

**WRITTEN QUESTIONS TO THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND
PUBLIC SERVICES COMMITTEE BY DEPUTY T.J. LE MAIN OF ST. HELIER**

ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON TUESDAY, 21st JUNE 2005

Question 1

Would the President inform members –

- (a) whether any pre-application advice has been given to the Jersey Milk Marketing Board concerning the re-development of the existing dairy site at Five Oaks, which was originally developed on Green Zone and agricultural protected land, and, if so, what this advice was?
- (b) whether the original decision to allow development of the existing dairy in the Green Zone/agricultural protected land was based purely on the need of agriculture and in accordance with such policies in force at the time?

Answer

- (a) Informal discussions took place in 2003 between the Jersey Milk Marketing Board's architect and the Planning Department concerning the development of part of the site for housing purposes. The Dairy would have remained on the site. No formal proposal emerged as a result of those discussions.

A further discussion was held between a planning officer and a representative of the Board at a meeting in January 2004. However, the discussion focused more on the principle of unlocking capital in the existing site and the possibilities for relocating the Dairy, than the possible alternative uses of the existing site. Housing was the only alternative use for the Five Oaks site discussed at the meeting.

Later in the year, the Board marketed the site, and the Department received two or three telephone enquiries about its possible future use from agents, presumably acting on behalf of prospective purchasers.

- (b) The initial application for the Dairy at Five Oaks was made in August 1964. The site had been identified for "industrial use" in the 'Barret Plan', approved by the States in March 1963. Whether it was identified specifically for the Dairy is impossible to say from the information available. However, it is clear that the site had been identified for industrial purposes before the application was made, and thus the question is based on an incorrect assumption.

Question 2

Would the President inform members whether the Committee has yet considered the suitability of the existing Five Oaks site for downsizing the current dairy operation, and, if so, advise members of the outcome?

Answer

The Environment and Public Services Committee has not considered the matter. It has not been asked to do so, nor has it any right to involve itself in the affairs of the Jersey Milk Marketing Board.

Question 3

Would the President inform members whether the Committee has, as part of the pre-application advice, been advised of the financial position of the Jersey Milk Marketing Board, and, if so, whether this has played any part in the determination of the commercial and development value of the existing Five Oaks site outside of agricultural use? If so, how does this align with current planning policies and what are the implications for future similar applications by others, if any?

Answer

Save for the discussions referred to in the answer to Question 1, at which the respective officers were informed of the broad financial position of the Board, there has been no formal contact between the Committee and the Board. The Committee has not considered the matter, but members are aware of the Board's financial position which has been widely reported.

Neither the Committee or the Department has had any involvement in any assessment of value of the existing Dairy site. The site has an existing industrial use, (not agricultural as implied in the question), and is contained within the Built-up Area on the Island Plan 2002.

Question 4

Would the President advise members whether the Committee will bring a report and proposition to the States for consideration in due course in the event that an application is received from the Jersey Milk Marketing Board seeking to relocate, redevelop or sell their existing Five Oaks premises outside of agricultural use, and, if not, the reasons why?

Answer

The question is hypothetical as the land is not in agricultural use. However as a general rule the Committee would only bring a proposition to the States were it minded to grant permission for a development that was contrary to the policies of the Island Plan. I must repeat that the premises are in industrial, not agricultural use.