

## **DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING AUTHORITY**

### **OPEN PLANNING MEETING AGENDA**

An Open Planning Meeting will be held at Beau Sejour Centre, Cambridge & Delancey Rooms, on **Wednesday 27/07/2016** at 9.15am for a 9.30am start.

The following applications will be considered at the Open Planning Meeting:-

#### **Agenda Item 1 :-**

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER:</b>	<b>RES/2015/3133</b>
<b>APPLICATION ADDRESS:</b>	Le Vieux Jardin, off Courtil Le Clement, Vale.
<b>DESCRIPTION OF WORK:</b>	Erect 20 one bedroom flats comprising Supported Housing and 8 one bedroom dwellings within an Autism Unit, construct associated access road and 29 parking spaces.
<b>NAME OF APPLICANT:</b>	Guernsey Housing Association LBG.

#### **Agenda Item 2 :-**

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER:</b>	<b>FULL/2016/0001</b>
<b>APPLICATION ADDRESS:</b>	Longue Hougue Reclamation Site Bulwer Avenue St. Sampson.
<b>DESCRIPTION OF WORK:</b>	Erect a waste transfer station building, with associated hardstanding for up to 180 shipping containers and ancillary plant including a 20 metre high chimney, two weighbridges, fire water tank and pump house, electricity sub-station and fuel storage area. Erect a facilities building. Construct a Household Waste Recycling Centre. Construct associated roads and parking and a bund along the southern site boundary (Environmental Impact Assessment development).
<b>NAME OF APPLICANT:</b>	States Trading Assets.

The agenda for the open planning meeting, along with the planning application reports relating to the applications to be considered, which follow below, are made available five working days before the date of the Open Planning Meeting on the States website and also in hard copy at the Planning Service's offices. The planning application reports below contain a summary of consultation responses and of any representations received on the applications from third parties.

There will be provision for **public speaking** at the open planning meeting. The opportunity to speak is afforded only to persons who:

- a) have submitted a representation in writing within the period specified for publicity of the application under section 10 of the Land Planning and Development (General Provisions) Ordinance, 2007, along with the applicant and/or their agent for the application; and
- b) who have notified the Planning Service in writing (by letter or by e-mail addressed to [Planning@gov.gg](mailto:Planning@gov.gg)) of their intention to speak which is received by Planning Service by 12.00 Noon on the working day immediately preceding the date of the Open Planning Meeting.



**PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT**

**Application No:** RES/2015/3133  
**Property Ref:** C013310000  
**Valid date:** 21/12/2015  
**Location:** Le Vieux Jardin off Courtil Le Clement Vale Guernsey  
**Proposal:** Erect 20 one bedroom flats comprising Supported Housing and 8 one bedroom dwellings within an Autism Unit, construct associated access road and 29 parking spaces.

**Applicant:** Guernsey Housing Association LBG

**RECOMMENDATION - Grant: Reserved Matters with Conditions:**

---

1. The development to which this approval of reserved matter(s) relates shall be begun within 3 years from the date of the outline permission granted for that development.

Reason - To ensure compliance with section 18(1) of the Land Planning and Development (Guernsey) Law, 2005.

2. This approval of details is pursuant to outline planning permission reference OP/2015/2377 issued on 9 November 2015.

Reason - To define the permission for the avoidance of any doubt.

3. The development hereby permitted and all the operations which constitute or are incidental to that development shall be carried out in compliance with all such requirements of the building regulations as are applicable to them, and no operation to which such requirement applies may be commenced or continued unless (i) plans relating to that operation have been approved by the Authority and (ii) it is commenced or, as the case may be, continued, in accordance with that requirement and any further requirements imposed by the Authority when approving those plans, for the purpose of securing that the building regulations are complied with.

Reason - To comply with section 17(2) of the Land Planning and Development (Guernsey) Law, 2005.

4. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be used or occupied until such time as the new footway on the western side of Courtil le Clement and extending to the Autism Accommodation has been completed, as shown on drawing no. 755-100G.

Reason - To make sure that satisfactory pedestrian access to the development is provided, in the interests of road safety.

5. No development shall begin on site until precise details of all hard surfaced areas within

the site have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Authority. The works shall be carried out only in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason - To secure the satisfactory appearance of the completed development.

6. No development shall begin on site until precise details of the treatment of the application site boundaries and the boundaries to individual dwellings, including those forming part of the Autism Accommodation, have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Authority. No occupation of any dwelling shall begin until the agreed scheme for boundary treatment in relation to the site boundaries and that dwelling has been fully completed.

Reason - To secure the satisfactory appearance of the completed development.

7. The landscaping scheme shown on drawing no. 755-104A shall be fully completed in the first planting season following the first occupation of any part of the development or completion of development whichever is the sooner, or in accordance with a programme previously agreed in writing by the Authority. Any trees or plants removed, dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased, within 5 years of planting shall be replaced in the following planting season by trees or plants of a size and species similar to those originally required to be planted.

Reason - To make sure that the appearance of the completed development is satisfactory and to help assimilate the development into its surroundings.

8. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Land Planning and Development (Exemptions) Ordinance, 2007 (or any other Ordinance replacing or re-enacting that Ordinance), no extensions, sheds, greenhouses, outbuildings, fences, walls or other buildings or structures shall be erected or constructed within the curtilage of any dwellinghouse to which this permission relates, except as may be permitted by the terms of this approval.

Reason - The carrying out of development of this type may cause harm in terms of the overall appearance and character of the area and its impact on the amenity of neighbouring dwellings.

## **INFORMATIVES**

This approval should be read in conjunction with outline planning permission Ref. No. OP/2015/2377 dated 9 November 2015 of which it forms a part. The conditions on that outline planning permission remain in place and must be complied with.

Condition 4 of the outline permission limits the development to social housing. Social Housing is defined in the Rural Area Plan as:

'that which is (a) provided by the States' Housing Department, (b) provided by a recognised Housing Association in co-operation with that Department, or (c) in a scheme to secure specific forms of social housing sought in the Corporate Housing Programme, with the support of the Housing Department. Such housing would normally be for subsidised rent or for partial ownership but may include sheltered housing in schemes

that are approved by the Housing Department'.

Please note the enclosed copy of comments received from the States Archaeologist and from Environmental Health on this application. The developer is advised to follow the advice contained in these comments.

Existing trees on the site are the subject of a Tree Protection Order and permission is needed for any works to uproot, cut down, top or lop the protected trees. Unauthorised works to a protected tree are a criminal offence.

---

## **OFFICER'S REPORT**

### **Site Description:**

The application site comprises a relatively flat field with frontages to La Grande Rue and Courtil Le Clement. There is planting on all the field boundaries. A field gate gives access from La Grande Rue.

On the opposite side of Courtil Le Clement is the Close Care development known as La Nouvelle Maraitaine. There is a grass verge and douit on the western side of this road.

To the south of the application site is an area used as overspill parking, beyond which is an area identified as a *Community Green* associated with La Nouvelle Maraitaine, but which is yet to be completed.

On the opposite side of La Grande Rue is a detached dwelling on the corner with La Maison Au Compte. There is open land to the north of this dwelling.

To the north-west of the application site is a dwelling, *Shamrock Cottage*, and its garden. Shamrock Cottage is a protected building.

To the north-east are houses with their side towards the application site.

There is a strong hedge with trees on the boundary to La Grande Rue with further planting on the three other sides. A Tree Protection Order was made in January 2016 and confirmed in May 2016 and relates to the group of trees extending along the western and southern site boundaries, including along La Grande Rue.

### **Relevant History:**

OP/2015/2377      09/11/2015      Outline permission to Carry out residential development (Social Housing)

### **Existing Use(s):**

Agricultural

### **Brief Description of Development:**

The application as originally submitted sought approval of reserved matters for a development comprising:

1. construction of a new vehicular access to Courtil Le Clement;
2. construction of an access road positioned approximately centrally within the site;
3. erection of 20 one bedroom flats on the land to the north of the access road with two parking courts accommodating a total of 18 parking spaces;
4. erection of an Autism Unit to the south of the access road to include 8 one bedroom units, an enclosed central area and an associated parking court accommodating 11 parking spaces and a drop-off area;
5. construction of a pedestrian access, 3 metres wide, to La Grande Rue. This was also shown as a parking area for a Minibus;

Separate pedestrian routes were also shown to Courtil Le Clement and the *Community Green* to the south. In addition, the five Autism flats fronting Courtil Le Clement would have had separate access points to this road.

The application is accompanied by a Planning & Design Statement. This is a revised version of the document submitted at outline stage. It includes a section specifically dealing with this reserved matters application. It describes the different parts of the development and the design reasoning to support each element. Reference is made to the treatment proposed for each of the site boundaries and the access and parking arrangements and it outlines the form, scale and character of the proposed buildings. It describes the provision to be made for pedestrian movements and the materials to be used. Particular attention is given to the detailed specification of the Autism unit.

Consideration of the application was deferred in view of concerns in particular about:

1. the adequacy of the proposed landscape buffer along La Grande Rue and the impact of the development on the protected trees;
2. the access arrangement to La Grande Rue and generally the provision to be made for pedestrians;
3. whether the scheme would have a satisfactory street presence to both La Grande Rue and Courtil le Clement;
4. the relationship of the nearest dwellings to La Nouvelle Maraitaine;
5. the relationship with the adjoining dwelling to the north-west;
6. the hard appearance of the development and whether the proposed development would represent a satisfactory transition from La Nouvelle Maraitaine to the more rural areas to the west.

In response, a revised scheme has been submitted.

The main changes from the original scheme are:

1. the Autism unit has been re-positioned to the west, close to the frontage to La Grande Rue;
2. the associated car parking has been re-positioned to the east of the Autism unit alongside Courtil le Clement;
3. the number of parking spaces has been reduced by one;

4. the flats along La Grande Rue have been moved south and have frontage to La Grande Rue with a footpath introduced on that side;
5. the car parking area in the north-west corner of the site has been removed with the area now being planted;
6. the access to La Grande Rue is pedestrian only; and
7. the position of the douit running alongside Courtil le Clement has been retained as existing.

**Relevant Policies of any Plan, Subject Plan or Local Planning Brief:**

Rural Area Plan

RGEN3 - Landscape, ecology & wildlife

RGEN5 - Character & amenity

RGEN6 - Design

RGEN7 - Safe & convenient access

RGEN8 - Parking & open space

RGEN11 - Effect on adjoining properties

RCE1 - Protecting open land & avoiding unnecessary development

RCE2 - Landscape character

RCE8 - Landscape design

RCE11 - Buildings of special interest

RCE12 – Design & local distinctiveness

RH1 - New housing

RH2 - Social housing

**Representations:**

14 letters of objection were received in relation to the original scheme. Ten of these were passed on by a Local Deputy. Most are of a standard format and are submitted by residents of La Nouvelle Maraitaine.

The grounds for objection can be summarised as:

1. the field is a “green lung” in an area which is heavily developed. It is used for agriculture and is a haven for wild life and flowers, including orchids;
2. the development would become a “ghetto” and the site is unsuitable for autistic people. The mix of elderly, disabled and autistic people would be inappropriate. Existing residents of La Nouvelle Maraitaine are anxious about the proposed facility. A site closer to amenities and accessible to St Peter Port would be preferable;
3. the proposal would affect the outlook from La Nouvelle Maraitaine and would result in a devaluation of property;
4. if it is not possible to resist the principle of developing this area, consideration should be given to scaling back the plans. This might involve a larger community garden to the south of the site, fewer units limited to single storey and with larger gardens and more extensive planting;
5. concern about the health effects of dust resulting from building operations.

Reference is made to the publicity provided at the time of the submission of the outline planning application and questioning whether this was adequate. Concern is also expressed that the GHA did not inform its own tenants/partial owners of the application.

In addition, a separate representation has asked that the application be considered at an Open Planning Meeting, held at the Vale Douzaine Room.

Following the receipt of the revised scheme, two of the original objectors have re-iterated their objections to building on this field. It has been suggested again that to mix elderly people with those with autism is inappropriate. There is reference to other developments in the area and it is suggested that, "the Vale has been built on enough". It is suggested that the field is a valuable resource for flora, fauna and amphibian wildlife and it is questioned whether it is suitable for building in view of its wet nature. The impact on the water table in the area is also questioned.

Letters from the Chairman of Autism Guernsey and from the Chair of the Parent Carer Council of Guernsey have been received in support of the application. The latter suggests that the location of the Autism unit adjacent to the extra care housing at La Nouvelle Maraitaine would ensure not only a purpose built unit but one close to a supportive and caring community into which they can be fully integrated. The current practice of sending people with learning disabilities and/or autism to the UK has been unsatisfactory and expensive. The new development would allow people off Island to return to bespoke accommodation individually designed for the user and with appropriate support. It has the potential to bring families back together, deliver better outcomes for Islanders with ASD, provide cost savings and integrate residents back into the community.

