

STATES OF JERSEY



DRAFT ANNUAL BUSINESS PLAN 2010 (P.117/2009): EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT

**Lodged au Greffe on 8th September 2009
by Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade**

STATES GREFFE

DRAFT ANNUAL BUSINESS PLAN 2010 (P.117/2009): EIGHTEENTH
AMENDMENT

PAGE 3, PARAGRAPH (g) –

After the words “accepted by the Minister for disposal in 2010 and thereafter”,
insert the words –

“except that the property “Land adjoining 108/109 Clos des Sables,
St. Brelade” shall be removed from the schedule of disposal set out in the
said Table J”.

DEPUTY M. TADIER OF ST. BRELADE

REPORT

Firstly, it should be pointed out that the piece of land in question is actually adjoining the properties 107 and 108 Clos des Sables, and not 109.

Having spoken to a number of residents in the immediate area, it is felt that this piece of land should be kept in public ownership. There is a more general consensus from residents of the estate that the green areas are essential to maintain the quality of the environment in what is, after all, a very built-up residential area.

The Draft Annual Business Plan states that the land is 'effectively unused'. The use of the word 'effectively' is significant: the land is either used or it is not used. However, it is clear that the land is used from time to time for children to play on; this was even more the case in the past, when children of the 'first generation' of estate residents were growing up. It will, once again, be the case in the future when the wheel turns full circle.

There is also a problem with the location of the site, namely that it is on a corner, which we know to be heavily used by school traffic. The sale of this land would most certainly lead to some kind of fence or natural barrier being put up which would restrict visibility.

The Business Plan goes on to explain that there are no other stakeholders to consult. As one of the Deputies for the District, I was not consulted, and as a representative for the area, I find this to be most unacceptable.

This piece of land represents better value left in public ownership for the enjoyment of all residents, and I ask members to support this amendment.

Financial and manpower implications

There are no manpower implications and no direct financial implications – the property would simply be retained in public ownership.