

**STATES OF JERSEY**  
**SCRUTINY ENVIRONMENT PANEL**  
**FRIDAY, 7th JULY 2006**  
**Planning Process Review**

**Panel:**

Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour (Chairman)

Connétable K. A. Le Brun of St. Mary

Deputy G.C.L. Baudains of St. Clement

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier of St. Saviour

Deputy S. Power of St. Brelade

**Officer:**

Mr I. Clarkson

**Witnesses:**

Mr V. Roberts

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour (Chairman):**

Okay. Right. When you speak, if you can speak into the microphone because it is all being picked up on the tape recorder. It will be transcribed afterwards. I just have to read you the Notice, first of all. "It is important that you fully understand the conditions under which you are appearing at this hearing. You will find a printed copy of the statement I am about to read to you on the table in front of you. The proceedings of the Panel are covered by Parliamentary privilege through Article 34 of the States of Jersey Law 2000 and the States of Jersey Powers, Privileges and Immunities Scrutiny Panels PAC and PPC Jersey Regulations 2006. Witnesses are protected from being sued or prosecuted for anything said during hearings, unless they say something that they know to be untrue. This protection is given to witnesses to ensure that they can speak freely and openly to the Panel when giving evidence without fear of legal action, although the immunity should obviously not be abused by making unsubstantiated statements about third parties who have no right of reply. The Panel would like you to bear this in mind when answering questions. The proceedings are being recorded and transcriptions will be made available on the Scrutiny website. This particular Scrutiny Review is being undertaken by lead member Deputy Baudains, assisted by Deputy Roy Le Hérissier. I think it is only fair that we start off by offering either of those two Members an opportunity to lead with their opening questions.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier of St. Saviour:**

Okay. Thank you for coming, Mr Roberts. We have obviously read your correspondence and you have

obviously been through fairly intensive process. What we are interested in learning, obviously, are where the process has worked and where it has not worked. So we are very interested, obviously, in your observations and drawing that from your... so do you want to give us... I know you have stated it here and you have written various letters and you have got involved and so forth. But, in your own words, do you want to tell us where you felt the process broke down and, indeed, where it worked?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

Certainly. Can I just make it clear that I work with developers? I work for a builder, so I am involved in this environment. The reason we got involved is because we have a lot of older neighbours who have been seriously affected by the development that we are talking about. So I know the environment. I just did not take a lead in the objections but, as you can see, we wrote many letters. The biggest problems that we have I think you have picked up in your ten points. If I might just say that everyone thought there was an inevitability about the permit being granted? That was the main thing that we found. Secondly, the main points that you have picked up in this were the submission of extreme initial applications, which we thought was quite clear in the development of this particular site. It was a massive scheme that was first submitted and we all thought that that was just the sprat to catch the eventual mackerel. We think they got probably more by using that tactic than they would have normally anticipated. In one of my letters... I have got no great qualms about development. I think it is almost inevitable. I thought that the site was developable with two properties, maybe, but they went for four and got three. If anyone cares to visit, if you look from the other side of the road, they are so close together that it looks like one huge mass. There are no gaps. It is the mass, I think, that bothers us more than anything. So I think you have actually picked up the main points that bothered us in terms of this application. It was the inevitability of it, the fact that their submission was extreme in the first instance, and we felt that we were divorced from the design and the planning process. There was very little consultation with the people who lived around us. I cannot put it any more clearly than that.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier:**

Just for the record, you do mention in your letter... you go into quite an analysis of letters that were sent, letters that appear to have fallen through the cracks and so forth. At the risk of awakening negative thoughts in you, so to speak, I wonder if you could just work us through that and if you could tell us... you do not have to name names but did you follow, for example, someone who was a contact person in the Planning Department and were you allegedly or officially working with this one person, in the hope of getting your views across?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

We did not deal with anyone in particular, but we responded to every application that was in the paper. We are told by our neighbours that at least five of them wrote letters, more than one in some instances, and yet we believe officially there were only five considered. I would say there were at least 10, maybe 15, letters sent. We cannot corroborate that because it is purely on the advice our neighbours have given

us. Some of them rang up and gave up because of the negative attitude that was displayed. We did not try and contact anyone personally. We just went through the normal official channels by writing letters of objection every time something appeared in the paper.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier:**

I know Senator - previously Deputy - Le Main got involved. Was he involved as your local Deputy?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

He was involved by one of our neighbours talking to him. One of our neighbours spoke to both himself and to Simon Crowcroft.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier:**

