A homes that could not easily be provided within the built up areas. These 7 sites were selected because they met with strict planning selection criteria including; that they fitted well within the existing built up area and met with the revised spatial strategy policies for the island, did not cause any significant visual or environmental harm, were near good transport network/bus routes/schools/shops and, where possible, were brownfield sites. This site met with all of these criteria and was also highlighted	Minister minded to remove this site from the Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								we will be given the opportunity to make representations at his Examination in Public, Please advise me when this is likely to take place and whether we will be able to make our representations to the Inspector in person.		in the 2002 Island Plan as a future category A housing site. The removal of this site will reduce the supply of category A family homes and alternative provision will need to be found in order to ensure adequate overall supply of these types of homes on the Island is met. However, as this site is not supported by the Constable of St. Saviour, and the Minister for Planning & Environment has given an undertaking that any site not supported by the relevant Parish will be withdrawn from the draft Plan, this site has been withdrawn.	
DP798	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	CTV Site, La Pouquelaye, St Helier Maintain site as part of the Built-Up Area	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper and to the proposal to maintain the CTV site within the Built-Up Area. Because, the character of the site is dominated by the existing commercial building, car parking and forms part of a continuous area of developed land that spreads out from central SI. Helier it is entirely appropriate that the site should be maintained within the Built-Up Area. I understand this case will be referred to the Independent Inspector and we will be given the opportunity to make representations at his Examination in Public. Please advise me when this is likely to take place and whether we will be able to make our representations to the Inspector in person.	Noted and supported	The site is zoned as built up area under the revised draft proposals map and will be subject to the new affordable housing policy (H3).	Noted by Minister
DP799		Mr Chris Sampson	States of Jersey Transport & Technical Services	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Zoning of La Collette Area. The Planning Zones shown for La Collette in the Draft Island Plan do not reflect our plans for the current or future uses of the site and do not fully account for safety restrictions imposed post Buncefield . Further information to follow. See attached letter		Accept	On the grounds of potential risk from adjacent land uses, represented by the revised safety zones at La Collette (Policy NR5), there is likely to be a restriction on general public access to this area. On this basis, the use of the land here for a publically accessible area of open space is not viable on safety grounds. The land can continue to serve, however, as a visual green buffer to the industrial uses and built forms at La Collette, and remain to be protected as open space. There is a need to amend the draft Plan to state, at 7.53, 3rd bullet, that: 'La Collette 2 coastal park: the planning framework for	The Minister is minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										the use of land at the La Collette 2 reclamation facility envisages that provision of a significant area of open space at the completion of the reclamation activity. Whilst this space is unlikely to be publicly accessible, on account of its location within the safety zones for adjacent hazardous installations, it will provide an important visual buffer and screen to the industrial uses and buildings at La Collette 2.'	
DP800		Managing Director Carlo Riva Riva Architects Ltd		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Re-zone land forming part of the Countryside Zone and identified as H3-10 in the 2002 Island Plan, and which is proposed to become Green Zone in the Draft 2009 Island Plan into a Category A Housing Site.	PARTICULARS ASSOCIATED WITH FIELDS 888 +890 Areas The two fields are not commercially used for agriculture. They ceased being cultivated approximately 15 years ago. The topography of the fields are generally level. There is no reason to assume that there should be any land contamination issues. The verges and vegetation which currently enclose the fields make a positive contribution to their character and should be sought to be retained and enhanced. Such measures would increase environmental connectivity and ensure the presence of historical continuity to the site. Field888 - approximately 2,790m' (1 .55 verges) Field 890- approximately 2,016m' (1.12 verges) Approximate Total 4,806m' (1.19 acres 2.67 verges) Densities on such out of town sites can vary between 10-15 dwellings per acre. Hence the development yield could be: 12-17 units The Planning Department records suggest a potential yield of 17 homes, however, the enclosed sketch proposals illustrate a potential yield of 14 N° 3 bedroom dwellings. Given the site constraints and increased housing standards, this appears a more realistic figure. All mains services are available. Field 890 may currently be accessed through the adjoining property to its West (Mon Desir). which itself is accessed through St Peters Ironworks. This is not ideal for redevelopment purposes. and so access would be through Field 888. which has a direct, single vehicular access to La Rue Cappelain. Adequate visibility splays may be achieved onto this Parish road, although improvements may be gained by agreement with the owners of the property to the North (Villa Elmar). Site Context - The area around La Rue Cappelain has experienced a tangible amount Built-Environment of development during the	Reject	The proposed site is undeveloped and therefore does not meet the revised spatial strategy of the 2009 plan and the Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. A sufficient supply of category A homes has been identified by the draft plan from brownfield sites.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>course of the current Island Plan, as sites become consolidated and redeveloped. No disenable architectural character could be described as typifying the area, although recent developments tend to be steering the area towards a 'contemporary' interpretation of traditional forms using traditional materials. The recently approved proposals for the Avis Headquarters site to the North of Field 888 is certainly an example of this form of development. Public Consultation It is understood that 'informal' support has been obtained from the Parish of St Peter Connétable regarding the proposed redevelopment of the fields in question. The owners of certain neighbouring properties/premises around the fields have also expressed their support for the development proposals. Northern boundary. This is marked along its entire length, by the 'Avis Headquarters' site, the owners of which are potential development partners to the site in question. Western boundary. This boundary is delineated by two properties ' Alfriston Lodge' and 'Mon Desir', the property owned by the proprietors of Field 890. Southern boundary. Field 890 bounds with parts of Fields 891 and 892. Eastern boundary. The rear gardens to three dwellings mark this boundary. Development Programme It would be advantageous to the neighbouring environment to consider the development of Fields 888 and 890, and the redevelopment of the 'Avis Headquarters' site as an entirety. The benefits would be to reduce the extent of the development period, and to reduce development costs. CASE FOR RE-ZONING H3 Sites Both H3 and H4 sites were zoned as potential 'Need' housing developments for the second half of the duration of the 2002 Island Plan. Subject to the identification of the Island's housing requirements, such sites would be carefully assessed to determine the contribution they might be able to make in reducing the housing need shortfall. While the majority of the sites designated by the 2002 Island Plan have been successfully developed in recent years, this is not the case for all. As the September 2009 (Draft) Jersey Island Plan clearly indicates, there is a need to provide new homes. In fact the document suggests 4,000 over its 10-year validity period . Notwithstanding, the comment made in Clause</p>			

