

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

Purpose: This table contains the comments received during the April-May 2014 Development Plan consultation and, as far as possible assigns them to the following categories:

- A. comments on the process so far (which will be taken into account when planning the next consultation stage);
- B. comments that relate to the content of the development plan and indicate broad support for the emerging approach (which is welcomed);
- C. comments that relate to the content of the development plan and raise issues or propose changes which are relatively minor and detailed (these will be taken into account in producing draft documents);
- D. comments that relate to the content of the development plan and raise significant issues or propose fundamental changes – these issues have been the focus of debate in various meetings/workshops); or
- E. issues which do not relate directly to the development plan, but are relevant for its delivery (e.g. the way in which FIG land is disposed of) – these will be summarised and brought to the attention of the relevant sections and, it is hoped, inform relevant processes and strategies.

Housing	Nature of Comment	Relevant Policy
Planning Issues		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No more loops at the Sapper Hill development or anywhere else. 	• C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP4A • TP2C & D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to make sure that we control change so that the expansion of Stanley does not result in more 'Mink Parks' being built, and spoiling the neatly laid out plan of Stanley. 	• C	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any new houses around Stanley should be laid out in the style of those houses on Jeremy Moore Avenue. These offer their inhabitants substantial space for vegetable gardens and the houses are also a good size themselves. 	• C	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both. But I would like to see the planners stipulate that businesses that build houses that people can move straight into are not allowed to build rows of identical houses. They must differ in style and colour. Nothing is more hideous than rows of identical houses and is out of keeping with the spirit of Stanley. We have made that mistake in the past. Let us learn from it. 	• C	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, but again there should be planning guidelines that ensure houses are not crazy angles like Mink Park, and that they follow regulations. 	• C	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New housing development needs to be based on a grid layout to fit with Stanley historic development and structure and with roads, pavements and street lighting provided. 	• C	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planning doesn't take into account the loss of view. The angle of the houses goes against the east-west alignment of 	• C	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>Stanley to the detriment of those who have built houses there. It is very difficult to build a house with a garage on the plots provided.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A2 yes but the current methods on sapper hill with narrow roads, lack of pavements and a move from a grid based road system needs to be stopped immediately as this development is completely out of character with the rest of Stanley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I really dislike the fashion we are getting away from the grid system of roads/streets in new areas Stanley and now Sapper Hill and Mink Park. The first of these loopy-swoopy roads was built in East Stanley with ‘ squid money’ and naturally nick-named ‘Squid Row’. The houses in Squid Row were erected without any thought for facing the sun, so in some cases houses are back on to the sun and living rooms face into the road and other lounge windows. How silly when there is also a splendid view over the harbour! The traditional grid system is surely less expensive in terms of roads and service provision, it looks tidier, more convenient and not least, houses face the sun, which is mentally beneficial. Quite frankly East Stanley is a maze of swoopy roads and unless one gets to know the arrangement of streets, is extremely frustrating. The lack of post and rail fencing at Mink Park (unlike the new plots were in East Stanley) makes the whole of that estate look like an unfinished tip with houses facing different positions and at the West side crammed together. This must surely be a fire hazard. I fully understand house designs are the choice of the owner and they do not always fit well on a plot but Mink Park is not a planning jewel in the crown. Surely there must be a computer programme into which proposed house profiles can be fed, in relation to the intended plot and surrounding areas so that planners can see how a completed building fits its surroundings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP4A TP2C & D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do think perhaps more stipulations can be made to make the overall development look nicer. A small house on a large plot next to a large two storey house looks odd. Perhaps rows should be allocated to suggested house size (if they aren’t already), dictating minimum footprint and minimum total floorspace. However, uniformity is not the objective here, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>individual preferences should be met where it does look fine and makes sense.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What needs to be in place are robust policies to ensure that adequate standards of amenity are achieved, design guidance to achieve coherence and a sense of place, and that development is properly serviced before it is occupied. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I agree with some changes but only the necessary changes such as building more homes but if you were to place a supermarket or pub in front of someone's home it will block their view and they potentially get upset as there are other pubs and supermarkets they can travel to by foot or by car, they may not want or in front of their home blocking their view. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I believe that designating neighbourhood commercial areas in the new housing developments (especially those such as Sapper Hill and Mink Park which are "satellites") is a very good idea I believe they should be on-site provision but not necessarily public. If commercial developers are undertaking house building they should be required to provide public amenities as part of the planning permission approval. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP4A • TP2C & D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A2 - the plots would have to be thought through and when they are put in place they should be made so there is some kind of organised way of putting so they don't end up insuch as Mink Park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for a property to only cover 25% of the plot is outdated and means that large plots of land are being unused. The percentage should be increased so more of the plot is used up by housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I believe that any new housing developments should be properly-spaced and should return to more of a grid system rather than attempting to squish and rotate plots, which leads to oddly-orientated houses, a lack of views for residents, confusing road systems and potential for housing developments to become an eyesore. I believe there should be a consistent rule on boundaries and position of houses across all new developments, rather than it being XXm from the boundary in one development and YYm from the boundary in others. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The layout of plots should allow builders to position houses to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>maximise solar gain. Ne/SW plots such as are on the new sapper hill development are not conducive to this at all. Any new developments should have wide roads, and wide pavements on both sides of the road. Penny pinching over road layouts will be regretted in the future. The argument over whether gridiron or cul-de-sac and crescent layouts should be used is a common one and having ultra narrow roads and tiny pavements is not acceptable. East Stanley is well laid out and should be used as a template for future development. Sapper Hill, unfortunately, is not a good example being poorly laid out with badly aligned plots, very narrow roads and narrow pavements on one side only.</p>		
Infill		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not support further infill housing, and would to see it controlled. Control could be in the form of limiting it to single-storey dwellings to minimise visual impact (and the issue of overlooking other buildings). Original house and new house could be limited to a % of overall plot size. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP6C
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.12 infill housing is ruining Stanley and putting huge requirement on services that are already overloaded – apparently. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not clear 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I don't want to see Stanley cramped together suddenly like with the infill plots. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There needs to be some control as infill building should no longer be allowed and stop people just dumping dead vehicles wherever they want. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infill plots can be ok in some larger unused plots but on some smaller ones the use of the plot can be excessive. But realites are (or were) that plots were scarce and in demand, and so, needs must. Some of the plots in Stanley have improved the general appearance and general use. But perhaps some still available could be pursued for purchase by FIG to turn into more green space, tree plantations etc? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not clear 	
Infrastructure		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Until we can significantly increase our infrastructure in Stanley the town cannot support the health and educational needs of an extra 450 households. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing development is needed but at this level we need 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

