

5.8 Deputy J.H. Young of the Minister for Planning and Environment regarding delays in signing a Planning Obligation agreement associated with the development at Plémont Holiday Village:

Will the Minister explain the reasons for the delay in signing the Planning Obligation Agreement following his decision to approve development at Plémont Holiday Village in November; advise how and by whom the agreement was drafted, whether its terms have been thoroughly reviewed; and whether he has personally reviewed it and is satisfied that the agreement completely fulfils the promises which were publically made by the applicant?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour (The Minister for Planning and Environment):

The Planning Obligation Agreement for this site was not delayed but I agree did take some time to negotiate. The site is a complex one with several strands to the agreement. The subjective element is well known to be controversial. The agreement was prepared in discussion with the applicant and officers in my Department acting with the benefit of all appropriate advice. Particular care was taken to ensure that all of my requirements were included within the terms of the agreement. I did personally review the agreement before it was signed on my behalf by the relevant director.

5.8.1 Deputy J.H. Young:

Why does the agreement then not include definite arrangements or terms for the transfer of land to a public interest body? The absence of such an arrangement, effectively releases the appellant from that commitment.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

I do not think it does. I think the obligations were there that the land shall not be ceded until the landscaping as set out in the approved plans has been completed to the satisfaction of the Minister. In order to do that, the pre-landscaping works and the demolition works have to be undertaken to the Minister's satisfaction.

5.8.2 Deputy J.H. Young:

Would the Minister confirm that the funds provided within the agreement for the costs of maintenance of the special landscape areas, would he explain why it is only £2,500 and why they have not been subject to cost of living increases for the full 25 years of these agreements?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

As far as I am aware, it is not £2,500. It is a sum that is twice that amount for the full 16.66 vergées. The reason that the contributions are not subject to cost of living arrangements was determined as to be a reasonable deal or obligation on the grounds that they are being paid, not in a one-off amount but on a continued basis for the full 25-year period. The landscaping, once it is completed, will mature and the rationale behind such a costing is that the cost of that maintenance will decrease as time goes on.