



St Helena
Government

MINUTES

Land Development Control Authority Meeting

Date : Monday, 3 May 2021
Time : 10 am
Venue : The St Helena Community College, Jamestown

Present	Mrs Ethel Yon OBE	Chairperson
	Mr Paul Hickling	Deputy Chair
	Mr Gavin George	Member
	Mr Ralph Peters	Member
	Mr Gerald Yon	Member
	Mr Karl Thrower	Member
	Mr Ismail Mohammed	Chief Planning Officer (CPO)
	Mr Shane Williams	Planning Officer (PO)
	Mrs Karen Isaac	Secretary

Also in Attendance Seven Members of the public including Objector. ENRP Portfolio Leader was also in attendance.

1. Attendance and Welcome

The Chairperson welcomed all present and thanked members for attending and said that she apologised for having to hold a special meeting but because the application involved a vast amount of presentation and discussion, it was necessary. There would also be the normal monthly meeting on Wednesday, 5 May 2021

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest to declare.

3. Application for LDCA Determination

1) Application 2020/35 – Proposed development of Trade Winds Ocean Village, Comprehensive Development Area – Horse Pasture – St Helena Developments Limited

The Chairperson said that she was grateful to Miss Isabel Peters and all Stakeholders for their contribution to this development application.

The CPO presented the application. The site is located at Horse Pasture, on the North Western side of the island, adjacent to Lemon Valley and is just north of the area that has been allocated for a comprehensive development at Burnt Rock. The proposal is to cater for a high value tourism facility and would consist of units that would be freestanding homes of varying design. Six design concepts have been submitted. The camping and picnic facilities would be relocated to the south and west of the existing area but would still be the most accessible for the community.

The proposed development aims to provide improved community facilities that would include an area for camping and picnicking, ablution and kitchen facility, BBQ areas and a playground for children and an adventure course including jungle gym equipment and a dedicated parking area. A site layout of the development showing the roads across the site have been supplied that includes secondary and local access roads that would be constructed. The road upgrade and the improvements need to be carried out to make accessibility across the site easier and a lot safer. The six designs for the residential buildings include two types of layouts for the two, three and four bedroom accommodations. The residential development proposal includes an open plan kitchen, dining room and lounge, en-suite bedrooms, store room and patio area. It would also include two parking spaces for the golf buggies with electric charging points.

The applicant had not indicated how many of each of the development types would be delivered as this would be determined by the market and the demand building type. The buildings would be supported by concrete and timber piles that would reduce the potential impact on the environment, through minimal ground disturbance through excavation. It was noted that timber housing construction is long established and could last a long time, if treated properly. The units are planned to be energy efficient using a mix of mains and solar systems. The water supply, sewage disposal and grey water discharge were highlighted and it was stressed that the applicant may be required to source additional water supply. The details for the proposed systems are still to be considered. The CPO advised that he had received more recent correspondence from the applicant stating that a dam linked to

the neighbouring development at Broad Bottom would be of sufficient capacity to meet the needs of both developments.

The CPO highlighted that he had discussions with the applicant in 2019 and he had advised the applicant that he should be on the island to engage and discuss with the local community his plans. The applicant had organised three public meetings that were not very well attended and had also organised presentation and engagement with a number of Stakeholders.

The CPO explained in detail the Environmental Impact Assessment and the Environmental Management Plan and highlighted that it was difficult to assess the full impact as set out in the EIA and EMP due to large area covered by the proposed development site. He stressed that there would be a need for further environmental assessment of the area, including the need for a walkover of the area with the Chief Environment Officer closer to the point of implementation and before any development work took place. The CPO pointed out that the development is comprehensive in its design and delivery but not in the context of the LDCA policy as a comprehensive development area.

The Members were reminded that in 2015 development permission was granted for the Golf Course Resort to this applicant/company that was reviewed in 2017 and that a renewal of development permission was granted in 2020.