One further letter of representation has been received from a Deputy expressing concern about the apparent delay in determining the application and the impact on prospective residents.

#### **Consultations:**

##### **Traffic Services Unit (original scheme):**

I advise that an access should: -

- a) Enable a driver 2.0m from the edge of the carriageway to see a minimum of 20m in the direction of oncoming traffic;
- b) Not have any obstructions or planting greater than 900mm high above the road surface within the visibility splays;
- c) Have sufficient width to enable cars and light vehicles to exit and enter the drive without crossing into the path of vehicles on the opposite side of the carriageway;
- d) Be square to the carriageway;
- e) Be sited at a distance not less than 20m from a junction.

A site visit has been undertaken by a Traffic Services Officer and the following observations have been made as a result.

I refer to our previous response of October 2015, a copy of which is attached for your information. At that time, the Traffic Services Unit supported the proposal to create a new access adjoining the Courtil Le Clement access roadway on the basis that the existing field



access adjoining La Grande Rue was retained for emergency access only and that appropriate measures were taken to ensure that no vehicles were permitted to park within the visibility splay that would be observed by a driver exiting from the new access onto Courtil Le Clement access roadway.

The supplied plans indicate that it is proposed to retain the existing field access solely as a pedestrian access to the development, by the installation of a bollard; this measure would be acceptable and would overcome previous concerns that this access would possibly be retained as a vehicular access point. The TSU would recommend however that a physical measure such as a bollard or raised kerb is put in place so as to prevent any vehicle reversing into this area (shown as minibus parking on supplied plans) placing pedestrians who are using this access point, at risk.

The parking provision would appear to be commensurate with a development of this scale and nature, and the internal roadway layout would provide adequate two way access - albeit it is a shared surface at a mid-point between the Autism Accommodation and General Needs areas. The access adjoining Courtil Le Clement access roadway has adequate radii so as to provide good access/egress in both directions, and the supplied plans show that the sightline in both directions would meet the minimum distance requirements.

The proposal to provide a dedicated pedestrian route from within the development as well as the rear of Units 4 – 8 of the Autism Accommodation, that links with the existing Courtil Le Clement footpath and onwards to the public footpath, is welcomed by the TSU; likewise a pedestrian footway that connects the Community Green area to the western side of the new development and the Autism Accommodation's Terrace area is a welcome feature as it removes the need for residents, particularly of the Autism Accommodation, to use the shared surface area of the internal roadway and thus reduces potential vehicle/pedestrian conflicts.

It is noted from the supplied plans that the Courtil Le Clement access roadway has been retained at its current width, however no detail has been provided as to whether parking restrictions are intended, as suggested in our previous response, so as to ensure that the sightline in the direction of oncoming traffic observed from the new access, is not compromised; accordingly the TSU would strongly recommend that this measure is given serious consideration.

### **Summary**

Overall, the proposed access would potentially meet with Engineering Guidelines in terms of bell mouth radii and two way access width with a shared surface within specific areas of the proposed development site. The parking provision would appear commensurate with a development of this scale and nature and the layout appears to be satisfactory from a traffic flow perspective, with turning points being provided at strategic points.

The potential for sub-standard sightlines onto the Courtil Le Clement access roadway can be addressed by ensuring no vehicles are parked on the western side of the access roadway as previously identified.

Given the above observations, the Traffic Services Unit considers that no Traffic related grounds exist on which to oppose the application in its current form. This would however be conditional on measures being taken to ensure that no vehicle parking is permitted within the visibility splay of a driver exiting the proposed access adjoining Courtil Le Clement.

Traffic & Highway Services (revised scheme):

I advise that an access should: -

- a) Enable a driver 2.0m from the edge of the carriageway to see a minimum of 20m in the direction of oncoming traffic;
- b) Not have any obstructions or planting greater than 900mm high above the road surface within the visibility splays;
- c) Have sufficient width to enable cars and light vehicles to exit and enter the drive without crossing into the path of vehicles on the opposite side of the carriageway;
- d) Be square to the carriageway;
- e) Be sited at a distance not less than 20m from a junction.

The former Traffic Services Unit commented in detail in October 2015 and January 2016, regarding proposed residential development at this site. The latest revised plans take account of concerns raised with regard to the vehicular use of the field access adjoining La Grande Rue (through its removal) and also a yellow No Stopping line has been installed along the access road adjacent to the site which should help the need to ensure adequate visibility when drivers exit Le Vieux Jardin.

The development access road, sightlines and parking provision are all considered appropriate for proposals of this scale and type. In addition, the sightlines observed where the Nouvelle Maraitaine access road adjoins Maraitaine Road and access design at this point are deemed to be acceptable. However, it is considered that there would be benefit in an extension of the footpath paving from Unit 12 around the western side of that building. This would be to improve a pedestrian route around the site and enable pedestrians to walk off of the parking court.

Taking into account the above, there no traffic management grounds to oppose the application and no significant road safety concerns. However, Traffic and Highway Services would welcome if consideration could be given to an extension of paving as described above.

Environmental Health Department:

I have reviewed the proposed plans for the erection of a number of residential units and I have concerns regarding potentially contaminated land. Taking into account the historic use of the site there are indications that this area of land is potentially contaminated. Historic mapping shows that in both 1938 and 1979 several glass houses existed on the site. It is clear from the plans that the proposed dwellings will include gardens, where, if occupants choose, they could grow consumable fruit and vegetables. Further investigation is required into potential contaminants using the source, pathway, receptor model. I would refer the applicant to <https://www.gov.uk/contaminated-land> where there is a wealth of information available.

I recommend that the following phased condition be applied to the consent (**please note this is one condition with multiple sub-sections**):

1. (i) No works pursuant to this permission shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Environment Department: (A desktop study shall be the very minimum standard accepted. Pending the results of the desk top study, the applicant may have to satisfy the requirements of b and c below, however, this will all be confirmed in writing).

- (i) (a) A desktop study documenting all the previous and existing land uses of the site and adjacent land in accordance with national guidance as set out in Contaminated land Research Report Nos. 2 and 3 and BS10175:2001 - Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites - Code of Practice;

**and** unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Environment Department,

- (i) (b) a site investigation report documenting the ground conditions of the site and incorporating chemical and gas analysis identified as appropriate by the desk top study in accordance with BS10175;

**and**, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Environment Department,

- (i) (c) a detailed scheme for remedial works and measures to be undertaken to avoid risk from contaminants and/or gases when the site is developed and proposals for future maintenance and monitoring. Such scheme shall include nomination of a competent person to oversee the implementation of the works.

(ii) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied or brought into use until there has been submitted to the Environment Department verification by a competent person approved under the provisions of condition (i)c that any remediation scheme required and approved under the provisions of condition (i)c has been implemented fully in accordance with the approved details (unless varied with the written agreement of the Environment Department in advance of implementation). Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority such verification shall comprise:

- (ii) a) as built drawings of the implemented scheme;
  - (ii) b) photographs of the remediation works in progress;
  - (ii) c) certificates demonstrating that imported and/or material left in situ is free from contamination.

Thereafter the scheme shall be monitored and maintained in accordance with the scheme approved under condition (i) c.”

#### **Informatives/Advice Notes**

The phased risk assessment should be carried out also in accordance with the procedural guidance and UK policy.

The site is known to be or suspected to be contaminated. Please be aware that the responsibility for the safe development and secure occupancy of the site rests with the developer.

It is strongly recommended that in submitting details in accordance with the above/below conditions that the applicant has reference to CLR 11, Model Procedures for the management of land contamination. This is available online as a pdf document on both the DEFRA website ([www.defra.gov.uk](http://www.defra.gov.uk)) and the Environment Agency ([www.environment-agency.gov.uk](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk)) website.

I strongly advise the applicant to contact a contaminated land consultant.

States Archaeologist:

There is some potential for the survival of archaeological deposits on the site, particularly in the southern third of the field, which did not previously have greenhouses on it. We would welcome the opportunity to excavate a couple of small (2m x 2m) test-pits in this part of the field, to assess any possible archaeological remains. This work could be done at relatively short notice and should only occupy a few days. We would be grateful if you would consider informing the applicant of our wishes.

Summary of Issues:

The main issues in deciding this reserved matters application are:

1. the impact of the development on the appearance and character of the area and whether the proposal would result in a satisfactory living environment;
  2. the impact of the development on the setting of the adjoining protected building;
  3. the impact of the development on the amenity of people living in the area; and
  4. parking and access issues,
- taking into account the policies set out above.

Although comments have been received from Environmental Heath and the States Archaeologist about contaminated land and archaeology respectively, these matters were not raised at the outline application stage. As such, it would be unreasonable to impose limitations in relation to these matters at this stage. The issues raised will be drawn to the attention of the applicants as part of any decision to grant planning permission.

However, in relation to potential contamination, the glasshouses on the northern part of the site were derelict and unused by 1979 so almost 40 years has elapsed since their last use. The area occupied by the glasshouses would accommodate one bedroom flats. The outside areas provide amenity to the flats but would not be used as gardens in the normal sense of the word.

Assessment against:

**1 - Purposes of the law.**

The objectives of the Law, as set out in Section 1(2), have been considered and this forms part of the assessment of policy issues set out in 2 below.

## **2 - Relevant policies of any Plan, Subject Plan or Local Planning Brief.**

This is an application for the approval of matters reserved by the outline planning permission granted in November 2015. The outline planning permission establishes the principle of social housing on this site. Section 18(1) of the Land Planning and Development (General Provisions) Ordinance, 2007, prevents refusal of an application for approval of reserved matters *on grounds which go to the principle of the development for which outline permission was granted*. As such, **it is only details of the siting, design and external appearance of the proposed buildings, the means of access thereto and the landscaping of the site which can be considered in deciding this application.**

The Planning & Design Statement submitted to support the outline application has been revised to accommodate the detailed proposals. However, the design principles agreed at the outline stage remain unchanged.

### Impact on the appearance and character of the area and whether the proposal would result in a satisfactory living environment

Policy RCE1 of the Rural Area Plan (RAP) seeks to protect and enhance the open and undeveloped character of the rural area and to restrain development. However, the policy accepts that some forms of development may necessarily require a rural location such as those associated with agriculture, horticulture, extensions to existing rural tourist facilities and outdoor recreation. In addition, specific reference is made to the possibility of social housing in accordance with policy RH2 of the RAP.

Policy RH1 of the RAP deals with new housing. The supporting text indicates that new build housing *will not be permitted unless the proposal fully satisfies the provisions of policy RH2*. The policy indicates that new residential development will be permitted only where:

- *the site is suitable having regard to the existing characteristics of the site and its relationship with the surrounding area; and*
- *the development is acceptable in terms of siting, design, scale, massing, amenity and provision of a satisfactory living environment.*

The outline planning permission was granted in accordance with the provisions of policy RH2. This states:

*Proposals for the erection of social housing will only be permitted where:*

- a) the site is suitable, having regard to its characteristics and neighbouring land-uses and is, or can be, integrated into the existing built environment;*
- b) the site is within or would round off existing State-controlled housing or is well related to one of the designated Rural Centres;*
- c) the development would be of a scale and design appropriate to the rural setting; and,*
- d) adequate provision is made for the protection of the rural character of the site and appropriate measures for the general environmental enhancement of the locality.*

*The erection of new housing in Areas of High Landscape Quality will not be permitted.*

When determining the outline application, it was concluded that the requirements of criteria a) and b) were met. As the principle of development was acceptable under policy RH2, the same conclusion applied to the principle of development under the requirements of policies RH1 and RCE1.

**The decision to be made in this case is whether the details of the siting, design and external appearance of the proposed buildings, the means of access thereto and the landscaping of the site as proposed in this application are acceptable.**

The requirements of criteria c) and d) above are therefore of relevance to the determination of the current application.

There are similar requirements and objectives included in the RAP, notably in policies RGEN6 and RCE12 dealing with design, RGEN3, RGEN5 and RCE2 which seek to respect the character, including landscape character, of an area, and RCE8 which promotes landscape design.

The application is accompanied by a Planning & Design Statement (PDS), including an Addendum to address the revised scheme. The submitted scheme is intended to provide a transition between the large contemporary style buildings comprising La Nouvelle Maraitaine and the predominantly rural character of the land to the west of La Grande Rue. The buildings are intended to be more domestic in scale and character and *take cues from the local vernacular to retain the general character of the area*. The scheme is intended to replicate the courtyard form of La Nouvelle Maraitaine and Courtil le Clement, while the housing fronting La Grande Rue would have a similar building line to existing development. There is a similar design theme to both the Autism unit and individual dwellings to ensure it appears as a unified development.

The proposed Autism unit has been very carefully designed to provide the very specialised and unique accommodation required to meet the general needs of those with autism. This has presented significant design challenges.