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>6.33 of the Draft 2009 Plan document, it is contended that the H3-10 does have a material contribution to make in meeting Island-wide housing needs. This proposal further challenges the statement made in Clause 6.76 that: 'These (H3 & H4 sites) have all been systematically evaluated to determine those that could help appropriately meet the Island' identified housing need'. The proposed Spatial Strategy as defined in the Draft 2009 Island Plan Strategy is clearly ambitious, as it 'seeks to concentrate new development over the Plan period in the Island's Built-Up Area, and particularly St Helier, is dependant upon the release of land and the realisation of development opportunities in the Island's urban areas'. Clause 6.58 goes on to suggest that there are risks associated with meeting this objective, for as Clause 6.81 confirms 'that unless higher density development yields are generally realised on all development sites.....it will not be possible to meet all the identified needs for housing without zoning additional housing sites'. We contend that Fields 888 and 890 may help make a small contribution to reducing the Spatial Strategy gamble. Parish Vibrancy Although the Draft 2009 Plan does not recognise the Parish of St Peter as being a village settlement in need of extra dwellings to increase its vibrancy, the Parish itself has expressed some support of the proposed redevelopment of Fields 888 and 890. The positive contribution that the development of up to 14 dwellings to the parish community should not be underestimated. Travel The proposed site lies in close proximity to one of the Island's main bus routes. It further benefits from good vehicular 'permeability' in that it has a variety of options of road links to Town, Red Houses and other parts of the Islands. QUALITY OF DEVELOPMENT Efficient Site Even the most cursory of site assessments confirms that the fields may be efficiently developed in a manner which maximises yield to communal circulation areas. The proposed dwellings may also be accessed in such a way that the private amenity areas will benefit from good, sunny aspects. Mitigation measures will need to be introduced to minimise the impact of the development onto adjoining properties to the East. This will need to guide site layout and the proposed landscaping designs. There is no</p>			

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>reason to assume that this would not be successful however. Design Precedent The proximity and the extent of the proposed 'Avis Headquarters' site will clearly serve as a potential design generator for the development of Fields 888 and 890. The quality of this site is implicit in the fact that it received a planning consent under the terms of current Planning Policy and Guidance. SERVICE CHECKS All service checks associated with the site have been carried out. The service providers have been notified of the potential housing yield on the site and have responded accordingly. Jersey Telecoms On 15 February 2010, Jersey Telecoms commented as follows: '... At this present moment in time we do not foresee any abnormal circumstances to accommodate your proposed development....' Transport & On 9 February 2010, Transport & Technical Services Department Technical Services commented as follows: 'A public foul sewer is available in La Rue Cappelain to the North West that has the capacity for the increase in flow from the proposals'. It is acknowledged that a communal pumping chamber may be required to serve the proposed development. Surface water will need to be disposed of within the site by the use of permeable paving and soakaways'. Jersey Water 9 February 2010, Jersey Water commented as follows: Jersey Water has an 8 cast iron water main in La Rue de Cappelain, running past the proposed entrance to the site. This will be more than sufficient to supply the development.. .'. CONCLUSION The above and enclosures have endeavoured to establish the case in support for the re-zoning of fields 888 and 890. The Need for family Category A Housing is clearly advocated in the States Strategic Plan 2009 - 2014. There is no current economic value to the site. The proposed redevelopment plans have been given good parochial and adjacent neighbour support. The development design could potentially contribute positively to the character of the area and help to clearly delineate the difference between the built up and adjoining rural areas. In essence. it is suggested that the development of this site will contribute to the greater Island community, and as such the proposal to re-zone should be supported.</p>			
DP801	Mr	Mr	MSPlann	Map .1	Proposals	Objecting	Mont Matlhieu (Land at), Le Mont Matlhieu, St	Notwithstanding that the above site is zoned	Reject	The Countryside Character	The Minister is

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
	Michael Stein	Michael Stein	ing Ltd		Map		Ouen Case to Re-Zone into Built Up Area to enable Residential Development	as Green Zone on the Draft Proposals Map, the attached submission sets out a reasoned case why it would be reasonable and appropriate to re-zone the site as Built Up Area so that it creates an opportunity to provide new Category B Housing to help satisfy the demand for 4000 homes over the lifespan of the new Island Plan. I would therefore be grateful if you would refer this case to the Independent Inspector for consideration at his Examination in Public, This case seeks to have the area of established wasteland to the east of the existing cluster of development (see location map and aerial photo in Appendix 1) on the brow of Mont Matthieu re-zoned from Green Zone to Built Up Area to provide an appropriate opportunity for residential development that will help to meet the much publicised shortfall of both Category A and Category B Housing in the island. The site has been vacant wasteland for a number of decades, seemingly having been a residual piece of land left over after the development of the residential development to the west that occurred in the 1960s. As it is serviced by some tracks (probably left over from the development of the land to the south - see photos in Appendix 2) it has been used for various unauthorised uses, including the parking of vehicles for the existing dwellings to the south west, unauthorised vehicle dumping and, even more concerning, there is evidence of the land being used for fly tipping. Although the owner has made repeated attempts to keep the land clear of all these unauthorised uses or activities, she has been unable to control this. Additional to this, there are parts of the land which have been overtaken by invasive brambles and bracken and which provide little or no ecological value, or landscape value.		Appraisal's evaluation is that the overriding local character of the area is C3 St Ouen's Bay Escarpment. The Appraisals' assessment of this area is that it is distinctive and provides the backdrop to wide St Ouen's coastal plain below, furthermore this is a very highly sensitive area and any development here is likely to have an adverse impact over a large area of the bay below. Therefore application of the Policy regime imposed Policy NE6, Coastal National Park is considered to be appropriate for determining development proposals given the character of the area. Development of the site fails the spatial strategy sets out the principle of preventing the further loss of greenfield land to development, and the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary into the countryside.	not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP803	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Villa Devereux, La Route Orange, St Brelade Re-Zone Land into Built Up Area	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper in connection with the above site which (together with adjoining existing development) I consider justifies being re-zoned into Built Up Area (as a natural extension to the existing Urban Settlement), as presently the site is zoned as Countryside Zone (or as Green Zone in the White Paper) which precludes any new residential development taking place. I would refer you and the Inspector to the Planning Statement I submitted to you on 24th November and	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. In addition the northern boundary of the site forms one of the last remaining	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								which sets out a comprehensive and reasoned case for the re-zoning of this land into Built Up Area. Basically, this represents a missed opportunity to provide additional residential development on infill sites such as this which may, because of site characteristics, be capable of accommodating more development without being harmful to the character of the area. Alternatively, the new Green Zone Policy needs to be re-drafted to enable such sites to be developed, as an exception to the presumption against development, to enable the provision of much needed Category B Housing.		gaps in the built environment along La Route de Orange. Development of this gap would be detrimental to the character of the local area.	