significant change in our infrastructure, (education, health, water, roads etc) before this is a realistic proposition.		
Housing Allocations		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I agree with the completion of phase 1 and 2 at Sapper Hill, but why does the rest of the proposed housing have to be all crowded into the 'Stanley area'. Why not consider going a bit further a field like areas near Stanley – Old Dairy, Two Sisters – just a bit further out of Town. I am sure there are quite a few residents who would like to be further out – much like the Old Browning's farm near Mullet Creek had developed privately. In fill – I dislike this central Stanley. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP4 TP6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think that developing houses south of the bypass is essential and a good idea. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> South of Stanley Bypass – if people would like to live to the south of the bypass then why stop them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Your comment H5 has potential – if layout and amenities can be amended. H4 again has potential but up to the private sector as to what they do with it. H3 – area of historical interest – ruins of WWII Camp still remain and should be protected. Most of the bullet pointed sites suggested in 4.12 have had planning permission refused at one time or another. If or when these do become available for development (or indeed change of use was implemented) I would suggest that all previous submitters should be contacted and asked if they would like to resubmit their application and the earliest submitters considered first. As for other sites, the area to the West of the golf course and Moody Brook Valley could be developed further although I do believe there are some remains of the research station that might need to be considered/protected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area to the south of the Bypass should be left largely as it is – it is recreation land which seems to be diminishing as the town/population grows. Why not extend the housing along the west along the harbour and then, east along the north side as far as Fairy Cove. That's assuming the Port project goes ahead and water/power services taken down that side of the harbour. Revert to the old fashioned grid system for the layout of future housing developments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit Sapper Hill to development so far and put link road into 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