The design principles adopted in the PDS are considered appropriate for the development of this site. However, in considering the original scheme, a number of design concerns were identified:

1. the adequacy of the proposed landscape buffer along La Grande Rue and the impact of the development on the protected trees;
2. the access arrangement to La Grande Rue and generally the provision to be made for pedestrians;
3. whether the scheme would have a satisfactory street presence to both La Grande Rue and Courtil le Clement; and
4. the hard appearance of the development and whether it would represent a satisfactory transition from La Nouvelle Maraitaine to the more rural areas to the west.

The existing planting along the frontage to La Grande Rue makes a significant contribution to the rural character of the area. The retention and strengthening of this landscape buffer is considered key to satisfactorily assimilating any development of the application site into its surroundings. The submitted landscaping scheme indicates that the existing planting along La Grande Rue would be retained and strengthened, where necessary, by new planting.

The scheme has been revised to include greater separation between the flats in the north-western part of the site and this planting with a footway being included to the front of the flats. There is some concern that the proposed Autism unit would be unduly close to the trees in this area. However, the space outside each of the flats would not be used as gardens in the normal way and residents would be allocated flats according to their individual needs. The Autism unit includes an enclosed central area and sensory garden designed as a communal space for residents.

The revised scheme limits access to La Grande Rue to a footway only using the existing field access and thus reducing the impact on the landscape buffer. The arrangements for pedestrian access through the site are improved and this includes a clearer definition of the areas of hard surface shared by both drivers and pedestrians. There is a clear pedestrian route to the proposed Autism unit.

The changes to the original scheme emphasise the fact that the flats in the north-western part of the site would face towards La Grande Rue, while the building comprising the Autism unit would be seen as part of the street scene to La Grande Rue, albeit screened to some degree by the frontage planting.

The area of car parking fronting Courtil le Clement would not create a presence to the street. However, its visual impact would be reduced by the presence of the existing doulit, grass verge and planting.

The revised scheme includes an area of open space in the north-west corner of the site and introduces a footway to the front of the flats to its south. The submitted landscaping scheme confirms retention of existing planting and significant areas of tree and hedge planting. These changes all help to soften the appearance of the development.

The design reflects that of La Nouvelle Maraitaine but the design concept is more domestic in feel. The form and mass of buildings are designed to ensure that their height reduces towards La Grande Rue from where they appear as largely single storey.

Taking into account the nature of the development, which is designed to meet particular requirements for social housing, it is considered that the proposal would meet the objective of policy RH2 to meet a range of housing needs in different parts of the Island. The development would be of a scale and design appropriate to its location adjoining both La Nouvelle Maraitaine and the older area of housing grouped to the north. The proposal provides for the retention of existing planting in and around the site as well as new planting to supplement this. As such, in the context of residential development of this site, it provides for protection of the rural character of the site and for environmental improvement.

The proposal satisfies the provisions of policy RH2.

Policy RH1 also requires new development to provide an adequate level of amenity and a satisfactory living environment for new residents. The new flats and Autism unit are purposely designed to meet the requirements for specific types of social housing. The characteristics and amenity associated with the units have been based on the knowledge and experience of the applicants and considerable research into the best way to provide housing for people with autism. There is nothing to suggest that the new units would not provide a reasonable level of amenity and a satisfactory living environment.

#### Impact on the setting of the adjoining protected building

Shamrock Cottage to the north-west is a protected building. There is a statutory duty to have regard to the desirability of preserving and enhancing the special interest and setting of Protected Buildings. There is a strong presumption against planning permission being granted for any development that adversely affects its special character or features. These duties are reflected in Policy RCE11 of the Rural Area Plan.

Shamrock Cottage is a 1½ storey cottage with accommodation in the roof space fronting onto La Grande Rue. It is separated from the application site by a bank and planting.

The new dwellings to be located in the north-western part of the site would be set on a similar building line to Shamrock Cottage, would have a similar form and mass and would front onto La Grande Rue. The scheme includes a planted area separating the new dwellings from the protected building. The new dwellings to the east would be separated from the protected building by the existing garage. For these reasons, and taking into account existing planting, the proposed development would have little impact on the setting of the protected building.

#### Impact on the amenity of people living in the area

There are existing dwellings on each side of the field. Policy RGEN11 of the RAP seeks to protect the reasonable amenity of neighbours.

Taking into account the scale and mass of La Nouvelle Maraitaine and the road in between, the physical impact of the new development on the amenities of the existing flats would not be significant. There is scope for overlooking but this would be more from the existing flats over the new development.

The closest house to the north-east of the site is positioned gable end on to the site. The closest flat to this dwelling would be about 10 metres away and separated by a planted area and douit. The gable to the nearest flat would contain a first floor window, which would look towards the side of the nearest house to the east. However, its position is such that there would be limited potential for overlooking.

A terrace to the first floor flat would allow for some potential overlooking, although this would be over the front garden of the adjoining houses and down the road.



Shamrock Cottage, the adjoining cottage to the north-west, is positioned gable end on to the site. The nearest flats to the south would be over 12 metres away separated by a planted area and the drive to the cottage. A first floor gable window is included in the nearest flat, providing the potential for overlooking particularly as there is a glazed extension to the cottage. However, the limited size of the window, the intervening distance and the presence of existing and proposed planting all reduce the potential impact.

The flats to the east contain first floor accommodation and face towards the gardens of the two adjoining dwellings to the north. However, first floor openings on this side are limited to roof lights, two of which would serve corridors with the two others being tucked into the corners of the living areas. This would limit any potential overlooking of these gardens.

Taking into account the relationship between the new and existing buildings, there would be no undue loss of outlook from those existing. Existing planting and the relatively low height of buildings on the northern side would also reduce the impact on the outlook from these gardens.

The impact of the development on neighbours would not be significant and the proposal meets the requirements of policy RGEN11.

#### Parking and access issues

A new vehicular access to serve the development would be constructed from Courtil le Clement. Traffic & Highway Services consider this to be satisfactory. There is a footway serving the Autism unit. Beyond this, the road becomes a shared surface with a rumble strip included to mark this change. There are pedestrian links to the west, south and east. Access into, through and from the site is satisfactory for the purposes of policy RGEN7 of the RAP.

The revised scheme provides for 20 parking spaces to serve the 20 flats (all one bedroom) and 8 spaces and a minibus space to serve the Autism unit. Traffic & Highway Services consider this provision to be satisfactory and sufficient to meet the requirements of policy RGEN8 of the RAP.

The suggestion made by THS that there should be an extension of footway on the western side of Unit 12 is noted. However, this change would be at odds with the general concept of the parking and access arrangements in this area, which are in the form of a shared surface. As such, this change is not required by planning condition.

### **3 - General material considerations set out in the General Provisions Ordinance.**

The matters to be considered under Section 13 of the Land Planning and Development (General Provisions) Ordinance 2007 have been assessed as part of the section dealing with policy issues set out in 2 above.

The representations received by the Department refer to a number of issues which cannot influence the planning decision on this application:

- (i) the principle of developing this site for social housing has been established by the grant of planning permission. The type of social housing considered appropriate for this site is a matter for the Housing Department and Guernsey Housing Association. However, for the purposes of policy RH2 of the Rural Area Plan, there are clear links between the proposed housing and the existing at La Nouvelle Maraitaine with a shared use of facilities and staffing associated with the latter;
- (ii) devaluation of property is not a material planning consideration. Almost every decision has some impact on property values;
- (iii) similarly building operations are a consequence of any planning decision authorising new buildings. Potential health effects cannot be a material consideration except in very exceptional circumstances.

In addition, despite reference to the application site being a haven for wildlife, the field is not a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and there is no evidence of it having any special wildlife interest.

Although complaints have been made about the publicity given to the outline planning application, the evidence suggests that it was the subject of a notice displayed in two locations and the legal requirements were fully met. Any communication between the GHA and the residents of La Nouvelle Maraitaine is not a planning matter.

#### **4 - Additional considerations (for protected trees, monuments, buildings and/or SSS's).**

The proposal would have no impact on protected trees or sites. The impact on the setting of the adjoining protected building is considered in section 2 above.

**Date:** 18 July 2016



**PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT**

**Application No:** FULL/2016/0001  
**Property Ref:** B003540000  
**Valid date:** 18/02/2016  
**Location:** Longue Hougue Reclamation Site Bulwer Avenue St. Sampson Guernsey  
**Proposal:** Erect a waste transfer station building, with associated hardstanding for up to 180 shipping containers and ancillary plant including a 20 metre high chimney, two weighbridges, fire water tank and pump house, electricity sub-station and fuel storage area. Erect a facilities building. Construct a Household Waste Recycling Centre. Construct associated roads and parking and a bund along the southern site boundary (Environmental Impact Assessment development).  
**Applicant:** States Trading Assets

**RECOMMENDATION - Grant: Planning Permission with Conditions:**

---

1. All development authorised by this permission must be carried out and must be completed in every detail in accordance with the written application, plans and drawings referred to above. No variations to such development amounting to development may be made without the permission of the Authority under the Law.

Reason - To ensure that it is clear that permission is only granted for the development to which the application relates.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within 3 years from the date of grant of this permission.

Reason - This condition reflects section 18(1) of the Land Planning and Development (Guernsey) Law, 2005 which states that planning permission ceases to have effect unless development is commenced within 3 years of the date of grant (or such shorter period as may be specified in the permission).

3. The development hereby permitted and all the operations which constitute or are incidental to that development must be carried out in compliance with all such requirements of The Building (Guernsey) Regulations, 2012 as are applicable to them, and no operation to which such a requirement applies may be commenced or continued unless (i) plans relating to that operation have been approved by the Authority and (ii) it is commenced or, as the case may be, continued, in accordance with that requirement and any further requirements imposed by the Authority when approving those plans, for the purpose of securing that the building regulations are complied with.

Reason - Any planning permission granted under the Law is subject to this condition as stated in section 17(2) of the Land Planning and Development (Guernsey) Law, 2005.

4. No development, including demolition and site works, shall begin until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Authority. The plan must demonstrate the adoption and use of the best practicable means to reduce the effects of noise, vibration, dust and site lighting during the construction process. The CEMP shall include the following information:

- Arrangements for waste management and disposal, including demolished and/or excavated material;
- Hours during which demolition and building works would be carried out;
- Site lighting and light pollution control;
- Measures for dust prevention and management;
- Construction phasing; and
- A detailed noise and vibration management plan.

The construction works shall be carried out only in accordance with the agreed CEMP.

Reason - The site occupies a prominent, exposed position and routes to the site are through residential areas. A limit on the use is needed to prevent a nuisance or annoyance to nearby residents and the local amenity.

5. No development, excluding demolition and site works, shall begin until such time as a scheme to provide a footway and cycleway from the junction of Bulwer Avenue and Longue Hougue to the application site has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Authority.

Reason - The provision of a new footway and cycleway is included as part of the proposal in order to mitigate potential significant effects of the development. It would provide a safe route associated with the increased pedestrian footfall and cyclists on the site access road resulting from development.

6. No part of the development, hereby permitted, shall be occupied or used until such time as the footway/cycleway required under the above condition has been fully completed in accordance with the agreed scheme.

Reason - The provision of a new footway and cycleway is included as part of the proposal in order to mitigate potential significant effects of the development. It would provide a safe route associated with the increased pedestrian footfall and cyclists on the site access road resulting from development.

7. No development, excluding demolition and site works, shall begin until a landscaping scheme, to include those details specified below, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Authority:

- i) the treatment proposed for all ground surfaces, including hard areas;
- ii) full details of tree and hedge planting;
- iii) planting schedules, noting the species, sizes, numbers and densities of plants;
- iv) finished levels or contours;
- v) any screen walls or similar structures;
- vi) any other structures to be erected or constructed;
- vii) functional services above and below ground; and
- viii) all existing trees, hedges and other landscape features, indicating clearly those to be removed.

Reason - To make sure that a satisfactory landscaping scheme for the development is agreed, in order to help assimilate the development into its surroundings.

8. The landscaping scheme shall be fully completed, in accordance with the details agreed under the terms of the above condition, in the first planting season following the first occupation of any part of the development or completion of development whichever is the sooner, or in accordance with a programme previously agreed in writing by the Authority. Any trees or plants removed, dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased, within 15 years of planting shall be replaced in the following planting season by trees or plants of a size and species similar to those originally required to be planted.

Reason - To make sure that the appearance of the completed development is satisfactory and to help assimilate the development into its surroundings.

9. No building on the site shall be used or occupied until a landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Authority. The agreed landscape management plan shall then be fully implemented.

Reason - To make sure that the appearance of the completed development is satisfactory and to help assimilate the development into its surroundings.

10. No development, excluding demolition and site works, shall begin until an ecological mitigation strategy has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Authority. The works shall be carried out on site only in accordance with the agreed strategy.

Reason - To make sure that important features of ecological interest are protected and satisfactory mitigation is completed.