DP807		Mr Jeremy Harris		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 525, St. John - Field 525 was identified in the 2002 Island Plan as a 'site for further consideration for Category A Housing', and a copy of the relevant paragraph is given below (my emphasis)- Field 525, La Rue de la Mare Ballam , St. John 8.124. Field 525 is a large flat field of 1.9 acres (4.3 vergées) in arable use on the south side of St John 's Village. There is a modern housing development on the north side of the site and a boundary of mature trees on the south side. The site could provide approximately 14 homes as well as land (0.8 acres) for an extension to facilities at St John 's Primary School. A pedestrian route could be achieved through the school site and thereby to other village shops and services. Access for vehicles would be from La Rue de la Mare Ballam.' In late 2007 the ESC Department was invited to comment on a proposal that at least part of this field should be used 'to enable the expansion of educational facilities' at St. John 's School. Field 525 was being discussed at that time in the context of a proposal to sell off the Recreation Ground at St. John and to use the proceeds for the creation of similar facilities closer to the village centre. The matter was discussed with the head teacher at St. John's School, and a letter was subsequently sent by the ESC Minister to the Planning Minister which set out the department's position (copy attached as Appendix Four). St. John 's School has again been contacted by the ESC Department (in February 2010) as a consequence of the current public consultation on the draft Island Plan, and it has confirmed that it would strongly support the retention Field 525 , St. John, in the new Island Plan , i.e., on the basis that at least part of the field should be retained for educational purposes, e.g. for a playing field and/or for additional parking/dropping off space. The ESC Department also supports the view that		Noted, and minded to accept proposal to safeguard western part of the site for school playing field, where the evidence of need can be demonstrated. Not minded to accept proposal to safeguard land for the purposes of facilitating car-borne access to the site and parking.	It is incumbent upon the Minister for ESC to demonstrate evidence of need for provision of school playing field facilities. The following has been submitted: The school currently uses the playing fields at St. John's Recreation Ground, which are situated about half a mile from the premises, and students have to walk along a busy main road to get there. This road has no pavement and is therefore considered unsuitable for the younger age range, and as a result the pupils in the Reception class and Years 1 and 2 do not have access to playing fields . If a playing field were to be provided on Field 525, it is recommended that such a facility should have a minimum area of 2,500 square metres so as to meet the U.K. statutory requirements for 5-11 primary schools. Provision of additional facilities for car parking and access arrangements is not justifiable and acceptable in the Green Zone on the basis of facilitating car use and the potential adverse impact on the countryside.	The Minister is minded to accept proposal to safeguard western part (up to 2,500 sqm) of F.525 for educational purposes to enable the provision of school playing field facilities and would be minded to support an amendment of the Plan. The Minister is not minded to accept proposal to safeguard land for the purposes of facilitating car-borne access to the site and additional car parking.

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							part of Field 525 should be designated for educational/ community purposes. Taking into account the location of the school and playground, it would be more appropriate if the western part of the field were designated for this purpose, as this would be adjacent to the school premises.				
DP854		J.S Carney		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Garden of Cliff house to be removed from built up area and placed in green backdrop or green zone.	We write to you on behalf of the beneficial owners of Dolphin Cottage and The Porthole Guest House Hotel in the immediate vicinity of the above mentioned site/garden, your file reference P/2006/1103. We submit that the proposed ongoing 'White Zoning' of this part of the land under The (Draft) Jersey island Plan, September, 2009 is flawed and incorrect. We enclose a site plan in order to be absolutely clear as to the parameters of land at issue. We make this assertion upon the basis that 3 previous Planning (1 excellent architectural/engineering design and so on) application to build a detached unit upon the site have all been rejected latterly under Policy G2 of (i, ii, iv & vi), General Development considerations G3 (i, ii & iv), Quality of Design H8 (ii, iii, iv, vii & viii), Housing Development Within a Built Up Area and BE9 Conservation Areas of Jersey Island Plan 2002. Furthermore, the site is narrow and steeply sloping closely surrounded by other buildings, and only accessible for construction, and thereafter by a narrow lane with buildings close to its edge, many of them of considerable age. Due to the narrowness and steep grading to the site, there is no space on site for storage of materials and equipment during the construction. The site is also within a Potential Conservation area, and a Tourist Destination Area, reflecting the historic character and importance of the Island's recreational tourism and facilities. This site forms part of the elevated green backdrop area of St. Aubins behind the Bulwarks. Any construction being considered therefore, would need to be of such a scale and volume that the materials to be excavated and the length of disruptive construction process would have an unreasonably harmful impact upon amenities and residents, and the character of the area as a whole. The last development proposal therefore had been deemed to fail to satisfy the Department's Policy G2, (i, ii, vii, viii & x) , General Development Considerations HB, (ii, iii & iv) , Housing Development Within a Built Up	Reject	The site is, as stated, "surrounded on all four sides" and clearly forms part of St Aubin's village urban area. It is therefore designated built up area. Development applications are concerned upon there merits, inappropriate proposals which do not satisfy plan policies will be refused permission.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>Area and BE9 Conservation Areas of Jersey Island Plan 2002. The fact of the matter is that the site comprises geotechnically/historically an unstable hillside. The site is surrounded on all four sides by existing houses of mainly vernacular traditional architectural type size and appearance, which would be very sensitive to any vibration caused by excavation, underpinning or large scale groundworks, piling , and construction and so on. In order to be financially viable, any Unit upon the site has to be of a certain size , which is so large as to necessitate substantial excavation into the hillside, creating problems with access, protection of neighbouring properties, the road , removal of spoil and so on.</p> <p>Furthermore, the one way narrow access 7.5 tonne weight restricted road is steeply sloping , has no pavement at present, and any ingress/egress to the site presents several almost insurmountable vehicular/pedestrian safety problems. We would therefore seek a more sympathetic Zoning of this particular area of land which has been the subject of considerable concern and debate to the residents of St. Aubin recently and for many years during the consideration of the above mentioned Application, which fully tested the various parameters of the site, and was found to be unacceptable. Finally, should any aspect whatsoever herein require more detailed verification please do not hesitate to telephone our office in the first instance any weekday morning, since we tend to be on site with clients in the afternoon.</p>			
DP855		Advocate Nigel Weston		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	High Gorse , Field 1534, Tower Road, St Helier	<p>I am writing in relation to the above-mentioned site, in response to the current consultation on the Draft Jersey Island Plan. I also refer to and rely on my letter and enclosures of 8 November 2008 to Senator Freddie Cohen (the "Proposal"), which included a full description of the site and its location. Also included were certain maps and diagrams, and a range of photographs from the air and various vantage points inside and outside the site. Copies were provided to the Minister and the Planning & Environment Department both at the time of writing and subsequently, but please let me know if any further copies are required. The Draft Island Plan gives rise to two major issues in relation to the site. These are as follows:- I. it proposes re-zoning an important part of the site from</p>	Reject	<p>The site has been included within the green zone in accordance with the Minister's criteria for protecting open spaces and green fields. This includes restricting the extension of the built-up area boundary, into open fields and the countryside to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. In defining the extent of the Built up area boundary, consideration is given to development that has taken place. Not to land that is, or at any time in the past intended to be built upon. In this instance defining and extent of the built up area is highly apparent. There</p>	<p>The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan</p>

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								white zone to green zone; and 2. it does not accommodate the application set out in the Proposal. For the purposes of the consultation process, kindly regard this letter as my formal objection to each of these. Both are dealt with in more detail below.		is a clear distinction between the developed land west of Field 1534, and the undeveloped land to the east. This includes the northern part of Field 1534. All proposals put forward before the adoption of the Draft 2009 Plan will be determined, duly and fairly, in accordance with the policies and principles of the 2002 Plan. The impact of planning policy on the value of the land is not a material consideration.	