West Stanley. Then use Moody Brook Road and Bennett's Paddock next. Encourage FIC to develop their land.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to embrace growth and development and identify and encourage more sites to do this around the islands. We are fighting for backyards to building houses, cramming into small spaces yet are surrounded by land. FIG should invest in putting infrastructure in other places. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
Plots		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serviced plots definitely assist people wishing to build to reduce their overall costs - when a plot of land is costing you up to £30,000 that doesn't leave a lot for building the actual house 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maybe housing plots of varying sizes should be made available. Larger for those people who might want a vegetable garden and smaller for those that don't. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide serviced plots, so buyers can have houses designed to their individual requirements and arrange their construction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On smaller plots and/or semi-detached so that they are more affordable for older people wishing to downsize and for young people wishing to get onto the property ladder 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There's no need to make massive plots like original Stanley plots but there's also no need to make plots so small that they're of no use. Just make them a sensible size. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be a variety of different sized plots. It is clear in East Stanley, there are small houses on large underutilized plots, they should have been sold a small plot. Those with families &/or wanting gardens should have large plots to choose from. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People should be given the choice of size of plot they wish to purchase and be in relation to the size of house they wish to build. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
Mix of plots and houses		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A mixture of both serviced plots and building accommodation (no necessarily houses). We should be looking for variety. We don't wish to see an eastern bloc type of housing estate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C-noted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP2 TP2 TP6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A mix of A and B. Serviced plots are good but everyone wants to build the biggest house they can afford on their plot to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

increase value. Re-sale price is usually above what 1 st time buyers can afford. Smaller single person/couple developments are needed to address bottom rung of housing ladder.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other. We need a mixture of both. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think you need a mix of both available - serviced plots and constructed houses people can move into. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other. I think a combination of both is needed. We need to ensure some plots are a decent size though for the reason outlined above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There needs to be a mix of the above with the additional option of acquiring low priced unserviced plots possibly with a minimum of two years to develop or hand back in. The one thing we have is plenty of land and this would relieve FIG of the work and financial pressure of servicing plots. The additional labour involved in servicing one's own plot could even contribute to the health of the nation :-) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
Housing types		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need more "Hansen Hill" type attractive 2-bedroom terraces. These houses are ideal for a couple, can be used to accommodate up to 2 children if accommodation is in short supply, but are not so large that single people feel uncomfortable for them. When built as terraces rather than semi-detached houses, they will take up less space, make more efficient use of roads and infrastructure, and have small front and back gardens which will not be too arduous to maintain for those who are not keen on gardening yet at the same time provide a safe enclosed play space for very young children. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many retired people would move to a smaller property if they could still have a garden. This would free up larger properties for families. Apartments and smaller houses would be good for people starting out. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	TP2 TP6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do think a wider range of accommodation, as suggested is sensible, starting with one bedroom flats, with at most a very limited outside facility such as a storage shed, two bedroom flats for one child family or couple, to larger properties for families. Perhaps systems such as least to buy could be considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The population will grow with labour coming into the Falklands, our young people need suitable accommodation, i.e. flats small one bedroom flats and starter homes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	TP2 TP6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow the market to set its own range of house size and types (because what is the point of administratively seeking to control or influence it?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Smaller homes for couples and single people need to be catered for. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think this is an oddly worded question. We do have a broad range of houses, yes many are detached on large plots, but some of those are small houses. I would be happy to see smaller houses being built, or two storey apartments, but nothing high rise, and maintaining large plots because we have plenty of land. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-detached properties, either privately or Government owned look tidier, and give a greater sense of permanence and "home" to those living in them. A line of semi-detached with a communal parking, laundry and drying area can simplify design and reduce costs appreciably 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognise that Stanley has an aging population. An appropriate place of residence for those who are unable to live independently should be a key focus to demonstrate a caring community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> But not in precincts of each type. Allows for a broad spread of demographics in all locations. Realistic sense of community and association with a range of people no matter what their background or circumstances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different types of housing should be considered - more flats for single people/contractors without children 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correct that probably not everyone wants to live in a detached house with a large garden. Some people would probably want to live in flats, although I can't understand it myself. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think people naturally want to design their own houses rather than have to take what someone else has decided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think the maths is about right. Having said that as mentioned previously, we should be thinking of flats/apartments rather than always concentrating on three or four bedroom houses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>Flats/apartments have a bad reputation, but can be properly designed and built to meet people's expectations and needs.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I keep finding that I have answered the points raised in previous responses so apologies! Yes we are too obsessed with houses. We need apartments/flats but properly designed to meet people's expectations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We already have a lot of mid-size to large houses on large individual plots. We need to provide a greater range of housing, and to address the needs of contract officers and temporary oil workers. Furthermore, as the private housing pool continues to expand with the development of Sapper Hill, so the housing market will expand, and people who in the future want a fair-size house but who cannot secure a serviced plot will be able to buy an existing property (some of which are becoming quite run down) and customise it by doing such renovations / extensions/ garden improvements as they think fit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<p style="text-align: center;">TP2 TP6</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is definitely a need for an apartment style accommodation - either in the style of flats or terraced accommodation - within Stanley. In varying sizes - 1 or 2 bedroom - this would cater for the young single population, couples and couple/single parents with one child. With the cost of buying or building a property steadily increasing year on year there are fewer young couples or single people in a position to be granted a mortgage by the bank and so small apartments available to rent or rent-to-buy agreement would help people get themselves onto the housing ladder. Additionally, there is a need to single person accommodation for the older generation - the YMCA is aimed at the younger end of the single population and most people in their 30s would not want to share accommodation with several 18 year olds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of options would cater for all types of homeowners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More detached homes on relatively large plots and some smaller homes on smaller plots. A lot of people from overseas will come here and settle for an apartment or flat as they have lived in them overseas in crowded towns or cities. However as they settle and acclimatize to the lifestyle they will desire a detached home with a garden. These will become overpriced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<p style="text-align: center;">TP2</p>