11. No building or facility on the site shall be first used until an ecological management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all areas of ecological interest, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Authority. The agreed ecological management plan shall then be fully implemented.

Reason - To make sure that important features of ecological interest are protected and maintained into the future and satisfactory mitigation is provided.

12. No materials to be used on the exterior of the buildings shall be placed on the site until such time as samples of those materials have been submitted to the Authority. Only materials agreed in writing by the Authority shall be used in carrying out the development.

Reason - To secure the satisfactory appearance of the completed development.

13. No development shall begin on the construction of the waste transfer station until sections at not less than 1:20 showing details of the eaves and verge treatment, including guttering and down pipes, and the plinth have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Authority. The works shall be carried out only incorporating the agreed details.

Reason - To secure the satisfactory appearance of the completed development.

14. No part of the development, hereby permitted, shall be occupied or used until details of all external lighting proposed for the site have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Authority. Any lighting to be installed shall only be in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason - To make sure the level of lighting is not excessive in order to secure a sustainable form of development and one which does not appear unduly prominent in this exposed location.

15. No development, excluding demolition and site works, shall begin on site until a scheme for the treatment of the application site boundaries has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Authority. No use or occupation of the buildings or other facilities hereby permitted shall begin until the agreed scheme for boundary treatment has been fully completed.

Reason - To secure the satisfactory appearance of the completed development.

16. Except in exceptional circumstances resulting from incidents such as equipment breakdowns, severe weather, or tidal constraints, the receipt of waste and operation of the Waste Transfer Station shall be limited to between 0600 hours and 1500 hours on Mondays to Fridays and between 0600 hours and 1300 hours on Saturdays.

Reason - To limit the period of activity to that necessary to ensure a viable operation, thus mitigating any loss of amenity to local residents and to the area in general.

17. Except in exceptional circumstances resulting from incidents such as equipment breakdowns, severe weather, or tidal constraints, the receipt of waste at the Household Waste Recycling Centre shall be limited to the following:

In the Winter (1 November - 31 March) between 0730 hours and 1800 hours on Mondays to Fridays and between 0900 hours and 1600 hours on Saturdays, Sundays and Public Holidays;

In the Summer (1 April - 31 October) between 0730 hours and 2000 hours on Mondays to Fridays and between 0800 hours and 1700 hours on Saturdays, Sundays and Public Holidays.

The total hours of opening in any week shall not exceed 55. Lighting on the site shall not be operated for periods more than 30 minutes before or 30 minutes after the site is closed to the public.

Reason - To limit the period of activity to that necessary to ensure a viable operation, thus mitigating any loss of amenity to local residents and to the area in general.

18. No part of the development, hereby permitted, shall be occupied or used until such time as the land on the seaward side of the proposed flood bund has been laid out and surfaced in a manner previously agreed in writing by the Authority.

Reason - To provide for the possibility of extending the coastal path around the perimeter of the application site and, in the future, the remaining land being reclaimed.

19. No development shall begin on the construction of the Household Waste Recycling Centre until full details of its layout and design have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Authority. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason - The information provided with the application does not include full details of this element of the proposed development. This condition is imposed to make sure that the Centre is of satisfactory design and does not have any adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.

20. No development on the construction of the facilities building or weighbridge kiosk shall begin until details of the solar panels to be included on their roofs have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Authority. The agreed panels shall be installed before either building is first used.

Reason - The information provided with the application does not include full details of the proposed features. This condition is imposed to make sure that solar panels are provided, in accordance with the requirements of the Development Brief relating to the need for sustainable design features

## **INFORMATIVES**

For the purposes of condition 7, any detailed landscaping scheme should be based upon that already submitted and the associated landscape strategy.

However, it is suggested that the relevant parts of the enclosed comments received from La Société Guernesiale and the Environmental Services Unit are fully considered.

When considering an ecological mitigation strategy for the purposes of condition 10, it is suggested that the relevant parts of the enclosed comments received from La Société Guernesiale and the Environmental Services Unit are fully considered.

The enclosed comments of the Environmental Services Unit regarding potential leaching should be fully considered when formulating detailed plans for drainage of the proposed development. Similarly, the enclosed comments of Guernsey Water, particularly in relation to the quality of wastewater, must be fully considered.

---

## **OFFICER'S REPORT**

### **Site Description:**

The application site comprises an area of 4.3 hectares. It is part of an area of reclaimed land, with operations continuing on land to the north, which extends eastwards out into the sea to the south of St Sampson's harbour. The site is flat but is contained by a bund on the seaward site giving protection against tidal flooding. It contains a temporary Household Waste Recycling Centre.

The incinerator and slaughterhouse buildings are located in the south-west corner of the site. There is industrial development on adjoining land to the north-west.

The site is within a Key Industrial Area (KIA) and the Harbour Area. It is outside the Settlement Area.

The application site covers most of the area for which a Development Brief – *Longue Hougue South Industrial and Reclamation Area* - has been prepared. This was approved in October 2009.

The conservation area based on St Sampson's harbour is to the north and west of the site, but some distance away. The setting of a number of protected monuments, notably Vale Castle and Mont Crevelt, would be affected by the proposed development.

#### **Relevant History:**

2012/1628	09/07/2012	Permission for Reconfiguration of existing recycling facility including erection of covered storage units
2011/3253	19/12/2011	Permission to Construct new slaughterhouse adjacent to existing incinerator, with security fenced compounds
2010/0148	09/03/2010	Withdrawn - New residual waste treatment facility
1996/4259	22/10/1996	No objections to application to Erect building to house cattle incinerator (revised)

#### **Existing Use(s):**

Reclaimed area, part of which contains a temporary Household Waste Recycling Centre.

#### **Brief Description of Development:**

The application seeks planning permission to:

1. erect a building 80 by 40 metres with a height to ridge of 10.5 metres to include:
  - a refuse-derived fuel (RDF) facility capable of handling up to 26,000 tonnes per annum;
  - a glass recycling facility capable of handling up to 2,500 tonnes per annum; and
  - a food processing plant capable of handling up to 4,000 tonnes per annum;
2. erect a facilities building 14 by 10 metres with a height to ridge of 13.5 metres to accommodate staff facilities and a site manager's office;
3. provide a replacement Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) to include:
  - a raised hardstanding incorporating up to 12 skip bays;
  - a portakabin for site staff; and
  - a repair and re-use dry storage area;
4. construct an external hard standing capable of accommodating up to 180 shipping containers stacked a maximum of 3 high;
5. erect a chimney stack 3 metres in diameter and 20 metres high;
6. construct two weighbridges, a fire water tank and pump house, an electricity sub-station, a diesel fuel storage tank and associated roads and car parking.



The design of the main building as originally proposed included a steel portal frame with dark grey metal cladding while the facilities building was to be of modular (portakabin) design finished in dark grey.

Construction work is due to begin in early 2017 and completion is projected to take about 13 months.

The core hours of operation would be:

Activity	Proposed Hours of Operation
Receipt of waste and operation of the Waste Transfer Station	0615 – 1430 Monday to Friday and 0615 – 1030 on Saturdays
	Winter (1 Nov – 31 Mar): 0730 – 1600 Monday to Friday and 0900 – 1300 on Saturday, Sunday and Bank Holidays Summer (1 April – 31 Oct): 0730 – 1600 Monday to Friday and 0800 – 1700 on Saturday, Sunday and Bank Holidays

However, it is indicated that, under certain, unusual circumstances, such as equipment breakdowns, severe weather, or tidal constraints, it may be necessary for the site to operate outside the hours set out above.

The application is accompanied by:

1. a comprehensive Environmental Statement (ES). This includes 15 chapters dealing with the following:
  - i. Introduction – This Chapter includes an overview of the proposed development, outlines the purpose of the ES and its structure.
  - ii. Proposed Development – This Chapter describes the need for the development, the alternatives considered and the various elements of the proposal. It also includes information about the construction works, its management and an indicative construction programme as well as information about the management of the facility once operational.
  - iii. Environmental Impact Assessment – This Chapter includes a table of environmental measures to be implemented to reduce any impact and describes the process of Environmental Impact Assessment which has been adopted.
  - iv. Planning Policy – This Chapter includes an overview of the planning policy against which the environmental effects of the proposal have been assessed. It makes reference to some documents, such as the States Strategic Plan and Strategic Land Use Plan which are not material planning considerations.
  - v. Land Quality – This Chapter provides an assessment of the potential land quality impacts during the construction and operation of the proposed facility. Where required, mitigation measures are identified to prevent, reduce and, where possible, off-set any potential adverse impacts that are identified to be of

significance. It concludes that predicted land quality effects to the various potential receptors during the construction and / or operational phase are considered to range from *negligible* to *'slight'* (worst case) and are therefore considered to be *'not significant'*.

- vi. Water Environment – This Chapter considers hydrology, hydrogeology, drainage and flood risk. A comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been carried out for the site and supplements this water environment ES chapter with full assessment of the risk, and recommendations for mitigation measures to reduce or remove the risk. The mitigation includes the creation of a tidal bund and the raising of finished floor levels 300mm above any determined flood levels that may be experienced on site.
- vii. Ecology – This Chapter assesses the potential likely significant effects of the proposed development on biodiversity. It concludes that the absence of semi-natural habitats on site significantly limits the potential for the site to support wildlife species. However, the site has potential to support breeding ringed plover and the proposal includes measures to provide for this.
- viii. Cultural Heritage – This Chapter assesses the impact of the proposal on Cultural Heritage which includes archaeology and historic buildings and structures. The area of study extends 1km from the application site boundary.  
As the application site comprises reclaimed land, the potential for disturbing archaeological remains is assessed as negligible.  
The ES makes particular reference to the impact of the proposal on Mont Crevelt Fort, the Parish Church of St Sampson's, Vale Castle, Delancey Battery, Vale Mill and the conservation area based on St Sampson's Harbour and concludes that any impact would not be significant.
- ix. Landscape & Visual – This Chapter provides an assessment of the potential landscape, townscape and visual effects of the proposal during the construction and operation phases. It identifies for study an area of 3km radius based on the application site boundary.  
The ES concludes that the effects of the proposal, both during construction and operation, on landscape elements and character types would not be significant. This is largely because the site is bordered by industrial development and the harbour area of St Sampson which contains built form of a comparable scale, form and materials. As such the operational development would represent a natural extension and continuation of this surrounding activity.  
The visual impact of the proposal is considered from 8 viewpoints and photomontages for each have been prepared. The impact is considered for both the construction and operation phases.
- x. Noise – This Chapter sets out the results of an assessment of the noise and vibration effects associated with the construction and operation of the proposed development. It concludes that no significant effects are predicted associated with the construction or operation of the proposed development.

xi. Air Quality – This Chapter reports the findings of an assessment of the potential effects of the development on air quality in the vicinity and the generation of odour. It considers:

- Road traffic emission due to construction vehicles during construction and operation;
- Emissions of dust during construction and operation;
- Emissions of odour during operation;
- Emissions of bio aerosols;
- Emissions of dust from crushed glass storage outside the building; and
- Emissions during fly ash transfer from barrels to dry powder tanker.

It concludes that the impact of the proposal in relation to these issues would not be significant.

xii. Traffic – This Chapter sets out the potential highways environmental effects arising from the proposed development. A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) has been completed as part of this work. As part of the proposed mitigation, it is indicated that a new section of footway will be provided along the site access road, connecting the existing provision with the site and this should be upgraded to include a cycleway too. A new coastal path will also be provided along the site boundary and bus stops will be provided on Bulwer Avenue (subject to agreement with bus operators). The conclusions of this Chapter are as follows:

*Where the assessment thresholds have been triggered and for the criteria that this assessment has considered; severance, driver delay, pedestrian delay, pedestrian amenity, fear and intimidation, accidents and safety, hazardous loads and construction; the negative transportation effects of the waste facility are not significant and the positive effects will benefit Guernsey. The island will be able to streamline its waste processes, handle a great quantity of recycled matter and minimise the quantity of waste passing to landfill.*

xiii. Socio-economics – This Chapter comprises an assessment of the socio-economic effects of the proposal. It concludes that, overall, after the adjustments, the estimated change in employment is expected to be very small, in the region of 5 additional jobs, a beneficial impact but not significant.

xiv. Cumulative Effects – This Chapter considers possible effects arising from:

- Whether any of the individual environmental effects of the proposed Longue Hougue Waste Facility development will combine to create a significant cumulative effect;
- How the effects from the proposed development could be combined with similar effects from other nearby comparable sites to result in significant cumulative effects; and
- How the effects from the proposed development could be combined with similar effects from other nearby development proposals to result in significant cumulative effects.

It concludes that any such effects would be not significant.