DP866		Mrs Jennifer Holley		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	I write again on behalf of a large group of residents asking that field 641 be rezoned from Built-Up Area in the draft Island Plan to Green Zone. Since my letter to you of 16 November 2009 the last proposal for development of the field (P/2009/1421) was rejected by the Planning Applications Panel on 15 December 2009 with this decision confirmed by the Panel on 28 January 2010. The reason given for refusal of permission was as follows: "The proposed development would, by virtue of the introduction of a dwelling into an open and undeveloped parcel of land, result in the loss of prominent open land and would unreasonably affect 'the character and amenity of the area and unreasonably impact on the local environment by reason of visual intrusion, contrary to the provisions of Policies G2(i) G2(ii) and H8(ii) of the Jersey Island Plan, 2002. " We are grateful for this decision and believe that it gives a strong indication in favour of the rezoning of field 641. My last letter included signatures of 107 residents, mainly from neighbouring households, in support of the request for the field to be included in the Green Zone. Since then, wider support has been gained from another 142 individuals, whose signatures, names and addresses appear on the enclosed 13 pages of petition to the Minister for Planning and the Environment. Please add these documents to our previous representations to the Minister. We ask that a rezoning amendment to the draft Island Plan be recommended to the inspector appointed under the Planning and Building (Island Plan) (Jersey) Order 2009. Our group would be pleased to send one or more representatives to a hearing arranged by the inspector should further explanation be required.		Minded to not amend the established boundary of the Built Up Area.	The site in question was zoned by the 2002 Island Plan as part of the St Peters village Built Up area. The thick hedgerow along the western boundary of the site provides a clear distinction between the Countryside Character Appraisals' evaluation of the land as forming part of the villages the built up area, not as part of interior agricultural land of the Western Plateau beyond this boundary. The site fits the spatial strategy preference for locating development within the built up area and not in open countryside and therefore minded to not amend the boundary of the established built up area.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP888		Mr John Way		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	1. My dwelling La Maison du Long champ, La Route du Petit Port, St Brelade is currently in the Built Up Area. The building attached to the east of		Reject Built Up Area boundary	1 and 2: Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							Maison du Long champ, which is the cottage was understood to be in the BUA too, however on the boundary of the Countryside Zone. On the proposals it is shown in the Countryside or new Green Zone?. For clarity, could this be changed to the Built Up Area? 2. The large building to the south of the cottage is currently in the countryside zone. Would this be able to be considered to go into the Built Up Area? It borders the road known as La Route du Petit Port and is west of our pond in field 398. This addition would be a sensible and continues addition to the Built Up Area. 3. The land directly to the north of La Maison du Long camp is Countryside Zone, currently going into the Green Zone. I would appreciate these boundaries being maintained as proposed as their is currently no outbuildings on this piece of land and I feel it would be a detrimental impact on La Maison du Long champ and other properties, should this piece of land be changed into the Built Up Area. The land in question is field B398, the most westerly part, bordering the boundary of Ocean View, Petit Port Close, owned by Mr and Mrs Alain Pinglaux.		extensions. Support for retaining Field 398 as Green Zone noted.	criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. 3: Green Zone boundary support noted	Plan
DP890		James Ransom	Longueville Garden Centre	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	I am writing to you with reference to the proposed rezoning of Longueville Garden Centre. My name is James Ransom and I currently lease the garden centre off Mr. Hamon with the hope to buy it. I have offered Mr. Hamon (over the past 2 years or so) 3 offers to purchase the property to continue as a garden centre business. The last cash offer I had offered Mr. Hamon was 20% higher than the highest valuation I had carried out on the centre. I would like to object to the proposed planning rezoning of Longueville Garden Centre on the following grounds. Access on peak traffic times will be a hazard to say the very least. With 10-15 houses (I understand there is a push to get 20+) could mean an extra 30 to 40 cars trying to leave and return at peak times. The road is packed enough and onto a very busy road by a trading estate. It would also be not viable to have then exit or enter from Rue Messervy this will be far too much traffic for the small lane. This is a perfectly viable business and I would be unable to start one in just any site. As above I have offered cash at more than market price. The traffic flow is far less on the site at the peak times than it would be as an estate. St Saviour parish is grossly under pressure with a number of far more viable redundant sites proposed for development like the milk marketing board; Mr. Carters proposed field development and the proposed revamping of		Objection noted	The Plan highlighted a need for 1000 category A homes, the majority of which are planned to be developed within the existing built up areas. A small number of sites (7) were identified to provide around 200 family style Category A homes that could not easily be provided within the built up areas. These 7 sites were selected because they met with strict planning selection criteria including; that they fitted well within the existing built up area and met with the revised spatial strategy policies for the island, did not cause any significant visual or environmental harm, were near good transport network/bus routes/schools/shops and, where possible, were brownfield sites. This site met with all of these criteria and was also highlighted in the 2002 Island Plan as a future category A housing site. The removal of this site will reduce the supply of category A family homes and alternative provision	Minister minded to support request to remove site from Plan.

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							Les Cinqs Chenes estate.			will need to be found in order to ensure adequate overall supply of these types of homes on the Island is met. However, this site is not supported by the Parish of St. Saviour and the Minister for Planning & Environment has given an undertaking that any site not supported by the relevant Parish will be withdrawn from the draft Plan. Accordingly this site has been withdrawn and so the request to remove this site is therefore supported by the Minister.	