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>and scarce if not enough are built and local buyers entering the property market may be priced out. The character of Stanley is special. Outlaw apartment blocks and terraces. Maybe allow a few semi-detached house if you have to.... Let the housing influence the lifestyle of the people who to it rather than restricting them.</p>		TP6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AS the Falkland isn't in a big need for apartments and flats I don't believe that the way of life should be introduced into the islands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are very limited options for renting in the Falklands at the moment and the houses/flats available are generally expensive and government housing is almost like gold dust. Although mobile homes are a cheap and easy way to house people, they are not permanent. A more permanent flat structure, such as the Jersey Road flats needs to be considered. As do single person units. Lookout Lodge was originally constructed for this however I do feel that maybe this was not appropriate for single contractors here for the long term. Having to share facilities with other people will potentially put contractors off. Single and coupled young people find it impossible to find places to rent. The lack of housing is forcing young people to build houses when really they are not ready to be forced to say in one place for at least 10 years (with the rules of a subsidised plot). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Again, a happy medium would be good here. Although people enjoy building houses that are uniquely their own. It is too much fuss for others and it puts them off. Have houses that are ready to move into would prove just as popular. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good to offer apartment option for young people and those who are on unaccompanied contracts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
FIG's Role		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governments needs to increase the housing pool, while still providing serviced plots for people to build homes, both first and subsequent buyers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FIG should only be building housing for their contract officers and social welfare circumstances. Otherwise private sector business should lead on housing development. FIG may facilitate servicing and financial arrangements for buyers but ideally that should be catered for by the bank and the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