What I do not think I saw here, Mr Roberts, the normal procedure is, of course, they get involved and sometimes they will say, "I will represent your case at the Panel or at the Committee". Did that happen?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I think they were involved too late. Senator Le Main displayed a lot of interest but I think it was too late.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains of St. Clement:**

On the final page, we have just been talking about and indeed on your submission mentioned the problem with neighbours and other interested members of the public seem not to have been properly heard by the letters that they sent in maybe not arriving where they should have arrived. One thing I am not clear in my mind is that concerning the public and the neighbours. Was, in your view, there any confusion among those people as to what stage in the process the development was, as it was progressing along, or were at any time they taken by surprise, thinking, "This is not going to happen. It is going to come back" and then suddenly finding it is being done?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

They were not taken totally by surprise because there is a reasonably good neighbourhood environment. People talk to each other. The older ones particularly were advised of what was happening, although one or two of them were too old off their own bat to do anything about it. I think the older ones lived in hope, more than anything. They thought someone would resolve the problem and obviously that was never going to happen.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

Sorry to interrupt you there. Is there any likelihood that the reaction to the initial stages of development by neighbours and other interested members of the public was at too late a stage? In the other words, had we reached really some point of inevitability over that?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

Once it first appeared in the paper, all the neighbours were aware of its appearance because neighbours talk to each other. Some of them were too old to react, but we are relatively young by comparison. They knew that we were responding and certain other people responded. Through the period of the development, because it appeared once and then appeared again as a revised version, by the time it got to the second revision I think people started to feel that they had done enough already. People feel isolated and I think the older they are, the more isolated they feel to what is happening, even though it is only five yards from their doorstep.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

Is the process easy enough for the public to use or are the public deterred from joining in the process because it involves writing to people? They may not be quite sure whether they should write to the Minister or the Department or how to phrase it and inevitably they do not.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

My personal view is there is a lot of fear involved, particularly for older people. It is such a remote thing. It is government taking place outside of their control and I do not know whether it is even possible to have dialogue with people in the vicinity. But that certainly did not happen. There is no liaison. There does not seem to be any form of easy appeal.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

Basically what I was driving at is whether you felt that the neighbours and other involved people really found that the process would possibly be too daunting for them.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I am sure there is a degree of that, yes.

**Deputy S. Power of St. Brelade:**

You mentioned at the outset, Mr Roberts, that you felt there was almost an inevitability to the whole thing. Where do you think the process has failed that would cause you to say that there was an inevitability to what was going to be the outcome? Where do you think it went wrong?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

In this particular instance, I do not know. We checked with our advocate to see if there was any way that we could object to this development. We thought a mistake in basic fact had occurred. We thought it was almost negligent that something of this size could have been allowed to be built in this area. I do not know what anyone could do. I do not know how the States or how departments can be changed to catch things like this. Maybe it is not as bad as we think. It is a very, very subjective ...

**Deputy S. Power:**

Yes but your views and the views of the people that we have seen correspondence from mirrors what is happening in other parts of the Island as well. People are standing up and saying that the scaling, the size, the density, the closeness, the height of some of these developments is inappropriate to the buildings in the surrounding area.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

It was the inappropriateness, I think, which staggered everyone. But what can people do? They can go to an advocate, which we did, which was proved ineffective. They can go to the Citizens' Advice Bureau. To go to the Planning Office is quite a frightening process, particularly for older people. You can talk to the desk and you can look at drawings, but it is a frightening process. There does not seem to be any other way that you can put forward an objection. I think particularly older people find that really daunting.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

Do you believe that objections are given the weight that the objectors believe they deserve?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

It is absolutely impossible to make a judgement on that basis. Impossible. We do not know.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

What I was getting at is the objectors themselves. Do they feel that their communication is being taken seriously or do they really feel that they are wasting their time?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I would say that most people feel that they have been wasting their time. It is impossible to know though what happens once you have submitted an objection.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

The reason I ask is there seems to be a common thread in complaints by the public. I have heard it myself many times "what is the point in writing in if they are going to build it anyway?". It does seem to be very unfortunate because we would like the public to have confidence in the planning process and, if we can find out why the public does not have confidence in it, then we can make recommendations that will hopefully overcome that.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I think one of the problems is access to the Planning Department. It just does not seem to be available to general members of the public. It seems too remote.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Perhaps if I could come in there. A criticism was levelled at the Department in terms of the planning process, that perhaps too much of Jersey's development seems to be done on an ad hoc basis. Certainly, in terms of its location, it seems to be sporadic. Do you think there would be any benefits in perhaps moving towards a system that laid out with greater certainty development plans for particular areas across the Island, so that people and residents living within a particular area were not caught with their trousers down, so to speak, in suddenly finding that areas of land next door to where they live were suddenly going to be developed in a way that they had not perhaps been able to foresee?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I think that would be a monumental task. I suppose it would be a good idea, but so difficult to achieve and things change so much, do they not, all the time? I would prefer to see every case dealt with on its own merits and I think that is where, in this particular case, we felt for the residents that they were let down. This development seems to be out of context to what is there already.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Well this is the point. If the residents are feeling that they are let down, there is a couple of things that arise from that. They are being let down because they were unaware of the particular scale of the development that was likely to take place. Secondly, in terms of the process itself, if indeed any development that is going to take place is inevitable, to what extent should the system be changed or modified in order to not necessarily placate the residents' objections but at least give them an opportunity to feel that they are involved?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