DP892		Susan Brown		Map .1	Proposals Map	Supporting	<p>SUBMISSION TO ISLAND PLAN CONSULTATION PROCESS IN RESPECT OF FIELD 263A I write on behalf of a group of five families who live in homes next to field 263A. In the last five years we have made previous submissions regarding this field which will be on file. As part of the new Island Plan consultation process we wish to make a submission urging the retention of this piece of land's current designation of Important Open Space.</p>	<p>There is a history of protection of this land from development dating back to the 1982. In that year the States' Assembly rejected a proposal to rezone the land for housing. A similar proposal in 1989 was withdrawn prior to debate. In 1987 the Island Plan designated the land part of the Sensitive Landscape Area in the restricted zone. This protected status was further upheld by a Planning Committee decision to refuse planning permission for a single dwelling in 1994. Finally in 2002 the Island Plan gave the land the protected status of Important Open Space which carries the highest presumption against development and should not be dispensed with other than for truly exceptional reasons. In 2004 the field's owner Mr McCarthy submitted a further planning application, at the invitation of the Committee. Permission was eventually refused by your decision as Minister in 2006. That decision resulted in Mr McCarthy appealing to the Royal Court and I have enclosed the written judgement of the case, dated March 2007. The Royal Court upheld the decision to deny planning permission and the judgement makes several points which are relevant to the current situation. In its introduction to the case the Royal Court judgement notes that "During negotiations with the Planning Department....the appellant offered to relinquish part of it (the field) for the use of the school if he were granted development permission for housing on the remaining part." In engaging in such negotiations, the judgement states "The procedures adopted by the Committee left a great deal to be desired. It confused its planning function with its desire to assist the acquisition of land for the benefit</p>	<p>Support for zoning Field 263a as Protected Open Space noted, however minded to amend the draft Plan, at SCO1 and the Proposals Map, to support the further safeguarding of land for educational purposes of part of Field 263a, where there is justifiable evidence of need.</p>	<p>The support for zoning Field 263A, Grouville as Protected Open Space is noted. Nevertheless the department is minded to accept proposals put forward by the Education Sport and Culture department to safeguard land additional land for educational purposes, where the evidence of need can be demonstrated. This includes Field 263a for the use by Grouville School. The redevelopment of the southern part of the site for school play space is not considered to be objectionable on the basis that it represents another form of open space that has a greater community benefit provided that the requirement for additional open space at Grouville School can be justified, particularly when Field 263 has only recently been provided and when the school also has relatively extensive grounds and access to Field 304.</p>	<p>The Minister notes the support for zoning Field 263a as Protected Open Space, however the Minister is minded to amend the draft Plan, at SCO1 and the Proposals Map, to support the further safeguarding of land for educational purposes of part of Field 263a, where there is justifiable evidence of need.</p>

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>of Grouville school. This was not, as it erroneously determined, a "planning gain". It was not a planning consideration at all." (para 45) While the Royal Court was critical of the planning authorities it noted that "equally the appellant must bear some responsibility for making a suggestion which the Committee could not properly accept." (para 46) We are aware that Mr McCarthy has again been canvassing for support for this 'deal'. In its judgement the Royal Court reviewed the history of the field's protected status and noted that during 2002 the Property Services Department (then part of the Planning Department) began negotiations with Mr McCarthy for the acquisition of the whole field. This action was prompted by a Project brought to the States' Assembly by the Planning Committee in January 2002. (Project 188/2001, enclosed) The States' gave its approval for the purchase, compulsorily if necessary, of field 263A and its immediate neighbour field 263 for the future use of Grouville Primary School. That Project clearly made the case for acquiring the whole of both fields, stating that "this would take into account any possible future need for the school or changes in guidelines and is in accordance with good planning principles. The Committee believes that it would be short-sighted to rezone just the barest minimum space for the current number of pupils." The Project continued, "The Committee did consider an earlier suggestion to acquire only part of the two fields but rejected the notion because it would be a constraint on future development of the school for any reason. Too many of our schools already suffer in this respect." To imagine that this particular school will not need to expand in the medium-term seems implausible given the new housing developments already approved for this parish (with more to be considered) and the explicit policy drive to increase the island's overall population in the coming years. Grouville Primary School is bordered on three sides by existing buildings. Field 263A is the only piece of available land adjacent to the school which could accommodate its expansion. It would seem reckless at this time to jettison the existing policy of securing this land to meet the inevitable future needs of the school. Returning to the negotiations between the</p>			

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>Property Services Department and Mr McCarthy in 2002, the field was valued at £310,000. It is worth noting that the adjoining field 263 was compulsorily purchased for £25,000 having been valued as agricultural land. It was made possible for Mr McCarthy's much smaller field to achieve such an inflated valuation by the mechanism of a Planning Committee decision in July 2002 which, extraordinarily, was unminuted. (para 8 Royal court judgement) In the absence of Planning Committee minutes it was stated in the affidavit of a Planning Department official that the Committee had decided that the protected status of the land was only in place in order to secure it for possible future use of the school and that the field might have been classed as being part of the 'built-up area' and thus the owner might have had a legitimate expectation of development being allowed had the Important Open Space designation not been in place. The history of the land as noted earlier suggests that this is not the case; decisions to defend this land from development have been made consistently since 1982, irrespective of the school's needs. The inflated value of field 263A made compulsory purchase unaffordable and Mr McCarthy's 'offer' regarding the school's acquisition of the lower part of the field came into play. In June 2005 the Planning Committee lodged a Project to remove the Important Open Space designation of field 263A in order to retrospectively legitimise its ultra vires decision to grant 'in principle' development permission. The Project was defeated by a substantial majority in the States' Assembly on June 28 2005 and the Committee therefore had no choice but to refuse planning permission; that decision was subsequently upheld by yourself as Minister in 2006. The Royal Court judgement of March 2007 concluded "It is hard to avoid the immediate conclusion that the history of this application is not a model of how planning procedures should be conducted." (para 20) It judged that the behind the scenes agreements reached between the Committee and Mr McCarthy denied the right of public consultation and were "a parody of due process." (para 45) Finally, as reported in the Royal Court judgement, in your refusal to allow the building of two houses on this field you</p>			

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								found that "the resulting development would result in the loss of part of an area of Important Open Space and would unreasonably affect the character and amenity of the area." (Intro) This decision echoes the previous. Planning Committee decision of 1994 to refuse an application to build one house on the grounds that it would be "detrimental to the amenity of neighbours". It seems to us that the issue of loss of amenity has a history of being considered as a serious impediment to development and we trust that this consideration will continue to be respected. As a group of neighbours of the school and members of the Grouville community we are prepared to sacrifice some degree of our personal amenity for the benefit of our local school's future expansion. This is a world away from having that amenity taken away to allow one individual to profit from building two houses on a piece of land that has been consistently protected from development for the last twenty-eight years. In conclusion, we respectfully urge you as our elected representative to uphold the spirit of the 2002 Island Plan and its 1987 predecessor and maintain the protection against development of field 263A so that it remains a valued open space in our community and continues to be available for the future use of the local primary school. Yours sincerely Susan Brown On behalf of Jill and Mo Matthews Lynne Troy and Brian Troy James Silvester and Jackie George Eugene and Mandy O'Donnell John Hodge and Susan Brown			
DP897		Mr Mike Waddington		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 1341, St Helier-Island Plan Inclusion Having met with you and Deputy Duhamel and our client on 30.12.2009 and recent meeting on site, we would like to submit the inclusion of this site for consideration under the new Island Plan.	We think it could make excellent use of land currently not used, on the fringe of St Helier. Our proposal would be for an apartment scheme cut into the steeply sloping lower section of the site. This could provide: 1. Much needed residential accommodation without adversely affecting either agriculture or the green backdrop. 2. An opportunity to improve the green backdrop with a green roof balcony edged development and significant planting scheme of appropriate new trees. 3. A public walk/nature trail within the new copse. 4. Footpath to St Helier 5. A scheme that could set a new benchmark for environmental performance.	Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										the release of additional greenfield land. Development proposals to enhance the local environment and character of the area through appropriate landscaping and improved public access would be permitted under the policy regime imposed by Policy NE7.	