private sector busy.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We also need to be flexible. Sapper Hill is fine, but the plots are small, the FIG scheme for first time buyers is too obsessed with control over young people's lives (the payback which effectively lasts for eleven years and the inability to rent rooms without loss of subsidy). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Room for both these options - private builders/investors should be encouraged but if FIG subsidised land is provided there needs to be a cap on rental charges as some of the private sector rates are astronomical - if there is no appetite from the private builders/investors could not FIG sell some of their old stock houses and reinvest in new build properties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
FIG Land Release Practice		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A proper land release policy should allow FIG to only service and build houses for contract officers and social needs. Subsidising plots has had the effect of deterring private housing developments (because it cannot compete) and should stop in order to encourage private developments. If necessary grants offered to individuals to buy serviced plots to safeguard development standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	<p style="color: red; text-align: center;">These are issues which will be relayed to the corresponding department for their information.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No point in encouraging the building of houses when there is no industry to sustain the new community. And there is no point in developing industry if the infrastructure is not there to support it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also, currently people who have a subsidized plot are almost prevented from purchasing another (due to high purchase price). As a young family with a subsidized plot but with good joint income we want to invest in building one or later, a few houses to rent yet the cost of the plots stops this. We don't want to take plots away from the 1st time buyers but there are available plots, that we can't afford to buy. If allowed to build to rent its helping solve a housing shortage, as not everyone wants a mortgage to build their own home. Equally there is a lack of building contractors to build houses upfront and then sell, there is a need in the market for someone to look at a show home and purchase a new house, as you would elsewhere in the world. Again, not everyone can cope with the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>task involved in building a house, but would perhaps finish a property happily. Perhaps FIG could assist in the financially in setting this up – by offering light loans or other assistance.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The list should give priority to those people already living in the Falkland Islands and not to Contract workers coming into the islands with oil companies. Priority should secondly be given to those islanders who are moving back to the islands after a maximum of 10 years away (10 years so they are able to retain their status). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A housing association to assist first time buyers. The FIC scheme is excellent and has helped many so far. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 49% of people earn 15k per annum or less. There needs to be some thought given as to how these people can be assisted on to the property market. Housing Association - flats - rent to buy schemes. All of these problems have been tackled in other jurisdictions and we should learn and adapt such schemes and apply them to the Falklands. We need to be aware of the poverty that exists here and make sure we create an equitable society. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A profitable system whereby FIG or the private sector build multiple houses - either large or small detached, semi-detached or terraced - and sell them on to members of the public for a reasonable price would be a venture whereby everyone wins. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although there is presumably a need for both serviced plots and constructed houses. Perhaps there is a need to provide some mechanism to encourage private sector led construction for re-sale. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B&E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIC approach at present in delaying payments until the house is completed is very helpful to people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having said that the provision of serviced building plots seems to be the greatest facilitator of house building and community growth if not economic growth. Serviced plots should be provided until demand is satisfied, providing it can be afforded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These are not necessarily mutually exclusive options. The demand should be assessed and acted on accordingly. Provision of serviced plots is clearly the first step. Thereafter individuals can either build their dream home, or buy 'off the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<p style="color: red; text-align: center;">These are issues which will be relayed to the corresponding department for their information.</p>

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

shelf' if someone has taken a chance in providing such housing.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In regards to land being allocated to more housing, I totally agree but I think strongly that this moment in time the first time buyer status holder should be priority / top of the list and not come on the same par as a PRP holder. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These houses should only be for islanders and first time buyers as there is a constant need for land and houses in the islands of locals but they should see them at a cheaper price 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
Targets		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocate land for housing 50 years plus ahead now. It does not need to be developed. If we do not we will always be looking round. Think big and look far ahead please. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some assumptions are fine. I feel looking 15 years ahead is too short. Look 50 years plus. Instead of 450 houses assume double the current numbers and earmark sites (1200 homes). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Think long term about where local facilities/houses etc may need to be built in the future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No it should be higher. As the economy grows so will the work force. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing costs are over inflated (a bubble). Increasing supply would compensate for this. 500 houses in Stanley plus increased investment in housing in camp at preferred locations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The target for housing cannot be established until the issue of a target population is established 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 450 is the figure that has been calculated used existing data - that is all we can use to make these projections, in 5 years time it may become obvious that the number needs to be higher or lower but for right now it seems a fairly sensible number to be working with. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of new houses is not enough. Stanley (and the Falkland Islands) has been experiencing a severe housing shortage for over a decade and FIG are only playing catch up and not getting ahead of the game. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FIG is only playing catch up...the number of houses required needs to be increased just to cope with local demand (especially as FIG keep giving houses required for the local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>pool away to the contract pool) plus as the Falkland Islands become richer more people will move back and want housing (has happened in the past, usually with kids and then become a burden on society). Plus private rental rates are too high for people to be able to afford to save for a mortgage and [pay] rent.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 450 houses planned to be built and potentially brought may not be enough for when the younger generation wants to settle down and build a home of their own 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing demand and the house building programme needs monitoring and adjusting accordingly. A simple figure may be appropriate. The level of population increase assumed probably depends on oil development - not a certainty. The population flat-lined between the 2 most recent census dates; actually declined marginally. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 450 houses? Where does that come from? Land sufficient for a particular outcome would be better. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
Miscellaneous		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No matter what though, there has to be consistency which has been lacking throughout the years of planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These are issues that are more relevant to the facilities available to build i.e. finance, mortgage
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RE housing. We need more houses and Sappers Hill will help a great deal with this, but it is still hard for some to build their own houses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing for young people is a huge issue. Some of the pressure has been taken off by schemes such as FICs housing scheme and FIG increase in government housing. However, there is still a lot of young people forced to take houses with high rent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More people are building houses which will reduce the house waiting list - if not, then more encouragement and opportunities needs to be given to enable those (that can) to build their own property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	