- xv. Summary of Effects – This Chapter identifies the predicted effects of the development judged to be “significant” as defined in the EIA Ordinance. It concludes that:

*The EIA completed for the application has found few effects that are considered to be significant and there have been positive effects identified including those associated with transportation, and employment opportunities, to the local area.*

For each topic, a broadly common format has been adopted. For most, this includes the following subsections:

- Introduction
- Context
- Assessment Approach
- Baseline Conditions
- Proposed Mitigation
- Assessment of Effects
- Summary of Predicted Effects
- Implementation of Mitigation Measures

2. Plans and Illustrations associated with the ES;
3. Appendices associated with the ES. These include the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA);
4. a supporting statement. The title refers to it being a Planning & Design Statement, but it does not contain any design analysis. It
  - describes the background to the application, the proposed development and the application site;
  - briefly refers to the issues considered in detail in the ES;
  - outlines the present position in relation to waste management in Guernsey; and
  - considers relevant planning policies; and
5. a Supplementary Design Statement. It is indicated that:  
*the purpose of this supplementary design statement therefore is to explicitly set out how the proposed development complies with the provisions of the extant Development Brief for Longue Hougue. In doing so, it will be explained how the proposed development has evolved. Importantly, this document outlines why the chosen design is considered to be the most appropriate for the site, and how this design complies with extant planning policy and associated supplementary guidance.*

It is indicated that the layout of the site has developed taking into account the following key considerations:

- *The area required for the works is kept to the minimum required whilst ensuring that operations and maintenance would not be constrained;*
- *Available land is used efficiently and sterile areas are not created,*
- *Site features and boundaries, and neighbouring facilities and features, including the adjacent abattoir, and the Development Proximity Zone (DPZ) relating to the nearby petrochemical storage facility; and the setting of the nearby Mont Crevelt and Vale Castle;*

- *The need to protect the site from potential wave over-topping;*
- *The need to screen / soften the visual effects of the proposed development from nearby sensitive receptors;*
- *The need to incorporate appropriate ecological mitigation into the overall scheme;*
- *The need for the overall design to reflect the site's coastal position – both in terms of structural durability and in a landscape context;*
- *Compliance with the Longue Hougue South Industrial and Reclamation Area Development Brief (Section 3 of this supplementary design document sets out further detail in this respect); and*
- *Environmental compliance in accordance with Waste Management Licensing.*

It describes the consultation carried out and how this has influenced the design and indicates that the landscape strategy: *has been developed to respond to a number of environmental opportunities and constraints, whilst aiming to create screening features that would reduce the visual effects experienced by local receptors.*

It refers to a lighting strategy to reduce lighting to that essential for security and effective operation of the site. It confirms that lighting would meet the thresholds in the *Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light* in relation to Environmental Zones 2.

The Statement identifies the policy objectives identified in the Development Brief and the Development Guidelines designed to meet these objectives. It then describes how the proposed development meets the principles identified in these Guidelines.

In relation to design issues, the Statement refers to Chapter 9 of the ES which addresses the Landscape & Visual impact of the proposal. It indicates that the design rationale underpinning the proposal is one of integration into the existing landscape so that the proposal would blend in with the existing industrial landscape and not detract from important historic features such as Mont Crevelt and Vale Castle.

The design rationale is considered in more detail in the section of the report addressing the Planning Assessment of the proposed development.

Consideration of the application was deferred in view of concerns about the design of the proposed development and, notwithstanding the significant supporting information, whether it would meet the requirements of the Development Brief. It was suggested that the proposal would not:

- achieve a good standard of architectural design;
- avoid the introduction of elements that would appear obtrusive or discordant;
- safeguard the setting of the conservation area and protected buildings and monuments;
- make a positive contribution to townscape quality;
- provide a satisfactory appearance when viewed from the sea;

- create a high quality innovative design or high quality, unified architectural concept; and
- include integrated sustainable design features

In addition, it was requested that a detailed landscaping scheme should be prepared to accompany the application.

In response, the design issues have been reconsidered, with input from a local architectural practice. A detailed landscaping scheme has been prepared with input from the Planning Service. In addition, a high level report considering the use of renewable energy at Longue Hougue and produced by Peter Barnes, Renewable Energy & Projects Officer, States of Guernsey, has been submitted.

A Design Appraisal has been prepared by local architects outlining the Site Context, considering the initial submission drawings, assessing the planning concerns, describing ways to improve the original proposals and setting out recommendations to take the matter forward. Following a more detailed site analysis, the Appraisal describes the Design Development leading to the revised scheme. The scheme is considered in views from Salerie Corner, the Cruise Liner Anchorage and Vale Castle.

The revised scheme retains the position, size and mass of the main building, but introduces design details to add interest and break up the building mass. This includes the use of:

- a rounded aluminium standing seam roof system with overhanging eaves and verges;
- matching bullnose gutter detailing;
- wall cladding and doors of different colours and texture; and
- a brick plinth projecting from the line of the cladding above;

A similar effect would be applied to the ancillary buildings, while the proposed chimney would comprise a simple circular shape clad in stainless steel. There are some changes to the size and design of the ancillary buildings as originally submitted, but these are minor in comparison to the overall scale of the proposal.

The original proposals have been revised in three other ways.

The manner in which residual waste would be exported has changed since the application was originally submitted, as the preferred bidder wishes to transfer baled material from Guernsey in four containers every weekday and Saturday mornings (instead of once every 4 weeks). The containers would be transferred to St Peter Port harbour in the same way as previously proposed. As a consequence, there would be a requirement to store only up to four containers on the Longue Hougue site at any given point, (instead of the 180 stacked 3 high as previously required). This change is an operational rather than a planning matter but would have two significant benefits:

- a significantly reduced requirement for the on-site storage of shipping containers (and the associated landscape and visual benefits this would have); and
- a considerable dilution of heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements required to transfer the baled waste from Longue Hougue to St Peter Port Harbour i.e. rather than the predicted average of 4 HGV's in and 4 HGV's out per hour, under the revised export arrangements, this would be per day. This more even distribution of

HGV movements would also have a positive effect in terms of distributing associated noise and air quality effects.

For these reasons, the agents conclude that this change would not fundamentally alter the relevant conclusions reached in the ES.

However, it should be borne in mind that the method of export could change in future. As such, the scheme retains the original large, open area for potential storage of containers should this be needed in the future.

The second change involves a proposal to increase the hours of opening of the HWRC from those originally specified. The original hours are outlined above as:

*Winter (1 Nov – 31 Mar): 0730 – 1600 Monday to Friday and 0900 – 1300 on Saturday, Sunday and Bank Holidays*

*Summer (1 April – 31 Oct): 0730 – 1600 Monday to Friday and 0800 – 1700 on Saturday, Sunday and Bank Holiday*

It is indicated that the operator now wishes to change these hours with the flexibility for the site to open up until 20:00 on one or two evenings per week. At this stage, it is unknown which evenings would be the best. The application is therefore seeking permission to allow opening between 07:30 - 20:00 on weekdays only (all year round), but limited to a maximum of 50 hours per week (the current civic amenity facility is open 55 hours per week and it is considered any reduction in current hours would not be reasonable). It is indicated that the site would **not** be managing any increased quantities of waste; rather the same quantities would be spread over longer hours for one or two days during the week.

The agents suggest that the assumptions in the ES were based upon a potential opening time of 20:00 in relation to noise. Although this was not the case in relation to traffic, it is suggested that traffic flows to the HWRC would be diluted as a result and would thus represent an improved position in traffic terms.

Although the agent's conclusions in relation to noise and traffic are generally accepted, they do not consider the visual impact of opening later in the evening. The need for lighting during the hours of darkness is likely to have a very significant visual impact in this exposed coastal position and extended Winter opening into the evening is not considered acceptable. As an alternative, the period of opening at weekends and Public Holidays during the Winter has been extended until 16:00.

The form and layout of the HWRC has changed from the original submission. Its position remains unchanged and householders would still drive up a ramp to dispose of materials in up to 15 skips positioned in a horse-shoe shape. However, a modular approach to construction is now to be adopted with the lower area under the ramp being available for storage. This is considered both cost effective and a more efficient use of the land. The agents suggest that the change is relatively minor and would not alter any of the conclusions reached in the ES. The latest landscaping scheme is based on this revised layout.

In addition, the agents have responded to some of the comments/issues raised by consultees.

In relation to the comments of the States Veterinary Officer, they correctly point out that matters of animal welfare are not controlled through the planning process. However, they state that, in relation to low frequency noises, if the proposed development can operate within acceptable limits for humans, it follows that it would not give rise to any low frequency noise nuisance to animals. In terms of higher frequency ranges, external noise generation would be limited to low frequency noises only. As such, it is not anticipated that animals would be affected by high frequency noise. The issue of noise through vehicle horns could be the subject of a warning sign.

In relation to air quality issues, the agents state that it is not anticipated that the site would generate bio aerosol. It is not expected that there would be any contamination affecting products of the abattoir. Emission levels are generally set by the waste management licence and this would describe any action necessary if there is any breach of its conditions.

The agents confirm that further screening of the abattoir could be provided if necessary.

In relation to comments made by Guernsey Water, the agents indicate that wastewater would be taken to the foul sewer. The operator would agree with Guernsey Water the acceptable quality of wastewater.

In relation to comments made by Environmental Health, the agents confirm that the assessment in relation to noise remains valid, despite the slight variation in construction hours in Guernsey.

In relation to comments made by La Société Guernesiaise, the agents have confirmed that the applicants would be happy to discuss the optimum number, position and type of bat and nest boxes. The landscape proposals are a conceptual scheme and subject to change to reflect the Guernsey environment.

#### **Relevant Policies of any Plan, Subject Plan or Local Planning Brief:**

##### Urban Area Plan

GEN1 - Sustainable development  
GEN2 – Comprehensive development  
GEN3 – Landscape, ecology and wildlife  
GEN5 – Design  
GEN6 - Character and amenity  
GEN7 - Roads and infrastructure  
GEN8 – Safe and convenient access  
GEN9 – Open space and parking  
GEN10 - Hazardous developments  
GEN12 – Effect on adjoining properties  
DBE1 – Design – General  
DBE4 – Landscape Design  
DBE6 - Skyline and public views  
DBE7 - New development in Conservation Areas  
DBE8 - Buildings of special interest  
DBE10 – Archaeological Remains  
EMP8 - Development of the land reclamation site



CO1 - New development outside the Settlement Areas  
CO3 - Landscape character  
WWM6 - Solid waste management  
ED1 - Essential Development

Longue Hougue South Development Brief

The ES makes reference to policies of the Rural Area Plan, the draft IDP and the Strategic Land Use Plan.

### **Representations:**

A letter has been received from the National Trust of Guernsey expressing concern about the visual impact of the development, particularly in views from the Little Russell, Salerie, North Beach, Delancey Park and Les Cotils. The views of the site are important for both Island residents and visitors approaching by sea.

The Trust notes the proposal to create a bund and walkway with tree planting, but expresses concern about the storage of shipping containers two and three high behind the main building. It is suggested that due consideration be given to the visual impact of the proposals, with specific attention to screening the area for the shipping containers or restricting the height to which they can be stacked but still screened.

The Trust notes that the building and high chimney will be difficult to conceal.

### **Consultations:**

Consultation has been carried out in relation to:

- whether the scoping of the ES was appropriate; and
- the planning merits of the application.

Where appropriate, both sets of comments have been included.

### **Chief Health & Safety Officer:**

Thank you for providing me with information about the above proposed development. As you are aware, extensive work was commissioned by the Health and Safety Executive to take into account the best scientific evidence now available in relation to land use planning around major accident hazard sites. The report prepared by the Health and Safety Laboratory has provided an up-to-date and site specific map of consultation zones around the relevant major accident hazard sites.

#### *Statutory advice (development in proximity of a major hazard site)*

The proposed development of the site falls both within the consultation inner and middle zones, with the main buildings in the middle zone. This means that HSE would not advise against the development as currently proposed.

#### *HSE advice (general health and safety at work)*

The HSE have concerns about the following aspects, which will require additional consideration by the developers at design stage, to ensure compliance with the principles of the Construction (Design and Management) Approved Code of Practice in designing out health and safety issues for the life of the site.

### 1. Container storage and movement

Consideration for a suitable container lifting system should be included in the design. A large number of containers are expected to be moved on a regular basis and this should be properly planned. An overhead container gantry crane or large mobile crane would be more suitable than fork-lift-type arrangements.

### 2. Traffic management on site

The developer should consider designing a one-way system to minimise reversing, where possible. In particular, where and how will the loading / unloading of containers take place? Could the location of the weighbridges be amended to allow vehicles to drive around the waste transfer station building?

### 3. Access at height

If access to the roof is anticipated (roof lights, extraction or plant located on the roof), design considerations to provide permanent safe access / egress, and edge protection / parapet should be included.

Commerce & Employment Department (Business): No reply received

### Commerce & Employment Department (States Veterinary Officer) – comments in relation to the request for a Scoping Opinion:

The comments below relate to issues that could negatively impact upon animal welfare and the safety of meat produced at the Guernsey Abattoir; aspects of its operation that are the responsibility of the States Vet.