DP900		Mr Peter Troy	North Jersey Construction Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 155 Rue des Maltieres, Grouville This site is on the fringe of development at the rear of Grouville and is currently utilised as garden allotments . We suggest that the garden allotments , which are unsightly, could be relocated, and either housing or a hotel complex with conference facilities placed on the site.	We have never submitted plans for the site but have had discussions with the Chief Officer of Economic Development (Mike King) who has expressed support for a Hotel complex on the site, which would aid the tourism industry that has been in a state of decline for many years. The current Assistant Minister of Planning Deputy Duhamel has visited the site and recognises that it has potential, and of course we recognise that any development would have to proceed through the Planning process . We would be interested in an eco-friendly development cut into the site, which slope backwards to a quarry at the rear and would like to continue discussions in bringing forward development in the near future. Derek Mason, architect, has done some work with us on this site, the content of which now needs some revision, but we are keen to progress this site further. Attached is a location plan with the site highlighted.	Reject	The site is zoned as a 'Protected Open Space' and provides allotment space, a much sought after community use. Therefore the site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP901		Mr Peter Troy	North Jersey Construction Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 128 St. Clement and consenting neighbours Field 127 This site is at Samares St. Clement, and we own field 128 with the owners of field 127 having confirmed that they would consent to development of housing in a single development. Drawings for the site have previously been sent to Deputy Le Main by our architect Mr. Andrew Harvey, showing a SO/50 mix of sheltered housing and category B units.		Reject	Site does not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
DP903		Mr Peter Troy	North Jersey Construction Ltd	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 1027 Beaumont. St. Peter A new gyratory could progress through the edge of field 1027 providing a bus stop area and access to a housing development on F1027. Mr Derek Mason has previously completed drawings for a gyratory system and Mr Andrew Harvey has previously completed drawings for a SO/50 mix of sheltered housing and category B units.	Beaumont traffic junction carries a considerable amount of traffic from the west and has excessive pollution levels . In the past it has been suggested that a gyratory system be created to improve traffic flow into St. Helier and reduce pollution build up. The site is close to shops and bus routes .	Reject	<p>1. The principle of highway improvements to the Beaumont/ Route de la Haule junction is identified by Policy TT14. As stated in the plan, simply improving the capacity at the junction would not alleviate congestion as capacity is constrained by the density of housing, the numbers of entrances and junctions, and pedestrian crossings between the junction and Bel Royal. A road construction solution would, therefore, involve not just increased capacity at Beaumont, but increased capacity on the road system through to Victoria Avenue. In turn, the increasing capacity in this area would subsequently put more demand on junctions nearer St Helier and unless those other junctions could cope with the increased arrival rate of vehicles, improvements to Beaumont would be of little benefit. For this reason it is important to undertake a detailed cost benefit analysis of all the options available at Beaumont, including the construction of a new gyratory system. 2. With regards to developing the site for homes, the site does not meet the spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the redefinition and extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Plan identifies a sufficient supply of Category A homes and makes it clear that within the existing built up area boundary there is sufficient availability of land to supply the demand for Category B homes. Accordingly therefore, there are no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet</p>	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land.	
DP951		Deputy Philip Rondel	Parish of St John Working Party	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	The western part of Field 525 is allocated for a playing field for St John's School.		Noted, and minded to accept proposal to safeguard western part of the site for school playing field, where the evidence of need can be demonstrated. Not minded to accept proposal to safeguard land for the purposes of facilitating car-borne access to the site and parking.	It is incumbent upon the Minister for ESC to demonstrate evidence of need for provision of school playing field facilities. The following has been submitted: The school currently uses the playing fields at St. John's Recreation Ground, which are situated about half a mile from the premises, and students have to walk along a busy main road to get there. This road has no pavement and is therefore considered unsuitable for the younger age range, and as a result the pupils in the Reception class and Years 1 and 2 do not have access to playing fields. If a playing field were to be provided on Field 525, it is recommended that such a facility should have a minimum area of 2,500 square metres so as to meet the U.K. statutory requirements for 5-11 primary schools.	The Minister is minded to accept proposal to safeguard western part (up to 2,500 sqm) of F.525 for educational purposes to enable the provision of school playing field facilities and would be minded to support an amendment of the Plan.
DP952		Deputy Philip Rondel	Parish of St John Working Party	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	The car park and tennis courts to the north of the Recreation Centre field 674 - is currently designated in the DJIP 2009 as a Built Up Area. The Working Party supports its retention as a Built Up Area with a slight extension to accommodate an extension to the car park of the Recreation Centre and for a skate-board park.		Reject	The site occupies land zoned as 'Protected Open Space' within the 'Built Up Area'. Proposals for a skate park and an extension to the car park for users of the recreational facilities would not be restricted by these designations.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP953		Deputy Philip Rondel	Parish of St John Working Party	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	That field 224 is designated for allotments for the use of parishioners subject to confirmed demand and planning approval.		Reject	The site is detached from the built up area boundary. Whilst the difficulties of finding a site for development of this nature within the built up area boundary are recognised, proposals for allotments will only be permitted that are in accordance with Policy SCO6, Allotments.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP954		Deputy Philip Rondel	Parish of St John Working Party	Map .1	Proposals Map	Supporting	Fields 236 and 237 were designated as H3 and H4 "Site for Future Consideration for Category A Housing" and "Site Safeguarded for Future Category A Housing. The DJIP 2009 proposes that these two sites revert to the Green Zone and the Working Party supports this proposal.		Support noted		The Minister notes support
DP955		Deputy Philip	Parish of St John	Map .1	Proposals Map	Supporting	Fields 676 and 677 were designated as Important Open Space. The DJIP 2009 proposes that these		Support for the proposals		The Minister notes the support

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
		Rondel	Working Party				two fields revert to the Green Zone and the Working Party supports this proposal.		map zoning noted		for proposals map zoning
DP971		Mr N P E Le Gresley	N. P. E. LE GRESLEY solicitor	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Proposed development of glasshouse site at property known as Alsmeer, la Route de St. Martin, St Martin for housing development.	My mother's property, Alsmeer, St Martin was first established in greenhouses in 1956 and those greenhouses were fully utilised for the purposes of growing tomatoes, cucumbers and peppers by my late father Edgar Stanley Le Gresley until the late 1970s. Thereafter the greenhouses, having become somewhat past their sell by date, were utilised by Richard Le Cornu for the purposes of indoor potatoes. The Alsmeer greenhouses are now in a complete state of dilapidation and whilst my mother Nance Amy Le Gresley, nee Le Selleur has recently had the glass panes removed from the most northerly block of the glasshouse site the structures still stand. As mum still lives at Alsmeer and whilst we have discussed these issues as a family for some time, it was considered proper that no application should be made for any planning whatsoever until such time as mum felt that she was unable to continue to reside in Alsmeer bungalow. Having reached the age of 89 years she happily continues to wish to reside in the bungalow and that is the reason that reference so far has not been made to your department in relation to any potential development of the site. Having seen the recent publications in the Jersey Evening Post mum has asked me to contact you to establish what steps should be taken on behalf of the family generally if any form of development on the Alsmeer site is to be permitted. It is not wished by any of us that any large scale of development would be implemented but rather a realistic number of residential units providing substantial garden areas with appropriate landscaping. The site measures approximately five verges and, having noted other similar developments on similar sites over the last decade or so, we would have thought that appropriate densities would, in the event of any consent being granted, suit somewhere between eight and twelve dwellings on the site. As I have said we do not wish to do anything until such time as my mother feels unable to continue living at Alsmeer but equally, and as a family, do not wish to suffer prejudice by virtue of the fact that we have not pressed this site for development in the past and would not so have done but for the recent publication of the proposals of the Island Plan disclosed in the	Reject	The Spatial Strategy states that there is a strong desire to protect the Island's countryside and prevent the further loss of greenfield land to development. This includes the redefinition, and extension of the built-up area boundary into the countryside to provide smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. In addition the plan makes it clear that there is sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area, therefore there is no need to release additional greenfield land for development. Any development proposals put forward within in this location need to be considered in relation to their potential impact upon the character of the area. The application of the policy regime imposed by Policy NE7 is considered to be appropriate given the Countryside Character Appraisal evaluation of the area as 'Interior Agricultural Land'. Whilst there is a presumption against the redevelopment of redundant and derelict glasshouses for other uses unrelated to agriculture; in exceptional circumstances, Policy ERE7, Derelict and Redundant Glasshouses, permits minimal non-agricultural development in order to ensure demonstrable environmental improvement of the site by the removal of the glasshouses and any contaminated material, the reduction in the area of buildings, and the repair to the landscape.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								Evening Post.			