Summary

Broad support for the continuation of serviced plot provision by FIG but also recognition that support needed to encourage the private sector to develop. A number of calls for FIG/Private sector to build houses ready to sell & move in to. Plenty of opinions about plot size, but general consensus calls for a variety of sizes. Recognition that small starter homes/flats/apartments would meet market needs and preferred to mobile homes/caravans. Calls for strategic design policy in terms of layout of plots and orientation of buildings. Number of comments relating to overly zealous conditions placed on terms of sale for first time buyers when purchasing FIG serviced plots.

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

MOBILE HOMES		
Supportive		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All towns need low-cost accommodation for 1st time buyers or low-income individuals. If mobile homes are cost effective and provide a reasonable standard of accommodation then so be it. Private sector should be encouraged to meet demand but provision of affordable flats/mobile homes (e.g. Eliza Crescent, Murray Heights) is needed and may not have enough of a margin to encourage private sector – better profit from building bigger houses – so FIG may need to lead on these. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	TP7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mobile homes provide a good source of accommodation for those not in a position to buy their own home. Personally I found living in a mobile home good incentive to get in a position (by doing three jobs) to get my own house. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mobile homes are fine as an interim option, but there should be some sort of deadline so that people don't end up living in them indefinitely. I don't want a whole bunch of mobile home camps appearing around Stanley. Whilst they do serve as rolling interim accommodation, whilst people look to find more permanent measures. A small house, of a similar size, or one bed apartment, may take longer to construct but if built well will look nice and last much longer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	TP7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other. I think mobile homes if of a good standard have a place as temporary housing facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	TP7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mobile homes are a welcome addition to fulfilling the housing needs. Its been gratifying to see young people especiatly so happy to have place either of their own or rented. Well done FIG 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mobile homes are good however it would be better if they could be a more permanent looking area with better landscaping etc so that they don't look as though they are just being thrown onto a piece of land and forgotten. I think we need a mix of both. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A limited supply of Mobile Homes as an interim measure or even some as long-term is fine - they have their purpose. Also 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

I see nothing wrong with people living in mobile home on their house site while they build if that suits them.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permanently sited mobile or caravan-style homes are an affordable accommodation option. Aesthetically, it would be better to create areas designated for the siting of that style of accommodation rather than it becoming a Stanley in-fill option and factors such as boundary fencing and off-street parking should be taken into account. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
Alternatives		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building more apartments and other smaller houses as 14b, would hopefully avoid the need for Murray Heights type accommodation (which by the way is not that cheap anyway) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	TP7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't agree with mobile home think flats would be a better option i.e. 1 or 2 bedroom flats are better value. If we use mobile home they should be for temporary labour. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, mobile homes should be a last option. Build smaller proper accommodation if needed. Mobile homes, waste of money, unsightly. Not for long term. Single accommodation can be built in blocks and later be used for something else or dismantled. Endless types of block accommodation for single/temporary accommodation available on the market. No more mobile home plots – building plots with proper houses and long term. Mobiles are terrible, 2nd rate accommodation. Not necessary for permanent or even short term (holiday living only 2-3 weeks) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> mobile homes are not suitable for long term residence, but there should be housing along the same lines for the cost of the rent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be enough housing built to enable the removal of Murray Heights and to provide spare capacity of say 10 units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please no more mobile homes! Build nice blocks of flats fit for purpose of semi-detached houses. The mobile home developments look horrific and I don't believe they are economical in the long term. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As an alternative to mobile homes why not build an apartment block? This would not necessarily have to be that large or imposing, and would likely be more efficient in terms of space. A communal garden would fulfil any needs for an outdoors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