To almost set a plan for, say, the next 20 years with every piece of land available?

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Yes.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

Is that achievable? I do not know.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

I do not know. If it could be achievable, do you think it would be desirable?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I think it would be helpful.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Fine, okay. Thanks.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

I noticed, Mr. Roberts in a way I suppose of trying to give you some relief, it was suggested, given the thing had gone the wrong way, that there would be a Committee of Inquiry. Did anything happen? I have heard nothing on that front.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I do not think so, no.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

What we are finding quite strange to get hold of is you went to a lawyer. Did somebody recommend you go to a lawyer?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

No. As I said before we have elderly neighbours. Many of them were not very well because of the pressure that was being put on them by this development. We just tested the water. We just wanted more precise advice about what we could and could not do. Our advocate advised us that there was very little that could be done.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

But you wrote these letters and you did this very detailed analysis of the facts and clearly, I presume, you were trying to prove, if the application is based on such a degree of unsound facts, you must question the whole application.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

Indeed. We wanted to know whether we had some case against the Planning Authority if they had been truly negligent. At times, we felt some of the decisions were negligent. But that is purely a matter of opinion. It is a very subjective subject.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

But at no point did any of you or perhaps your lawyer... Did any of you actually talk to the Planning Officer who was promoting this case?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I do not even know who the Planning Officer was.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Really? You never knew who it was? Right.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

Tell me, now that the new planning laws have just come into being and, as you are probably aware, notices now have to be put around a site for development, hopefully neighbours will be alerted at an earlier stage and not have to rely on seeing notices in the Evening Post, which not everybody takes any notice of anyway. Hopefully that will assist. Do you think that will assist with problems like this in the future?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I think it has to. The more information that is available to people in the vicinity, the better.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

And the fact also that - I do not think it is actually operational at the moment but it should be shortly – that the public will be able to attend application meetings by the Panel so that perhaps the public may be less daunted by the process – that they actually see it in operation? Do you think...

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I think that might be helpful as well, yes.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

Going back to the actual development we are discussing, I notice that in several cases towards the end of the approval system, the last three items I am looking at here were made under delegated powers and with no objections received. Were you aware of these changes that were going on?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I think we missed them. They would have been advertised in the JEP, I presume.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

That I do not know. Could I rely on a previous planning clerk to assist me here?

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

I think if applications were taken under delegated powers, I think that is the end of it. They are not actually advertised.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

Normally the delegated powers are only used for non-contentious items, but it would appear that this was a contentious issue. I am actually slightly surprised that these matters were taken under delegated powers because they are not completely minor issues such as balconies and additional roof lights to each elevation. I would personally have thought that, as this development had generated so much interest,



perhaps the Panel would have dealt with more of those issues. It seems that you were not aware.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I do not know how relevant this is but we spent a lot of time studying the original drawings. The original drawings clearly indicated that, because there is so much overlooking in this particular instance, the windows would be opaque overlooking ourselves and our neighbour. The windows are not opaque; they are clear, normal glass. So we have contacted the Building Inspectorate to ask them when they will check this building to make sure that it complies with the original drawings, which said opaque glass. We have had no response whatsoever. This is over a four- week, five-week period.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

The person we were previously interviewing raised the issue of one particular instance I am aware of where there were not supposed to be any windows overlooking neighbours. A person came back from holiday to find a window had been installed. Planning were not aware of it but the Building Bye-law inspectors had been round to check and decided that the window was necessary. One arm of the Planning Authority did not seem to know what the other was doing. But maybe, in between, there was no notification, so once again the public believed something mischievous had been going on, that the developer can do what he likes. "I could not put a window in my house, but the developer can." But, of course, it was not like that. It would have happened. It was that communications basically failed. Am I correct in assuming that this is basically what has happened to you here?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

Later on, yes.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

With such matters as opaque windows where clearly they had been approved by somebody at Planning but not by the process with which you would be familiar?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

Correct.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

Have you any views on how the process might be improved to obviate such things happening in the future? Obviously, what we are trying to do as a Panel is to find out if there are problems, where they are and how we might address them so that they can be removed as problems in the future.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

In terms of things that happened later on in the contracts, I just do not know. In my own experience as a builder working for developers, there seems to be a very, very strict control by building inspectorates

over things that are not done or are done, particularly from the overlooking point of view. Yet, in this particular instance, overlooking was a problem very early on but does not appear to be any more and I have no idea how that has happened.