There were representations to this proposal from a number of Stakeholders. Mr Andrew Pearce congratulated the CPO on his presentation. He voiced the concerns of the St Helena Heritage Society. He voiced very strongly that the development did not accord with the policies of the LDCA.

The CPO advised that Bio-Security had been consulted about the issues raised regarding the use of tiger worms for the bio-digestive sewage system proposed for the development and that the officer concerned had no issues with the use of tiger worms.

It was noted that LDCA had undertaken a site visit to review the application site in the first quarter of 2020.

The CPO advised the current process of engaging with the Authority on the discharge of conditions that appears to be suitable and can be continued to be applied. However, the public does not have any opportunity of viewing it.

While the Authority fully support investment in St Helena, it was felt that the Development Application lacked detailed information and inadequate plans. It also breached the Ordinance and LDCP. It was stressed that every aspect of the design of the project needs to be as informative as possible to allow the Authority to make an informed representation to Governor in Council. It was highlighted that more detailed information is required particularly in the site analysis considering the size of the development area. A phase by phase or multiple phases approach was considered to be a much better course of action to take.

The EIA Report was also discussed. It was noted that further work is required on this report in light of the Chief Environment Officer's advice particularly with regard to the local environment and the potential impact on the historic assets in the area. The Chief Environment Officer recommended that this could be done by an "Addendum" to the EIA Report. The Authority supported this, but felt this should be done before any development approval is given.

Detailed plans for the internal road layout were not included in the proposal. It was said that during the site visit accessibility across the development area were raised as a major concern by Members. Due to the topography of the site, any roads (including ones suitable for electric golf carts) would require significant construction work and no detailed plans had been submitted in order to meet the standards required for full development permission. It was stressed that accurate plans including cross sections should be required. It were further noted that no details were provided as to how emergency vehicles would be able to access the building within the development area. It was noted that housing on the sites as shown in the site layout plan would require some of the houses to be on stilts over 20m high. This would make the buildings visible on either side that is against some of the LDCP policies. There were no detailed plans for the commercial or service building with the development and therefore compliance with the LDCP and Building Regulations cannot be checked.

There is a lack of information with regard to the sewerage system across the development site, its disposal and output discharge. At this point attention were drawn to SD4 and SD7 of the LDCP policies. No details of telecommunications infrastructure and disabled access to facilities were supplied. It was stressed that there should be an assessment of development phases – a detailed design of each phase of the development showing relationship of buildings and building plots.

LDCP NH3 were highlighted in which it states “where proposed development is likely to have an adverse effect (either individually or in combination with other developments) on St Helena’s native species and habitats including the wirebird, permission will be granted only when the benefits of the development outweighs the impacts that is likely to have on the national and international importance of that species or habitat. The proposals must include measures to ensure that any adverse effect is mitigated or compensated. This would be subject to monitoring to ensure that the measures are carried out effectively”. It was noted in this respect no firm details were supplied and this makes the EIA inadequate.

It was noted that no percolation tests were carried out. Each building or soakaway, if there are to be several communal ones, would require a percolation test. With regard to the commercial building, no details had been supplied if it is planned for the houses to use a self-contained system to treat the effluent. LDCP policy SW4 states that “commercial and community development and development in Comprehensive Development Areas and Coastal Village Areas would be permitted only where the development includes appropriate provision for solid waste storage and collection”. It was noted that the Applicant had only provided very limited information in this respect. Therefore, more detailed information is required.

Mention were made of the water source at Fenches Gut in that it supplies the area of Blue Hill, Thompsons Wood, Barren Ground, Horse Pasture and Thompsons Hill. It also supplies the cattle and other live stock in these areas. It was also mentioned that there was a Reservoir at Little Broad Bottom that fed the Fruit Orchard but not sure if this is still in use. In times of drought, it is believed that water from Frenches Gut and Iron Pot were pumped to Red Hill Treatment Plant to supplement the demand. If the Applicant proposes to build a Dam to meet the demands of both developments, it was questioned whether the water would come from Frenches Gut Borehole or would it be to catch rain water that will run down the valley. Mention was also made that there is an earth dam across the valley already that catches rain water and it was questioned whether this would be the one the applicant proposes to use and would this be sufficient for both of the applicant’s proposals/developments. It was stressed that the reservoir and the earth dam did not feed the areas as mentioned but was for the sole use of the Farm and the livestock owned by Solomon & Company. It was not known whether Solomon’s still used this water supply.