As set out in Schedule 3, Scoping Options, it is the list of the principal emissions (d) which are likely to arise that are of main concern but a potential increase in pest species does not appear to have been considered.

In the comments below, areas for which further guidance will be valuable to assess fully the potential impacts of the WTS on the Abattoir, are shown in boxes.

### *Environmental Statement (ES) Chapters. Volume 1*

#### 10. Noise

Livestock have a higher frequency hearing range than humans (see table below).

Livestock are very sensitive to venting of high pressure gas and water from hoses and exposure to this can result in distress. Cattle are difficult and dangerous to handle and sudden loud noise in their hearing range can cause them to startle and panic which may create hazards for handlers.

Hearing Range		
Species	Lowest Frequency (Hz)	Highest Frequency (KHz)
Cattle	23	30
Sheep	125	30
Goats	78	37
Pig	42	40.5
Human	20	20

- Was noise over 20 KHz considered in the assessment?
- Was the production of sudden loud noise assessed in the hearing range of cattle?

- Can the use of motor vehicle traffic horns be restricted in this area on slaughter days?

### 11. Air Quality

It is the production of dust and the emission of fly ash, odour and bio-aerosols that could have a detrimental effect on meat produced and chilled and stored in the Guernsey Abattoir. All of which appears to have been considered in the ES and it is stated that contamination is unlikely.

The emission limits for dust, bio-aerosols and odour will be controlled through an operational licence for the waste transfer station. If these limits are exceeded, the waste transfer station operation may be being shut down by the Environmental Health and Pollution Regulator until the emissions are compliant.

- If there are carcase swab failures which are attributable to bio-aerosols from the waste transfer station operation who is responsible and what financial measure would be taken to mitigate financial impacts on users of the slaughterhouse? Clearly avoiding such a situation rather than relying of regulatory action once the problem has occurred is preferable.
- Will the operational emission limits be sufficiently rigorous to avoid contamination or spoilage of the meat produced in the Guernsey Abattoir?
- Can the emission limits be lowered if contamination of meat occurs at the proposed limits?
- Can finer filters be incorporated to the existing air intake filters in the abattoir to overcome emissions (which are in conformance or non-conformance with proposed limits) without affecting the positive pressure system?
- Who would be responsible for any modification to the abattoir air filtration system?

### 12. Traffic

Public access to the south of the abattoir site via the public peripheral path is of concern because of the absence of screening of operational procedures that occur in the 'dirty side'. This may require screening should operational sights cause public distress.

- If screening of the southern abattoir fence is proved necessary could this be undertaken at a later date?

### Pest species

I cannot find any reference to an assessment of pest species i.e. flies and vermin.

Constables of St Sampson: No reply received

### Environmental Health – comments in relation to the request for a Scoping Opinion:

Having had the opportunity to review the CD of the environmental statement I am content that it addresses the relevant issues.

I would make a comment with respect to noise guidelines for construction in Volume 1 Chapter 10.6 that the construction noise guidelines for Guernsey are:

Monday to Friday 8am - 6pm Saturday 8am-1pm, Saturday afternoon, Sunday and Bank Holidays - no noisy work i.e. there must be no site noise audible past the site boundary;

which varies from those utilised in the document. The above will be utilised by officers with respect to any complaints of statutory nuisance, should they arise.

#### Environmental Services Unit:

This response provides general comments in respect of the application received and makes reference specific to the following chapters or sections of chapters: the marine water aspect in relation to Chapter 6, Water environment, Chapter 7, Ecology, & Chapter 9, Landscape & Visual.

In respect of the proposal in relation to the ecology of the site it is recommended that La Société Guernesiaise be consulted as well.

#### **General**

- The Application recognises and states the policy and legal contexts in relation to the protection and enhancement of the natural living environment, including biodiversity, at the time of drafting. Since the Application was prepared the States has endorsed a Biodiversity Strategy (States of Guernsey Resolution, December 2015) which provides a framework to develop and implement a coherent set of action plans which aim to reverse the decline in biodiversity in the island. That Strategy recognises several threats to biodiversity, including development. Although the Strategy does not have the force of law one of its central tenets is the “mainstreaming” of biodiversity through, amongst other means, the formation of a Biodiversity Partnership to work with the community to help conserve and enhance biodiversity.
- Ramsar designation has been confirmed, through DEFRA, for Herm, Jethou and the Humps with effect from 19<sup>th</sup> October 2015.

#### **Chapter 6, Water environment**

- The ES states that, for example, the impact on the marine environment from the risk of leaching is not significant on, for example, the Ramsar site of Herm, The Humps & Jethou but there may be potential to cause harm as a result of the cumulative impact of leaching which is not controlled. Although it is noted that potential risks arising from leaching of materials may be mitigated, in part by “*frequent monitoring of surface water quality from the drainage soakaway*” it states that this should be done by the developer. This would imply that mitigation of impact is achieved but only during construction rather than operation. There should be somewhere an explicit statement made which demonstrates that any residual risks that remain, post construction, are satisfactorily dealt with.

#### **Chapter 7 Ecology**

- With reference to “*Value and importance for biodiversity conservation*” (ref: Box 7.3) the section states: “... *distinction between importance and value can be illustrated by common species such as the house sparrow. This species is important at a national level in the UK because it is a species of principal importance (Section 41, NERC Act 2006). However, a small population that could be affected by a development would often be assessed as being of insufficient value for an effect*

*(whether adverse or beneficial) to be of potential significance....".* It is accepted that importance attaches to species such as House sparrow, because of its status as a red data species (serious and rapid declines in population and / or range). However it should be recognised that value of the same species may be regarded as proportionately higher for a given if one takes into account the discreet nature of Guernsey as an island and its smaller physical size, relative to the UK. The effect of development on any particular site in a small territory such as Guernsey is likely to have a proportionately greater impact on any given species and its ecology.

- The measures to mitigate impact on Ringed plover and its habitat are supported.
- Whilst the focus of the ES with the Planning & Design Statement is on the mitigation of negative impacts from construction it would be an opportunity lost not to have some focus on enhancement of biodiversity. Whilst it is recognised that the suggested planting schemes, including grasses, shrubs and trees will enhance could the opportunity be extended beyond a few Sparrow boxes to other bird species and possibly bat species.

#### **Chapter 9, Landscape & Visual**

- The use of native species in any planting schemes is strongly supported in principle.

Care is advised in the use of mature /semi mature woody stock. There have been several examples in Guernsey where larger sized trees and plants have been used in far less hostile environments and they have failed due to lack of post planting management. Not only is it an unnecessary waste of resources it is wasted effort. The specification to replace plants lost after three years is noted but it is not a substitute for a properly planned and executed system to establish new plantings. It should also be noted that larger stock would require some form of conditioning to "harden them off" to reduce losses as a result of the very exposed location.

Fire & Rescue Service:                      No objections

#### Guernsey Water – comments in relation to the request for a Scoping Opinion:

We have considered the proposal carefully and the Environmental Statement seems to pick up all matters relating to drainage and water quality that we would be concerned with except wastewater quality. Under the emerging water pollution ordinance Guernsey Water will be issued with a discharge permit for Belle Greve wastewater centre that will stipulate various conditions, some of which will relate to the quality of wastewater discharged via the long sea outfall into the Russell.

As you will be aware, Belle Greve provides preliminary treatment of our island's wastewater, therefore without full treatment it is important to manage inputs of non-domestic sewage at source - we would refer to this as trade effluent. Under the water pollution ordinance trade effluent control will become even more important to Guernsey Water as without it we will have little control of our ability to meet water quality standards set out in our discharge permit.

Therefore it is important that the Environmental Impact Assessment considers the expected wastewater quality from the proposed waste management facility and the implications for the receiving marine environment. This will be of interest to both Guernsey Water and the Director of Environmental Health and Pollution Regulation.

Guernsey Water – comments in relation to the planning application:

Having reviewed the development Guernsey Water would like these comments to be taken into consideration:

- Surface water must be dealt with on site with any exceedance being discharged to sea due to its close proximity.
- Any by product from the recycling process must be treated as foul water and disposed of into the foul water system.
- Any discharge into the foul water system must be discharged at a rate to be agreed with Guernsey Water.
- Final build plans of the drainage system are given to Guernsey Water.

Harbourmaster: No comments

La Société Guernesiaise – comments in relation to the request for a Scoping Opinion:

We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on the above document that you sent us on 6th January 2016 and I apologise for the lateness of our response.

**Bats**

Chapter 7, section 4 includes the following statement *“There are no roosting opportunities for bats within the boundaries of the site or on any adjacent land, where the industrial buildings do not provide suitable conditions for roosting. The only habitat just off site to the west that could be of value for foraging bats is a small vegetated bund immediately adjacent to the adjacent abattoir. However, this bund is an exposed location and is isolated from other habitats that could support foraging bats. Given the limited foraging habitat and the absence of roosting opportunities on and immediately adjacent to the site other than commonly occurring small rodent species including mice and rats, the site is not considered to have the potential to support any other notable mammal species.”*

However, I have received a Pipistrelle bat for care from the GSPCA in 2003 that had been found in one of the Norman Piette buildings just to the east of the site. In November 2015, I received a report of a Pipistrelle bat found one morning in the wood mill, having flown in earlier to roost. These records indicate that Pipistrelles are using the Norman Piette buildings for roosting.

With this in mind, we recommend the provision of bat boxes (such as ‘Schwegler’ woodcrete boxes) on the various sides of buildings on site where possible. By providing boxes on a variety of aspects, the bats are able to choose a location that is appropriate for the weather conditions.

**Invertebrates**

Chapter 7, section 4 states the following for invertebrates: *“Although notable assemblages of invertebrates can often be associated with brownfield habitats, the Site is considered to have negligible value for these species due to the absence of any established areas of semi natural habitat.”*

Scaly Cricket, *Pseudomogoplistes vicentae*, is present on the shingle around Spur Point and in Belle Grève bay so could well colonise suitable locations on site. As this species is 'vulnerable' to extinction here and in the UK, it is important to be aware of this when planning any aggregate areas.

### **Plants & general ecological value**

We have not seen any specific recommendations for the species mixes to be used for tree and shrub plantings or the grassland reseeding on the site in the document and would be grateful for the opportunity to comment on these when such decisions are being taken.

Likewise, we have not noted any reference to the soil to be used on the site (these may be in the document, but have been missed!). However, we consider that the type of soil used for grassland areas is critical to establishing a sward that has nature conservation value. We recommend that it is of as low fertility as possible and of good drainage (such as sand).

### **Birds**

We consider the document has covered the needs of birds well, but would like to see House Martin nest boxes provided on the building if at all possible. They nest between Bordeaux and Fort Doyle and so there is a good possibility that they would make use of such nesting opportunities.

### **Future recording and monitoring of wildlife**

We would be grateful for any opportunities that could be provided for us to monitor plants and animals on site, such as nesting ringed plovers and other birds, roosting bats, and the colonisation of the site by plants and invertebrates etc.

### La Société Guernesiaise – comments in relation to the planning application:

Reviewing the new information contained in the CD sent to me, I can find no further information that requires our detailed comments.

The observations and recommendations on bats, invertebrates, birds, plants and general ecological value remain, as does the request to be allowed access for future recording and monitoring of wildlife.

It would be good to see our recommendations regarding soil for grassland areas and the use of appropriate 'coastal grassland' seed mix incorporated into the planning so that the site may have a positive environmental impact.

It would also be good to have confirmation that nesting and roosting boxes would be provided for House Martins and Pipistrelles, these both having declining populations locally. The former is now endangered in Guernsey as we estimate its numbers be around 40-50 pairs.

Whilst we appreciate that these are insignificant considerations in the overall planning of the development, they have the potential to achieve a significant benefit for wildlife for very little expense.

States Archaeologist: No archaeological implications on the site itself and no comments.

### Traffic Services Unit:

Our previous response in January 2016 in respect of the scope of the site's EIA, highlighted some concerns in regard to the use of the Kettering site as a model for assessing the likely vehicle movements associated with the public's interaction with a HWRC; however it was accepted that the Kettering site represented a reasonable guide to traffic data as it would be highly unlikely to find a model that matches the Guernsey scenario.

Notwithstanding the above, the Traffic Services Unit requested further information from the Public Services Department (PSD) in regard to the continuance of the free kerbside collection of recyclable materials and to the likely costs should the free collections cease in future. This was to try to understand what the financial disincentive would be to use the kerbside scheme in favour of what is assumed to be the continued free 'bring bank' sites including the proposed one at Longue Hougue for most recyclables. PSD has confirmed that in regard to the TIA that was provided, it was based on the present status quo in respect of kerbside collection of recyclables. The status quo is free collection and therefore would likely maximise use of that scheme.

