

STATES OF JERSEY



ISLAND PLAN 2011: APPROVAL (P.48/2011): THIRTIETH AMENDMENT

Lodged au Greffe on 26th April 2011
by Senator T.J. Le Main

STATES GREFFE

PAGE 2 –

After the words “the revised draft Island Plan 2011” insert the words –

- (a) “except that in Policy NE 6 Coastal National Park (on page 95) paragraph 2, after the words ‘intensification of their use’ there be inserted the words ‘, and any proposals for the future development of property in sensitive locations which applicants are seeking to develop into more than two units of residential accommodation will be submitted to the States’ Assembly for their views’;
- (b) except that in Policy NE 7 Green Zone (on pages 101–103) after sub-paragraph e. insert the following new paragraph –
 - ‘In the case of the future development of property in sensitive locations which applicants are seeking to develop into more than two units of residential accommodation, the proposals will be submitted to the States’ Assembly for their views.’ ”

SENATOR T.J. LE MAIN

REPORT

In returning from the UK on Condor Ferries, one cannot but be dismayed at the enormity of the development on the old Portelet Holiday Camp, in particular its height and mass, I cannot recollect this mass of buildings with the old holiday camp, and it seems the States Members are unable to have any say in the future of sites such as this; and you must consider that the old Milano Hotel/Portelet and Plémont Holiday Camps probably received no planning permission as it was prior to the Planning Laws being in place, but today these sites are highly protected.

Then you have sites like the old Jersey Five Oaks Dairy site, which was granted permission to develop on then agricultural land: another example that had “special permission” to assist the milk industry, otherwise no factory would have received permission on such a site. Some coastal hotels received “exceptional planning permission” years ago to assist the Tourism Industry; today permission would not be granted unless there was an exceptional case made and with full public consultation.

The reason for these amendments is to give members the opportunity to have political input into what is becoming a very worrying state of affairs, when the Public are told that because there is an existing building on the site “it automatically has to be given planning permission for development”. My view is that this policy or legal interpretation fails Jersey in this day and age, and that it should be able to further restrict development, etc. on these sensitive sites, and in many cases no development, but demolition and the return of the land back to its natural environment or placing in the hands of the National Trust or the Public, or other bodies prepared protect our environment.

Financial and manpower implications

There are no financial or manpower implications for the States arising from this amendment.