One Member said that he was told that the Stone Wall at Horse Pasture were built as a boundary wall to keep livestock from wandering in the days when Horse Pasture and the West of Woodlands were one big estate in the days of the Dovetons and the Mosses.

It was stressed that the suggestion that a dam linked to the neighbouring development at Broad Bottom would be of sufficient capacity to meet the needs of both developments is no more than a proposal (idea) at this stage and therefore cannot be taken as a firm commitment or demonstrates that the resource is available to make it work. It was stressed further that the Applicant has to demonstrate that Connect is on board with this proposal and that sufficient resources are available for its use, in what is a high demand collection area for the western population. To this end the Authority felt that this is one of the reasons why insufficient information has been supplied. Concern was also expressed about the proposed road network as the lack of detail provided did not offer anything more than a provisional plan. If this is to be taken forward as a condition, it was asked why the Authority is needed?

The Authority voiced concern about the application being taken forward as a 'full development application' with too many conditions to offset the missing detail. A Member's understanding (led to believe from previous CPOs) of a 'full development application' is that it is accepted with full details of all required drawings/reports to provide a comprehensive document to enable an accurate assessment/decision to be made.

There was no Traffic Management Plan. This should be supplied With regard to the stilts, concern was raised regarding the height of the stilts. The CPO at this time made reference to the Sapper Way development and as a suggestion, it was believed that some of the stilts on that example are too high, especially for a more exposed site at Horse Pasture. It was also suggested that it would reduce the height of the stilts if the back end of the individual sites were to be excavated to varying depths, depending on the gradient of the slope. In the absence of any elevation detailed drawings, it was felt that the Authority would not be able to make any assessment or offer an opinion.

It was highlighted that the stone wall is a heritage feature and is of historic value and therefore should be conditioned. The right of ways were also discussed and it was noted that some walkways are likely to be closed off and a slight detour may have to be made. It was stressed that alternative

<p>arrangements be provided for foot pedestrians to continue to reach their chosen destinations.</p> <p>Further questions were raised in respect of the development construction and if the excavation could be kept to the width of the buildings. It was stated that this would be dependent on each construction plot and where excavation is required that has to be undertaken.</p> <p>It was again emphasised that the proposal should be submitted in phases and should come back to the Authority. The public be consulted on each phase and each phase should have full details.</p> <p>The CPO was congratulated for doing a job well done on the Report.</p> <p>The Authority felt that in view of the lack of detailed plans and other pertinent information, the Development Application was inadequate to make a recommendation to Governor-in-Council for full development approval, but would support an outline application proposal. The Authority also felt that if the Governor-in-Council were minded to approve full planning approval, any conditions imposed that were of strategic importance should be brought back to the Authority for determination.</p> <p>The Authority asked to have sight of their comments before submission to GIC.</p> <p>Resolution: After much consideration the application for the proposed development of Trade Winds Ocean Village, Comprehensive Development Area at Horse Pasture, the Authority advised that full development approval, as recommended by the CPO should be refused. They would however support an outline. The Authority's views to be sent to them before the CPO finalise the Exco Report. To Exco for final determination.</p>	<p>CPO</p>
--	------------

4. Next Meeting

The next LDCA Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, 5 May 2021.

The Chairperson thanked Members for their attendance. The meeting closed at 12.15hrs.

Signed by the Chairperson of the Authority, as a true reflection of the Meeting.

Chairperson to the LDCA

Date