

From: Michael Green [greenhouse1@jerseymail.co.uk]
Sent: 03 April 2006 11:33
To: Ian Clarkson
Subject: A scrutiny of the planning procedures .

Dear Ian ,

Thank you for responding to my email.

I believe it was Deputy Baudains who advised me to contact you

Over the past years I have been of the opinion that breeches of the planning regulations under the heading of Site of Special Interest, etc. which apparently excludes the legality of the terms of the current Usufruct and the detail of various international conventions which Jersey is a party to, which was allowed to occur at Mont Orgueil Castle to the detriment of Planning Regulations and therefore undermining the authority of the law governing those Planning regulations and in breach of the aforementioned conventions .

A recent example being the conversion of the castle lodge to a modern restaurant to which I put forward several objections without receiving any response from the planning authority.

I would be happy to send you copies of any correspondence in my possession in relation to my concerns over my perceived breeches which may be worthy of your consideration.

Furthermore I noticed in last Wednesday's edition of the JEP with reference to the cottage known as l'Hospital at St Martin which until recently enjoyed the status of being known as an historic building owned by the people of Jersey . In the planning applications published that day was an application to demolish the extension and construct decking. My wife and I visited the cottage last year it was obvious to us that the aforementioned decking had been constructed at some indeterminate time prior to our visit . Furthermore the aforementioned extension was no longer there as this had also been demolished some time prior to our visit although at the time we were not aware that an extension had ever existed. s the result of our visit and the publication of my letter of concern in the JEP the last tenants to occupy the cottage for many years contacted me and I met with them . They were clearly upset at the way they claimed to have been treated in the affair. It was as the result of this meeting that I learned of the existence of the extension which apparently they had made habitable through their own efforts and expense and therefore was considered by them and the housing dept as part and parcel of the cottage. They asked for no recompense as they were given to understand that they would be allowed to enjoy their residence of the cottage for life whilst paying a peppercorn rent. This arrangement came to an abrupt halt when the cottage was made ready for sale on the open market and the tenants were persuaded to leave. Incidentally although I haven't had the opportunity to view the detail of the application to date I did notice the absence of any reference to the enormous gabion wall which has been constructed below the cottage to prevent it slipping into the sea. I can only assume that

this would also require a planning permit.

Finally, If I am correct in my observations, as the cottage has now been sold to a private developer for an enormous sum of money for such a small building one has to consider who has belatedly placed the application. Is it the Housing Committee who was actually responsible for the work or the purchaser of the property who may not have been made aware at the time of purchase that such a requirement had not been adhered to?.

It is quite obvious that such is the inappropriate delay in applying for permission to carry out the said work that the democratic right of any individual to object has been overturned. As I understand that planning regulations determine that such objections will only be accepted within a short space of time before the work is approved and therefore allowed to commence. This regulation appears to have been ignored with the work completed many months.

Yours Sincerely,

Michael W Green

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely

Mr Michael Green