**Deputy S. Power:**

Can I ask a question? On the specific detail relating to the variation between an opaque window and a clear glass window, have you as a group or as an individual actually contacted building inspectors or Planning...

**Mr V. Roberts:**

We have and received no response.

**Deputy S. Power:**

You have still received no response?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

Correct.

**Deputy S. Power:**

Have you written again?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

Yes.

**Deputy S. Power:**

And no response to two letters?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

No. Two emails.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

I think it is a fairly simple matter. Politicians do actually have access to the individual files and we can actually operate at two levels. One will be to actually view the stamped drawings and, if opaque windows have been specifically asked for, they will appear on the drawing. If indeed there is a specific requirement for a particular treatment, then that will actually be additionally referred to by way of a condition that goes with the permit. All of those documents can actually be viewed. So, although you have not been able to actually get access, if it is still an issue then perhaps your recourse must be to a politician to ask that that be done on your behalf.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

Anyone can go to the Planning Office and ask to see the original planning drawings. They are kept on file.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Yes, but the background material is not available to the public generally, but it is available to politicians.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

Oh. Okay.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

On the back of that, could I ask: the representations which have been made over this development from the early stages, to whom were they addressed? Were they addressed to the Department or to the President, Minister or..

**Mr V. Roberts:**

President, I think. The Committee.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Did you have any contact direct with the developers or was it all done formally through the Planning Department?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

We had some contact with the developers, just to ask them specific questions more than anything, and to let them know that we were objecting. We did specifically let them know that we were objecting.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

Was the Parish involved in any way in objecting to access or increased traffic or did not have a view?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

We presumed that inquiry would have been sent as part of the planning application. I think that is fairly normal. But Mr Crowcroft was involved by a neighbour very late on, too late to be able to do anything.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

Normally the process involves notification to the Parish authorities, to the Constable, to comment via their Roads Committee to implications.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I would have imagined that that would have been done then. But we, as a neighbour, have no idea really

what processes have been gone through.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Any further issues to be explored?

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

No unless Mr Roberts has any points he wishes to...

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I am sorry. I was quite happy to come today but, to me, there does not seem to be a clear answer to get over this problem. It will be nice from a residents' point of view or a neighbours' point of view if there was a better point of contact to make objections more clearly. You feel as if you are sending it into a void and, if it ever gets there, you have no idea. I think that would be the clearest advantage, to have an appeal board or an appeal authority of some kind that you could discuss things with.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

Would it help if on development, and I'm talking about your case specifically but in general, if members of the public with queries, objections or whatever were perhaps directed to the Planning Control Officer for that particular scheme, rather than sending them to the Department or the Minister or... to make this one focal point?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

Definitely. I think definitely they could speak to the Planning Officer. But I know that these guys are so busy anyway. Have they got time within their normal schedule to be able to deal with appeals or objections, as well as processing somebody's...

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

There could be a trade-off there because I know what we are talking about the moment may create more work for them. It could mean less work when people are disgruntled and less paperwork flying around all over the place.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

Indeed.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

What has troubled me for some time is the fact that people generally seem to have lost confidence in the planning process. What we are trying to do is identify those areas and the public confidence will come back again.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

To be able to speak to the person involved and to discuss objections, I think, would be very helpful. Whether it is practical or not, I have no idea.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

It has happened on some developments. That I am aware. Whether they are fairly large developments, whether they could work down to smaller ones or to what level that could go, I do not know. It does seem to me that you were involved in the early stages, which is good, whereas most people tend to get involved once the foundations are down and the blocks are going up and it is rather too late. But then it does seem that things sort of petered out and you were not really aware of changes that were going on because I know most members of the public do get irritated by, as I said before, what they see being built bearing not too great a resemblance to the plans that they have looked at. They have not been kept informed in the middle as to what changes have been allowed. They think that the builder has just got carte blanche to change things as he goes along, whereas we know that this is not the case. Do you have any particular views on how that problem might be addressed? Better communication, yes, but how do you think that could be achieved? Have you any particular views?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I really have not. I would like to see, as I said before, just the ease of appeal or ease of discussion with the Planning Officer increased. But, beyond that, I really do not know what else can be done. Everyone who has a building site near them, in front of them, behind them or whatever is going to have objections. How you can set up something to deal with the plethora of things like that, I just do not know.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