However, the TSU has concerns that should the kerbside collection costs reach a point whereby a significant number of households consider those costs to be prohibitive, they may decide to 'opt out' of the kerbside scheme and decide to utilise the HWRC at Longue Hougue, with the potential significant increase in vehicular movements through the Longue Hougue/Bulwer Avenue signalised junction as well as within the site itself. This would particularly be the case if there is a reduction in the number of bring bank sites and PSD has not given TSU a clear indication of their intentions on this matter.

In respect of the reuse of items brought to the HWRC, the PSD has reiterated that the TIA was based on there being a public drop-off facility, with a charitable organisation having the authority to remove items for subsequent re-use; they state that it has been assumed that there would be no public 'scavenging' facility. PSD has not indicated to TSU that a charitable organisation has been found to run this service at this time.

Notwithstanding the concerns regarding a lack of clarity on certain aspects of the waste process that might impact on traffic movements, based on the model for waste management as detailed in the application there are no traffic related grounds on which to oppose the application including the proposed method of waste transfer for shipping.

The TSU does however wish it to be noted that the predicted traffic flows based on the Kettering site's operation, whilst providing a reasonable baseline, would not offer a robust model if significant numbers of island households 'opted out' of the kerbside collection service, or a substantial number of 'bring bank' sites around the island were closed with the result that the public chose to utilise the Longue Hougue site, with the resultant increase in vehicle movements via the Longue Hougue/Bulwer Avenue signalised junction as well as within the HWRC site itself.

### Summary of Issues:

The main issues in deciding this application are:

1. whether the principle of the proposed development is acceptable;



2. the impact of the development on the appearance and character of the area, including landscape character, the setting of protected monuments and the conservation area based around St Sampson harbour;
  3. the impact of the development on health & safety;
  4. the impact of development on the water environment;
  5. the impact of development on ecology;
  6. the impact of development on noise and air quality;
  7. the impact of the development on archaeology;
  8. the impact of the development on the amenity of people living in the area; and
  9. parking and access issues,
- taking into account the policies set out above.

### **Assessment against:**

#### **1 - Purposes of the law.**

The objectives of the Law, as set out in Section 1(2), have been considered and this forms part of the assessment of policy issues set out in 2 below.

#### **2 - Relevant policies of any Plan, Subject Plan or Local Planning Brief.**

##### **Whether the principle of the proposed development is acceptable**

Although the site is located outside the Settlement Area, for the purposes of policy CO1 of the UAP, the development would not detract from the openness of the countryside or result in the loss of agricultural land. An assessment against other policies of the Plan follows.

Policy GEN1 of the UAP promotes sustainable development. The proposal is designed to meet the needs of the community and occupies a site specifically allocated for this form of development. The detailed design and its impact on the environment are considered below. The application has been revised since its receipt to accommodate some sustainable elements.

Policy GEN2 of the UAP seeks to ensure the optimum efficient use of land and ensure that proposals do not inhibit or prejudice future development opportunities. The layout of the site has been the subject of considerable discussion and revision to make sure it uses the land efficiently and to secure satisfactory access to the remainder of the land being reclaimed and located to the north.

Policy ED1 of the UAP states

*Proposals for developments that are clearly demonstrated to be essential to the public interest, health, safety or security of the community and accord with the general policy principles will be allowed where the development does not conflict unacceptably with other relevant policies of the Plan.*

Policy WWM6 of the UAP relates to solid waste management and indicates general support. It refers to the need where appropriate for an Environmental Statement to show that the environmental impacts of development have been satisfactorily addressed. The supporting text refers to the construction and management of a facility at Longue Hougue

that is capable of dealing with waste arisings on the Island for the next 25 years, but also recognises that other forms of waste related development may also be required.

The proposed development complies with these requirements, subject to compliance with other relevant policies.

Policy EMP8 of the UAP relates to Development of the land reclamation site and, with WWM6, provides a framework to facilitate consideration of a range of technologies for a Residual Waste Treatment Plant at the Longue Hougue Land Reclamation Area, together with other waste management facilities that may be developed by the public or private sector.

EMP8 states:

*At the Longue Hougue Key Industrial Area and Land Reclamation Site, the priority will be to accommodate:*

- Waste management facilities;*
- Industrial uses with a high environmental impact;*
- Uses falling within Use Classes 48-59 inclusive; and*
- Port-related industrial uses.*

*To ensure that the Key Industrial Area and Land Reclamation Site are planned comprehensively, a Development Brief will be prepared for the phased development of the land to the east of Bulwer Avenue, St. Sampson, the underlying principles of which will be to optimise the use of the available land and achieve a good overall development which enhances the Key Industrial Area and recognises the importance of the site's 'Gateway to Guernsey' location.*

*All planning applications for significant waste related facilities shall be supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment.*

The proposal is in general compliance with the requirements of this policy.

In accordance with this policy, the Longue Hougue South Development Brief has been prepared and was approved in October 2009. Although the Brief was prepared at the time when a significantly larger Residual Waste Treatment Facility was proposed on the site, its principles and objectives remain relevant and must be satisfactorily addressed in the current application.

The objectives of the Brief are:

1. To optimise the use of available land at the industrial land reclamation area at Longue Hougue South;
2. To achieve a good overall development which enhances the Key Industrial Area and recognises the importance of the site's 'Gateway to Guernsey' location;
3. To ensure that all significant environmental impacts arising from the development are addressed and where possible, mitigated;
4. To satisfy the general policy principles set out in the Urban Area Plan - Review No.1;
5. To achieve the implementation of the States Solid Waste Strategy in a way which provides for the best practical environmental option;
6. To meet the needs of future generations in dealing with the Island's solid waste;
7. To ensure that any proposed development accounts for, and does not adversely affect or constrain, other development needs on adjoining sites at Longue Hougue South; and

8. To ensure that the public's views have been fully taken into account in finalising the brief.

The layout of the site has been prepared taking into account the objective set out at points 1 and 7 above. The design objective, numbered 2, is considered in detail in the following section of this report. In relation to objective 3, the application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement addressing all the relevant issues. The relevant UAP policy principles in relation to objective 4 are set out above. The proposal is designed to achieve the objectives numbered 5 and 6. The objective numbered as 8 is not relevant to the consideration of the current planning application.

A further assessment of the environmental impact of development is included in the following sections. However, the principle of development is acceptable under the relevant UAP policies.

Impact on the appearance and character of the area, including landscape character, the setting of protected monuments and the conservation area based around St Sampson harbour

There is a statutory duty to have regard to the desirability of preserving and enhancing the special interest and setting of protected monuments. There is a strong presumption against planning permission being granted for any development affecting a protected monument. These duties are reflected in Policy DBE8 of the UAP.

There is a statutory duty to have regard to the desirability of preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of conservation areas, a duty reflected in Policy DBE7 of the UAP.

GEN5 and DBE1 seek to promote good design while GEN6 seeks to ensure that the amenity of an area, its pleasantness and local distinctiveness, are maintained. DBE4 indicates that landscape design should form an integral part of the design and development process and must be included as part of development proposals where:

- a) there are public open areas within the site;*
- b) landscape treatment is an intrinsic part of the design or is necessary to ensure the appearance of the development is acceptable;*
- c) it will reduce the impact of the development or screen it from neighbouring properties or from views outside the site;*
- d) the development would affect either a Conservation Area, a through-route, a gateway, or the setting of a building of architectural or historic interest; or*
- e) the site contains an important landscape feature which contributes to the appearance, character and history of the local area.*

Policy CO3 indicates that new development should respect the character of the landscape and maintain its distinctiveness.

Policy DBE6 of the UAP deals with public views and indicates that:

*Development will not normally be acceptable if it adversely affects an important public view of a landmark, the skyline or the sea.*

The Development Brief includes a section dealing with *Architectural Design and Layout*. It identifies the following key principles to be used to guide the design process:

1. *To provide a durable design for a marine environment that is fit for its context and sensitive to its local character;*
2. *To create an innovative development in design and functional terms that will enhance the local context and existing views from land and sea;*
3. *To provide a landmark for the site and its location;*
4. *To provide a positive, visual landmark at Guernsey's 'gateway' from the sea;*
5. *To demonstrate how views of the site from land and sea will be respected;*
6. *To address the screening of high impact uses within the site from the adjoining residential area and boat moorings and from the main access road through the site by means of hard and soft landscaping and other measures;*
7. *To provide, where possible, a high quality, unified architectural concept for all structures associated with the facility in terms of materials, colour, roof forms and juxtaposition of buildings and, as far as is practicable, contain all equipment within a unifying architectural envelope;*
8. *To ensure that no visually intrusive stockpiles of materials can normally be seen from outside the site;*
9. *To reduce any adverse impact on the setting of Mont Crevelt and views from Vale Castle;*
10. *To address the design aspects of the location of future phases from the outset; and*
11. *To introduce and integrate sustainable design features to reduce the environmental impact of the works.*

The Brief indicates that the following should be included when assessing the visual impact of development:

- The effect on views from nearby residential areas;
- The effect on wider views from the coast and from the sea;
- The effect on the mainly unspoilt character of the sensitive north-east coast and measures to limit views of development from this area; and
- The integration of any necessary flue stack(s) into the overall design.

The Brief was prepared at the time when a Residual Waste Recovery Facility of a much larger scale was being considered. Despite this, its principles and objectives remain relevant, including those relating to design. The initial proposals have been revised in an attempt to satisfactorily meet the 11 principles set out above. The following comprises an assessment of the revised scheme relative to these principles.

1. *To provide a durable design for a marine environment that is fit for its context and sensitive to its local character.*  
The main building is purpose designed for the site and this coastal location and has a lifespan in excess of 20 years.
2. *To create an innovative development in design and functional terms that will enhance the local context and existing views from land and sea;*  
The main design objective of any scheme must be to meet the functional requirements to provide a facility to deal with the Island's waste. However, the design principle adopted in the scheme as originally submitted was based on the assumption that the wider industrial nature of the immediate surrounding area meant that any new building should take its cue from this existing development. This clearly does not meet the principles included as 2, 3 and 4 above.

Although the reduced scale of development perhaps removes the need for a landmark building, it is essential that the new development makes a positive contribution to the character of the area, setting an example for future development on the remaining part of the land being reclaimed.

The proposed development includes three buildings:

1. Weighbridge Kiosk
2. Facilities Building
3. Waste Transfer Station

The weighbridge building is a relatively small building and by itself would not have a significant impact on the setting of the protected monuments and conservation area. Its design is simple and functional and the external materials are similar to those of the waste transfer station.

Similar to the Weighbridge Kiosk, the facilities building is relatively small and, as such, would not have a significant visual impact.

The Waste Transfer Station is by far the largest building on the site. It has been revised in order to mitigate its negative effects. The proposed design solution includes a curved roof with overhanging eaves; the walls have vertical proportions and are broken up using different shades of grey and type of wall panel. The different roof, doors and windows would add further contrast. The revised design of the building would achieve a good standard of architectural design as well as mitigating its negative effects.

A chimney is also associated with this building finished in stainless steel. The use of stainless steel would provide unity of the colour and materials across the site as well as provide a relatively small landmark.

The proposal would meet this design principle.

3. *To provide a landmark for the site and its location;*  
Although the need for a landmark building is weakened by the reduced scale of the present proposal, as indicated above, it remains essential that the design of the building is appropriate to this exposed coastal location and is a good exemplar for future development of the adjoining land to the north.

For the reasons set out at 2 above, it is considered that the proposal meets this design principle.

4. *To provide a positive, visual landmark at Guernsey's 'gateway' from the sea;*  
For the reasons set out at 2 above, and in the context of the scale of the present development, it is considered that the proposal meets this design principle.
5. *To demonstrate how views of the site from land and sea will be respected;*  
There are important views of the site, in particular from the sea, Vale Castle, Bordeaux Harbour, Salerie Corner, Delancey Park and the sea. The setting of and

views from Mont Crevelt and the character of the conservation area around St Sampson harbour are additional important considerations.

The information provided to support the application suggests that the visual impact of the proposal when viewed from these locations would be acceptable.