DP979		Mr. Maurice DUBRAS		Map .1	Proposals Map	Supporting	Open Space In concluding my comments on what needs to be earnestly protected, I am focussing on the area in the immediate vicinity of Magnolia Gardens. Indeed, I note the proposal to zone the four plots of land within this private development as IOS. As Chairman of the Group of Owners, I suspect it will be greeted with support but I have to confirm this at the next meeting of Owners. Around us, it is noted that the open space adjacent to St. Matthews Church is likewise to be protected.		Support for the proposals map zoning noted.		Support is noted by the Minister
DP981		Mrs Maureen Symes		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Fields 228, 230/230A, 613 & 616 in the Parish of St. John to be rezoned for housing & Public Hall (field 613)	We have been advised by Mr Butcher, the Constable of St. John that he would like part of field 230/230A to be used, initially, for the refectory of 15 semi-detached homes for 'First time buyers'. Furthermore my husband and I are both now over seventy years of age and wish to move from our present property, which is too large, and downsize to one more suitable for an elderly couple, which could be situated at the North end of the field. We also believe that another field, 613, has excellent potential for the construction of a rentable multi-purpose hall, with restaurant facilities and external car parking, to be used for indoor sports of various sorts, theatrical, choral and orchestral facilities, exhibitions etc. This would provide the Parish and the Island with facilities which are not available with the present Parish Hall.	Reject	The proposed sites do not comply with spatial strategy and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for incremental development opportunities. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land. Policy H5 (housing in rural areas) supports the provision of new housing as part of village plan proposals put forward by the constable and this is the policy where such housing sites may be considered in the future, provided they are required to support the vitality of the village.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP1188		Mr Graham Bisson		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 200, Rue du Vieux Menage, St Saviour	This small field is exactly half an acre in size and is the residue of Field 200 upon which the bungalow now called L'Esperance, our home, now stands . We understand that originally the bungalow was a farm workers cottage probably built in the late 40's, since when it has been extensively enlarged and modernized. The dwelling is connected to mains services. (Foul drainage is by a pumped system to the mains sewer to the east.) There is an existing tar macadam drive leading from the public road, Rue du Vieux Menage, which runs alongside Field 200 on the south side to give access to L'Esperance	Reject	Site has a low 'spatial strategy' suitability, as the site constitutes previously undeveloped land outside the built up area and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Countryside Character Appraisal's evaluation	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								at the top of this site. The field is used for the occasional grazing of a few neighboring cows, for no financial reward. It is of no other agricultural or horticultural value as it is too small for the economic growing of crops. Field 107 to the north is in public ownership having been purchased by compulsory purchase some years ago. Fields 159 and 160 to the south and the east are in private ownership and include some aged glass and very old agricultural buildings. The undeveloped part of Field 200 would be very suitable for the development of two or three single storey dwellings, (bungalows). We have a foster daughter and two married daughters of our own, each with one child, and we would like to provide each of them with a home on this site. In turn they would each be able to vacate the houses they now occupy which in turn would help the overall housing shortage. The existing driveway would provide access to any new dwellings and avoid the need to open a new entrance into a public highway. It is anticipated that mains services will be achieved by extending the existing provisions via L'Esperance. Alternatively there is a new mains sewer to the west of this site. The impact upon the "countryside" of such a development would be minimal and the new dwellings would only present a single visual frontage to Rue du Vieux Menage, as does the existing building, L'Esperance. I would therefore ask that serious consideration be given to the rezoning of this site in order that it may be included in the proposed Draft Island Plan when it is approved.		is that the site forms part of the Eastern Plateau, Interior Agricultural land, E7 the landscape sensitivity of this area is high. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land. The draft Plan's Green Zone designation remains consistent with the 2002 Island Plan designation. Designating this built up area would contradict the established policy.	
DP118 9		Mr Graham Bisson		Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	Field 1519, La Rue de la Ville au Neveu, St Ouen	This very small site is the residue of Field 1519 and is approximately one seventh of an acre. It is of no agricultural or horticultural value whatsoever being very awkward in shape and contours. I have retained ownership of this land for the last thirty nine	Reject	Site has a low 'spatial strategy' suitability, as the site constitutes previously undeveloped land outside the built up area and does not meet with planning Minister's criteria	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								years in the hope of putting the land to better use. This piece of land has two granite pillars bordering the road providing an entrance into the site which rises sharply from the roadway . Field 1519A below this site is at a lower level, in fact road level, includes sheds and other smallholding structures and activities and equestrian facilities .There are main services in the road adjacent to this site. This site is centrally located in a "hamlet" of dwellings and commercial uses with a pleasant, established settlement feel with a mini village green and attractive mature trees and planting . Please see location plan showing number of adjoining properties. It is evident that the Draft Island Plan as published will not adequately meet the housing needs of this Island in the near or distant future. It is also obvious that this very small fragment of land is not best utilized left vacant, but would provide a decent home in a very suitable and established rural settlement location . It can hardly be considered as "open land". With some excavation of the site, so as to be similar to that of the adjoining Field 1519A, a small dwelling would add to the harmony of the established hamlet feel in this situation and the only visual impact would be a different color on the planners zoning map. I would therefore ask that serious consideration be given to the rezoning of this site in order that it may be included in the proposed Draft Island Plan when it is approved.		for protecting green fields and open spaces. This includes the extension of the built-up area boundary, into the countryside, to allow for smaller-scale incremental development opportunities. The Countryside Character Appraisal's evaluation is that the site forms part of the North Coast, Interior Agricultural land, E4 the landscape sensitivity of this area is high. The suitability of this site for housing purposes is low given its location, sited well away from the established built up area in an area of poor accessibility. The Plan makes it clear that throughout the plan period, sufficient land is available for the provision of Category B homes within the existing built up area. There are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land. The draft Plan's Green Zone designation remains consistent with the 2002 Island Plan designation. Designating this built up area would contradict the established policy.	
