# **STATES OF JERSEY**



# PLÉMONT HOLIDAY VILLAGE SITE: NEGOTIATIONS FOR PURCHASE

Presented to the States on 19th January 2010 by the Minister for Treasury and Resources

### **STATES GREFFE**

#### **REPORT**

On 22nd October 2008 the States Assembly approved Proposition P.152/2008, "Plémont Holiday Village site: negotiations for purchase" (copy attached at the Appendix to this Report). This required the Minister for Treasury and Resources –

- (a) to open negotiations with the current owners of the Plémont Holiday Village site, St. Ouen with a view to ascertaining their willingness to sell the site and, if appropriate, determining an agreed value for it; and
- (b) to present the outcome of the negotiations to the States to enable members to decide what further action, if any, they may choose to take.

In June 2009 the Council of Ministers were appraised of progress in terms of opening negotiations with the owners and considered a number of options to progress this longstanding debate over the future of Plémont headland. The Council of Ministers considered 3 options –

- To allow the formal Planning process to be completed before any decision to purchase is made.
- To request the Minister for Treasury and Resources to proceed with a negotiated purchase for the site.
- To request the Minister for Planning and Environment to proceed with Compulsory Purchase of the land.

The Council of Ministers concluded that it should allow the formal planning process to be decided before considering an option to purchase the land and to rely on that process to deliver a satisfactory outcome. Their decision was based on the following factors –

- (a) The value of the land is directly related to its development potential, and until an approved scheme exists, opinions on the land value are based on wide-ranging assumptions.
- (b) The Planning process could lead to a greater area of the site than is currently proposed as being restored to nature, which land could be gifted to the Public, thereby forming a natural buffer to the surrounding area and preventing further applications to increase the scale of any development.
- (c) The Planning process will likely impose strict design and environmental standards to ensure that any permitted development makes a minimal visual and environmental impact on the site and its surrounding area.
- (d) CoM's decision (to allow the Planning process to be completed) places no pressure on the Public purse and has the potential to deliver a satisfactory compromise solution.

Jersey Property Holdings (JPH), acting on behalf of the Public, has held meetings with the development company acting on behalf of the owner of the site to try to establish an accurate market valuation. In October 2009, the developer's architects wrote to JPH reconfirming their argument that the Public had set a precedent in 2001 when it acquired the site of the former Bal Tabarin Restaurant at development value in order to restore the site to nature. JPH submitted a counter argument that a precedent had not been created in 2001 and this could not be used as a basis for value of the Plémont Holiday Village Site.

Until such time as the long-term use can be established, and recognising that the owners consider its value to be that of a development site as opposed to a natural open space, it is not possible to report on an accurate value for the site.

The development company submitted a planning application for the redevelopment of the site for holiday lets which was rejected by the Minister. The development company has since submitted a further planning application to redevelop the site for approximately 30 houses. Determination of this application currently rests with the Minister for Planning and Environment.

The Council of Ministers, having decided to allow the proposed planning application to be determined before considering an option to purchase the site, has been monitoring the planning process before reporting to the States. The States are due to debate P.144/2009 "Plémont Holiday Village: acquisition by the Public" on 19th January 2010 and the Minister for Treasury and Resources felt that Members should be aware of progress when preparing for this debate.

**APPENDIX** 

# STATES OF JERSEY



## PLÉMONT HOLIDAY VILLAGE SITE: NEGOTIATIONS FOR PURCHASE

Lodged au Greffe on 29th September 2008 by the Connétable of St. Ouen

#### STATES GREFFE

2008 Price code: B P.152

### **PROPOSITION**

### THE STATES are asked to decide whether they are of opinion –

to request the Minister for Treasury and Resources –

- (a) to open negotiations with the current owners of the Plémont Holiday Village site, St. Ouen with a view to ascertaining their willingness to sell the site and, if appropriate, determining an agreed value for it; and
- (b) to present the outcome of the negotiations to the States to enable members to decide what further action, if any, they may choose to take.

CONNÉTABLE OF ST. OUEN

#### **REPORT**

Following my proposition P.112/2006, where the States decided that they were of the opinion –

- "(a) to agree that it would be in the public interest for the headland at Plémont, as shown in Drawing Number 150/06/101, namely the site formerly occupied by Plémont (Pontins) Holiday Village complex and the surrounding associated land, to be preserved as open space for the enjoyment of the public of the Island;
- (b) to request the Council of Ministers to consider all options to preserve the land described in paragraph (a) and to recommend a preferred option to the states with the least possible delay;",

nothing appears to have happened.

I am aware that initially, following the 2006 decision, the Council of Ministers put off any decision until the Minister for Planning and Environment had determined the application which was relevant at the time.

On the 16th January 2007, Deputy J.B. Fox of St. Helier asked questions of both the Planning and Environment Minister and the Chief Minister. To the question asked of the Chief Minister, Senator Walker replied that a report on the Plémont headland was to be considered by the Council Ministers on the 25th January 2007, and to a further question, the Chief Minister replied that the details of that report would be reported to members of the States.

The Minister for Planning and Environment refused the application in June, 2008.

On the 1st July 2008, Senator L. Norman asked the Minister for Planning and Environment, in view of the fact that the application had been refused, what action he was going to be taking to comply with the wishes and decision of the States. The Minister for Planning and Environment replied that there was no action he could take personally, but stressed that the matter needed to be brought to a conclusion, and that, in his opinion, the site would be best in the hands of the public, used for the benefit of the public, and returned to nature.

On the 15th July 2008, the Chief Minister, in response to a question from Senator L. Norman, seeking a date when a preferred option would be presented to the States, in accordance with the States decision of 2006, said that he would undertake to bring the information and options to the House at the earliest opportunity.

Again on 16th September 2008, the Chief Minister, in reply to a further question from Senator L. Norman, inferred that no action was imminent. I therefore bring this proposition before the House in an attempt to proceed this matter, firstly by identifying a possible valuation of the site, and then bringing the matter before the Members of this House so that, being better informed, they may consider any further action.

#### Financial and manpower implications

There does not appear to be any financial or manpower implication associated with this proposition.