6. *To address the screening of high impact uses within the site from the adjoining residential area and boat moorings and from the main access road through the site by means of hard and soft landscaping and other measures;*  
A fully detailed landscaping scheme has been prepared since the original submission. In order to be able to take account of the comments of La Société Guernesiaise and the Environmental Services Unit, a planning condition has been imposed requiring the submission and agreement of a landscaping scheme.
7. *To provide, where possible, a high quality, unified architectural concept for all structures associated with the facility in terms of materials, colour, roof forms and juxtaposition of buildings and, as far as is practicable, contain all equipment within a unifying architectural envelope;*  
For the reasons set out at 2 above, it is considered that the proposal meets this design principle. The materials and colours of the three buildings and chimney bring a unity to the design that meets this design principle in the Development Brief.
8. *To ensure that no visually intrusive stockpiles of materials can normally be seen from outside the site;*  
The proposal, as originally submitted, involved significant outside storage of containers. The original proposal, involving 4 weekly export of waste required a maximum of 180 shipping containers stacked a maximum of 3 high. With daily shipments, the number is much reduced. However, there is no guarantee that this arrangement will necessarily continue in the future so the area of hardstanding to be provided for open storage remains unchanged in size.
9. *To reduce any adverse impact on the setting of Mont Crevelt and views from Vale Castle;*  
The revised design and landscaping proposals would significantly reduce the impact of the proposal on the setting of Mont Crevelt and views from Vale Castle. Any negative effects have been adequately mitigated by the proposed appearance of the building and the proposed landscaping scheme.
10. *To address the design aspects of the location of future phases from the outset;*  
The proposed site layout provides for the possibility that a Materials Recovery Facility may be needed in the future.
11. *To introduce and integrate sustainable design features to reduce the environmental impact of the works.*  
Since the original submission, the application has been revised to include solar panels on the facilities building and Weighbridge Kiosk.

The revised scheme meets the design principles set out in the Development Brief. For the same reasons, it complies with policies DBE7 and DBE8 (relating to the setting of the nearby conservation area and protected monuments), policies DBE1, GEN5 and GEN6

(relating to design quality and protecting the character of the area) and policy DBE6 (relating to public views).

In general, the proposed landscaping proposals would help to assimilate the development into its surroundings for the purposes of policies DBE4 and CO3. However, there is the potential for some detailed changes to reflect the individual characteristics of this unique site.

In relation to the concerns expressed by the National Trust, the changes outlined in the revised scheme would reduce the visual impact of development. The revised arrangements for the disposal of waste also mean that the very large number of containers originally proposed to be stored on site would no longer be needed.

#### Impact on health & safety

Policy GEN10 of the UAP indicates that care must be taken before new development is located close to existing hazardous development. It states that, *Permission will be refused if the level of risk associated with the development is considered to be unacceptable.*

The application site falls within the consultation middle and inner zones in relation to the nearby fuel storage depot. However, the proposed buildings are within the former. As such, the Chief Health & Safety Officer does not object. He has made a number of detailed recommendations which have been passed onto the agents. The level of detail he raises goes beyond that relevant under planning controls.

The proposal satisfactorily addresses the risk associated with the nearby fuel storage depot.

#### Impact on the water environment, noise and air quality, and potential contamination

Policy GEN10 of the UAP seeks to make sure that the quality of the environment and the health and safety of the public are not put at risk by hazardous developments.

There are specific sections of the ES that deal with the water environment, noise and air quality.

The ES considers the potential impact of development on surface, groundwater and marine water quality together with potential flood risk and the impact on water resource supply and demand. A comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment has been completed. The proposal includes a protective bund to remove the risk of wave overtopping inundating the site and finished floor levels to be above the extreme sea levels plus a 300mm freeboard.

Guernsey Water raise no objections in principle to the development. The detailed issues raised by them are principally matters for them and building control at the time when the detailed arrangements for draining the development are produced.

The issue of leaching raised by Environmental Services is an appropriate matter to be addressed through the provision of satisfactory site drainage.

In relation to noise, noise predictions in the ES were undertaken in relation to local residents close to the site potentially experiencing an increase in noise resulting directly from the development or from road traffic. The ES concludes that no significant effects are predicted associated with the construction or operation of the proposed development. However, this assessment was based upon the proviso that shipping container movements would take place on only two days a month. The revised arrangements would result in daily shipping movements although the scale of such movements would be far more limited. No observations have been received from Environmental Health regarding potential noise nuisance to nearby residents and the proposal must be assessed in its context. The application site is located in a predominantly industrial area and the nearest dwelling is over 300 metres away. A dilution of traffic movements is likely to be regarded as preferable in any event.

The chapter of the ES dealing with air quality and odour assesses the impact in relation to several locations, including the abattoir and the nearest dwelling. It considers the potential effects of:

- dust during construction;
- road traffic emissions;
- odour; and
- the storage of crushed glass.

It is indicated that no composting is proposed so there is no reason for the production of bioaerosols.

The application indicates that measures to reduce any problems include:

- Vehicles delivering waste will reverse into the WTS building and the roller shutter doors will automatically close behind them. They will remain closed at all times except when vehicles are entering and exiting, and only stay open for a short time until the vehicle is safely out of the way;
- With the exception of loading baled RDF into sealed shipping containers, all waste handling operations will take place within the main WTS building;
- Any external storage of waste will be in fully enclosed / covered containers. RDF will be stored in sealed shipping containers; food waste (which has potential to be odorous), will be pumped into a sealed tanker; and recyclable materials at the HWRC, with potential to produce dust or be blown around the site (e.g. plastics) will be removed or covered as soon as possible;
- Associated odour control infrastructure, comprising carbon filter technology and a 20 m high dispersion stack, will be located immediately east of the main WTS building;
- Water will be stored onsite to enable dust suppression as and when required;
- External roads, which may be the subject to the effects of 'trackout', will be managed by a mobile road sweeper;
- Drop heights will be minimised during the loading and unloading of materials;
- On-site vehicle speed limits will prevent dust arising from internal site roads;
- Vehicles will not be left idling when not in use; and
- A Dust Management Plan (DMP) and an Odour Management Plan (OMP) will be prepared and submitted to the Authority.

The assessment identifies that the impact from construction dust is not considered to be significant subject to effective mitigation, the road traffic impacts would be negligible and



the concentrations predicted from odour emissions met the most stringent threshold after passing through the odour control unit.

No observations have been received from Environmental Health regarding potential air quality or odour problems. The comments received from the States Veterinary Officer have been largely addressed by the agents, although, in any event, animal welfare issues are not the subject of planning controls.

The ES includes a chapter dealing with Land Quality, that is potential land contamination. The application site comprises land reclaimed from the sea. This has been achieved using inert waste, mainly construction and demolition waste and sea dredgings. In these circumstances, the ES concludes that there is no significant risk, although normal measures to mitigate against any risk are recommended.

#### Impact on ecology

Policy GEN3 of the UAP seeks to conserve and enhance the Island's landscapes and features of ecological and wildlife value.

There is a specific section of the ES that deals with ecology. The nature of the site, being reclaimed ground, severely limits its potential to support wildlife species. However, there is some potential to support breeding ringed plovers. The proposal would result in the loss of potential breeding habitat. In addition, any increase in potential predators resulting from the development would represent a threat to birds in the area.

To address these issues, it is intended, among other actions, to create a temporary breeding habitat during the construction phase and a permanent area as part of the development work. Good housekeeping, good ventilation and avoiding periods when waste will be stored for long periods would limit the conditions that would attract pest and predatory species. This would be accomplished through a management plan.

The comments made by the ESU and La Société Guernesiaise regarding bird and bat boxes have been accepted by the agents and their provision can be the subject of a condition of any planning permission. Similarly, the issue raised by La Société Guernesiaise in relation to the provision of aggregate areas can be addressed through this planning condition. The request for access for monitoring could form part of the recommended ecological management plan.

In relation to comments made by the ESU and La Société Guernesiaise about planting, these can be addressed through the detailed landscaping scheme required by planning condition.

#### Impact on archaeology

Policy DBE10 of the UAP requires developers to provide, as appropriate, for the retention or the investigation and recording of any archaeological remains.

In view of the fact that the site comprises made up ground following reclamation, the proposed development would have no archaeological implications. This is confirmed in the ES and by the States Archaeologist.

### Impact on the amenity of people living in the area

GEN12 seeks to protect a neighbour's reasonable amenity.

The location of the application site is such that the proposal would have no direct impact on people living in the area. However, the proposal has the potential to result in a number of adverse effects as a result of:

- noise;
- smells;
- pollution;
- traffic generation;

These impacts are addressed in the ES. Noise, odour and air quality, including in relation to traffic generation, are addressed in the section above.

### Parking and access issues

Policies GEN7, GEN8 and GEN9 of the UAP seek to make sure that roads and public utilities are adequate to cope with new development, that there is safe and convenient access and that parking provision is satisfactory.

The ES includes a chapter dealing with traffic and an associated Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA). However, among other assumptions, this is based upon the proviso that there would be a 4 weekly transfer of waste to St Peter Port for export.

As indicated above, the agents suggest that the change to daily export of waste would result in a considerable dilution of heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements required to transfer the baled waste from Longue Hougue to St Peter Port Harbour i.e. rather than the predicted average of 4 HGV's in and 4 HGV's out per hour, under the revised export arrangements, this would be per day. This more even distribution of HGV movements would reduce the traffic impact of the proposed development. This is a logical argument and is accepted.

The TIA considers the existing waste traffic across Guernsey and the changes resulting from the new facility. It estimates the re-assignment of waste trips on the road network and allows for future growth in the form of increased recycling trips. It includes an assessment for 2023 when it is envisaged that the plant would be operating at full capacity. This considers traffic flows at 7 different locations. At two, there would be a reduced traffic flow, with the maximum increase being 8.2% for all vehicles and 19.3% for HGV's at the junction of Bulwer Avenue and Les Bas Courtils Road.

The ES suggests that the proposal to transfer waste from Mont Cuët and Fontaine Vinery would involve some improvement, including a reduction in waste trips through the largely residential junction of Route Militaire and La Route du Braye and provision of a new footway/cycleway from Bulwer Avenue, thereby improving access to the site.

The ES concludes:

*Where the assessment thresholds have been triggered and for the criteria that this assessment has considered; severance, driver delay, pedestrian delay, pedestrian amenity, fear and intimidation, accidents and safety, hazardous loads and construction; the negative transportation effects of the waste facility are not significant and the positive effects will benefit Guernsey. The island will be able to streamline its waste processes, handle a great quantity of recycled matter and minimise the quantity of waste passing to landfill.*

## **Overall Conclusions**

The proposal is required to implement the provisions of the States Waste Strategy. The application site has been specifically identified in the Urban Area Plan to serve this purpose and has been laid out to provide for a Waste Transfer Station, Household Waste Recycling Centre and potentially, in the future, a Materials Recovery Facility, if needed. The scheme makes provision for access to the remaining area presently being reclaimed, including a new footway/cycleway from Bulwer Avenue, and a new pedestrian link alongside the coast. To this end, the principle of development is wholly in accordance with planning policy.

A Development Brief has been prepared to guide the way in which the site is to be developed and the proposal meets its objectives.

The application is accompanied by considerable supporting information, including a comprehensive Environmental Statement which considers in detail the environmental impact of development.

The application site occupies an exposed and prominent coastal location and development of this site is likely to be seen as a guide to the way other developments on adjoining land can proceed. The design of the buildings and associated structures has been the subject of substantial discussion and negotiation to make sure the scheme meets the design objectives set out in the Development Brief, does not adversely affect the nearby conservation area and protected monuments or key public views, and thus results in a satisfactory form of development.

The changes made to the design of the buildings, following the assistance of a local architect, have introduced interest and have helped to break up the mass of the main building. This, together with the implementation of a satisfactory landscaping scheme, should make sure that the visual impact of the development is acceptable and the development, if permitted, will be an improvement on much of the existing industrial surroundings.

The siting of the buildings is such that the presence of the nearby fuel storage depot would have no adverse implications. The nature of the site is such that there are no issues arising from land contamination. The issue of flood risk is satisfactorily addressed and while there are issues in relation to drainage, noise and dust, these are all addressed in the ES and there are no objections to the principle of development from the relevant statutory consultees.

The nature of the site is such that it has no archaeological potential and limited potential to support wildlife. However, the ES includes a number of proposals for mitigation,

including provision of a habitat for the ringed plover. Ecological mitigation and a requirement for a management plan are the subject of planning conditions.

The proposal would result in additional traffic in the vicinity of the application site, but is likely to result in reduced traffic elsewhere. Access is from the Inter Harbour Route via a traffic controlled junction designed to serve the application site and adjoining land. The area is predominantly industrial so industrial traffic is not out of place. A change from monthly to daily shipments of waste would eliminate the need for considerable movements of HGV's at one particular period.

In conclusion, the proposed development is located on a site earmarked for this type of use. The appearance of the buildings and structures would be satisfactory and the landscaping would help to assimilate the development into its surroundings. Other potential environmental impacts are addressed in the ES with appropriate measures of mitigation proposed where appropriate.

For these reasons, it is recommended that conditional planning permission is granted in this case.

### **3 - General material considerations set out in the General Provisions Ordinance.**

The matters to be considered under Section 13 of the Land Planning and Development (General Provisions) Ordinance 2007 have been assessed as part of the section dealing with policy issues set out in 2 above.

### **4 - Additional considerations (for protected trees, monuments, buildings and/or SSS's).**

The proposal would have no impact on protected trees. The impact on the setting of protected monuments in the vicinity and on the St Sampson conservation area is considered as part of section 2 above.

**Date:** 19 July 2016