DP119 5		Mr Mark Le Boutillie r	GR Langlois	Map .1	Proposals Map	Objecting	We would request that further consideration is given to including the Le Mourin Vineries site on the new Island plan for first time buyer housing.	Site Location/Current Use The site is located on the northern edge of Maufant village and is on a main bus route with a bus stop directly adjacent to the site. There is a footpath leading from the site to the existing Co-op Locale, hairdressers and Maufant youth centre which are all within 100 metres of the site. The majority of the site is	Reject	The site has been reviewed, and whilst it is adjacent to an existing built up area and does have good access to services and transport links, it is a relatively modern glasshouse site with a planning condition for their removal should they become in to disrepair or	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>currently built over with an existing farmhouse, outbuildings and glasshouses and is therefore considered a 'Brownfield' site. The site owners are tomato growers and it has been well publicised in the JEP that the tomato export industry as a whole has now ceased trading as the industry has basically become unviable (see attached). The site owners have other sites under glass and if Le Mourin were rezoned for housing they would continue supplying produce to local shops from their other glasshouses.</p> <p>Possible Scheme Design/Amenities An initial scheme has been drafted for discussion purposes consisting 98 x 2, 3 and 4 bedroom first time buyer homes and the renovation of the existing farm complex. The overall scheme is low density and loosely based on Jersey farm courtyard style properties. Also included in the scheme is a new Co-op Locale store with post office and chemist. We have been approached by Jim Hopley (chief executive) of the Co-op who is keen to promote the possible re-location of the Co-op Locale onto the Le Mourin site as part of any overall development. A new purpose built medical centre incorporating a doctor, dentist, chiropodist and chiropractor together with a 'character village pub' overlooking a large village green amenity space would be included. A village pub would be a useful amenity which could provide pub grub, be a meeting place for various clubs and could hold quiz nights etc. The communities at Five Oaks and St Martin's village to the north and south of Maufant village benefit from a local pub. This facility is absent at Maufant village. There is currently no meaningful amenity or play space in the Maufant village area and a large new village green would be a significant planning gain and provide a useful amenity space for use by occupiers of the new properties and existing residents in</p>		<p>disuse.</p> <p>The site had a major glasshouse extension to the existing glasshouses approved in 1997. The following condition was also attached to the permit:</p> <p><i>Should the glasshouses fall into disuse or disrepair they shall be removed from the site and the land restored to agricultural use.</i></p> <p>Discussions with the Planning & Environment Land Controls Officer have indicated that there are existing growers within the horticultural industry that are looking to rent or buy glasshouses and so until such a time that redundancy can be demonstrated they would not support the removal of this glasshouse development for alternative non agricultural uses.</p> <p>Should the redundancy be demonstrated however then it is expected that the disuse and disrepair condition would be applied, unless there was an exceptional case put forward to allow alternative uses of the site to be allowed, which may include the urgent need for additional Category A housing.</p> <p>However, sufficient land has been identified in the draft Plan for the provision of Category A homes and there are, therefore, considered to be no grounds to identify other sources of supply to meet housing needs, including the release of additional greenfield land by expanding the 'Built up Area'</p>	

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>Maufant village. Mains Services All mains drainage and services are available to service the site. Neighbours and Landscaping There would be extensive planting undertaken around the perimeter of the site and once established this would provide significant 'wildlife corridors' and obscure the majority of the new build ings from view from any of the adjacent lanes or the main road. There are no existing houses directly bordering the site so any impact to neighbouring properties would be minimal. Schools The primary school for the catchment area of the site is St Martin's primary school so the majority of school traffic would be in the opposite direction to town away from the main peak time congested areas. Information from the education department is that there would be adequate school provision at St Martin' s school for the development of the site from 20 IO. The frequent bus service runs directly from the site past a number of the secondary schools to town. Traffic and Transport The access to the site would be onto Chasse du Mourin which would be widened and extensively landscaped. The current poor junction with Chasse du Mourin and the main road (La Grande Route de St Martin) would be improved to create adequate visibility spay lines to comply with all the necessary safety requirements of the Transport and Technical services department The site is on a main bus route with a bus stop directly adjacent to the site. Currently the bus stops on the main road near a comer which obscures visibility and is quite dangerous. A bus lay-bye and shelter would be provided on the site aiding traffic flow and safety. The close proximity of existing and proposed new facilities would reduce the need for unnecessary car journeys. The site also has safe direct pedestrian access to the green lane network for walks and cycling etc.</p>		<p>boundary.</p> <p>It is recognised that this site has a number of attributes that raise the suitability of the site for the provision of Category A housing. Should the identified supply of Category homes not become available or the future demand for Category A homes require the reconsideration of sites put forward, the availability of this site for development together with its merits will be taken into consideration.</p>	

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>Demand in the Parish Some 18 months ago we undertook a survey to establish the level of demand specifically for first time buyers living within St Saviour, We received 194 replies from parishioners who required this type of housing 29 (1 5%) of which lived in States rental accommodation. Many expressed their total frustration and deep disappointment at the lack of availability of first time buyer homes.Demand for first time buyer homes has not diminished since our survey but mortgages for first time buyers have become more difficult to obtain, although this situation is now improving.</p> <p>General/Conclusion There is a significant number of first time buyers in St Saviour and throughout the Island who are in need of these homes. The development of this site would deliver first time buyer housing in a specifically designed scheme on a site identified on the 2002 Island plan for the purpose. The development has the advantage of being on the edge of an existing village and would offer existing residents in the Maufant village area significant community amenities and benefits. These new facilities together with an increased use of existing amenities by new residents would breathe new life into the village revitalising the area. We would request that the Le Mourin Vineries site be given serious consideration to be included on the new Island Plan as a site to be rezoned for first time buyer housing, Please find attached:- 1, Site location plan of the Maufant village area identifying the site. 2, Ariel photo of site showing the extent of the existing farm buildings and greenhouses. 3, Draft site plan of a proposed development 4, JEP cuttings.</p>			