Obviously on a development, a lot of people may be not content with it but usually a relatively minor amount of people will actually make a written submission. Do you believe that those who have made a written submission should then be kept up to date on practically all changes to the original plan? Just those people that have actually shown an interest?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

How could they keep in touch with people who might have an objection but have not expressed it in writing? That would be almost impossible.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

No I was just thinking from a logistical point of view because, you know, an application might generate half a dozen letters. A larger development might generate 20 or 30 letters. It would not seem to me to be unreasonable to send them a postcard every two or three weeks when the windows have been changed, the doors and the roof are a different shape and things like that, rather than having a lot of

disgruntled members of the public seeing things.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I think it would be a really good idea for anyone who had issued a formal complaint to be kept informed and then they would normally be able to inform neighbours of whatever was changed.

**Deputy S. Power:**

I think the consistent message here, Mr Roberts, is that your experience and the experience of your friends and neighbours is that communication and the lack of response on the planning process from the Planning Department is obvious. That is one of the reasons why I think it is important that you did contact this Panel because I think your views and a views of a lot of other people would be reflected in the review. There is, across the Island, a constant view that this is being repeated and has been repeated in many different places. It appears to be a big problem. People go to the trouble of writing to the Department, contacting the Department, in the process of a planning application, and you are feeding information into a vacuum. You started at the very start by saying there appeared to be an inevitability. I come back to what you said at the start. I think your view is not unique. In fact, I think your view is consistent with the views of a lot of other people out there, so there is a problem.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

In this particular instance, we knew who the developer was. We knew some of their personnel. Way, way before the final permit had been granted, they were preparing the site. So it was a fairly good indication that they were completely confident that they were going to get the permit.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

I was just refreshing my memory on one of the items which you made the written submission and that is you were concerned that the application may have contained knowingly inaccurate information and this is taken up further on. Have you any understanding of how this came about? Whether you believe it was deliberate or not --

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I do believe it was deliberate.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

Do you believe that the Officers were remiss in not picking it up or was it not relevant?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

It was highly relevant and maybe something should have been picked up, but it was clever use of words more than fraudulent. If you describe a building as "two-storey", is that a bungalow with a roof space or is it a house with a roof on top of it? The use of the words was very, very clever. Basically, we live on

an estate of bungalows and some of those bungalows have had dormers added. So they can try to say they were going to build two-storey units near to other two-storey units. It is just use of words, whereas they have in fact built houses overlooking bungalows.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

My normal understanding of a bungalow with dormers and a roof is one-and-a-half storeys.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

Well exactly. They were just using words very, very cleverly. So you could not say it was fraudulent but, at the same time, anyone who read the document would know that it was just a tactic.

**Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:**

Was there one property described as being in a dilapidated condition when in fact...

**Mr V. Roberts:**

The house that was knocked down was absolutely stunning. The old lady who lived in it died the year before. It was a stunning property with a stunning garden. My wife went into it very often. It was built roughly the same time as all the surrounding houses. It was not in any state of dilapidation. It was in exactly the same state as all our other houses. The garden and house were beautiful. It was just a crime that it was knocked down.

**Deputy S. Power:**

Do you think it would help that... a suggestion has been made to the Planning Department that if an application is made to build three, four or five houses on an existing house, that photographs are to be taken, a pictorial photographic record to be actually part of the planning application?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

I would say so. It is one of the points I have got down here, actually. To make a model every time is quite costly, but it would at least show people the scale of what is proposed if a model was made of the immediate environment. Photographs in this particular instance tell a tremendous story. It is a shame. It cannot be done now. They are not going to knock them down, are they? But it would be very, very useful, particularly if they were taken from not the developers' perspective but from Planning.

**Deputy S. Power:**

The existing residents, yes. This has happened more than once. Deputy Baudains was talking about another development in St. Clement, whereby an existing building was demolished to make way for another development on the same site. There are hardly any pictorial records of what was demolished. What has been built is an area of contention in relation to what was there originally. So I think photographic evidence as to what was there first is an important issue.

**Mr V. Roberts:**

We have it accidentally, not because we knew that the building was going to be knocked down, but as part of the application the people said, “The existing two-storey building will be knocked down”. It was, in fact, a bungalow with one roof light, which is stretching the imagination.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Any other issues? No, okay. In that case, would you like to make any final closing remarks?

**Mr V. Roberts:**

No, I think I have said as much as I can say.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

All right. In that case, I would like to thank you on behalf of the Panel for your attendance today. Thank you.