recreational area.		
Long term		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordability drives demand for cheaper caravan/mobile home type housing. New and appropriate land disposal and other policy will impact this in a positive way. With all the land the Falklands has available and the standard of living we enjoy we should not be housing our people in caravans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED AND PASSED TO RELEVANT DEPARTMENT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I particularly dislike mobile homes - it makes us look like a transient gypsy population rather than people who really live here. We should accept them as a necessary evil to cater for short term shortages of proper dwellings but the clear objective should be to get rid of them completely 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
Integrate		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mobile homes are cramped, poorly insulated, with no storage space and no gardens. In consequence they create an economic sub-class within our community. They are also located far from shops and services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As mobile homes aren't permanent accommodation and it will divide the islands as they are in the back of town. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
Against		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although mobile homes are a cheap and easy way of housing people, they don't necessarily look that great and I'm not sure they should be a long term solution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mobile homes have a limited life and give the appearance of a shanty town. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The idea of murray xxxxx shanty town hidden behind its fence and cunningly crafted peat bog track increasing in size is appalling - do we really want that to be our built heritage legacy! The aim should be to get rid of it entirely. What is currently up there should do for the interim measure only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<p>Summary General recognition that mobile homes are a temporary solution and that it would be better for flats/apartments/terraces in a similar price bracket to be built (by FIG or private sector). Concern that current siting of mobile home park creates segregation and isolation of the park residents from the main part of Stanley and the Stanley community. Some comments that if other mobile home parks are necessary they need to be better planned and integrated and landscaped than recent developments.</p>		

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

ALLOTMENTS		
Support		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So many reasons to support this; import substitution, recreation, mental health and wellbeing. Give people big enough plots to build a decent garden and you risk them subdividing them, which makes for poor planning. 	• B	• NOTED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I'm torn between the second and third options and think a combination is needed. Some plots should be big enough to allow gardens but allotments are also a good idea for those who prefer apartment living. 	• B	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would support allotment provision in principle, but would not be interested in taking one on myself. 	• B	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there was ever an allotment provision then people who have sold their back yards should be exempt from obtaining a plot. But this is probably another area that will just turn into a dumping ground. 	• C	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have sufficient garden space. Allotments are worth trying to encourage people to be more active and also provide a means of getting some cheaper vegetables. However, there is a high risk that the site would become unsightly. (I haven't seen too many tidy, attractive allotments in UK) so its location would need careful consideration. 	• C	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would support allotment provision in principle, but would not be interested in taking one on myself. I own a large plot already with vegetables & flower gardens and room for chickens. The idea of allotments would be a good one if housing plots were to decrease to 400 sq. metres or less. 	• B	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be nothing wrong with making some allotments for those people who are unfortunate enough to live in flats and terraces with no space but to avoid making that mistake in the future, make plots big enough. Even if one owner doesn't use it, the next may well appreciate it. 	• B	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't think it is a particularly important issue right now, I think more people should be aiming to be self sufficient. And would support maintaining large plots, however, there are lots of people who do not use the large gardens they have for anything so they are overgrown instead and some where they 	• B	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>have space for a veggie plot. For that reason I would definitely support allotments, but I have my own garden growing veg so wouldn't need one.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I'm sure most people have 80-100m spare in their gardens to develop their own garden but I would think one of the biggest issues is lack of decent top-soil. As with pasture improvement subsidies for farmers, could FIG not look to provide a similar subsidy for those in Stanley looking to develop their own garden? Hand-outs to Stanley Residents...now that would be noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED
Time constraints		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> My East Stanley plot is on a steep slope and contains a lot of rock. After factoring-in the space occupied by the house and parking, that leaves only a drying green and a front lawn. I hope that any allotments would have the rocks/stones removed before allocation, and be provided in the first instance with top soil. Like many people in Stanley I work very long hours (as well as volunteering in several different capacities) and I would struggle if required to "create" a garden rather than simply start planting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A veggie garden can be maintained in a small space - raised beds etc etc the problem which is not considered is that folk no longer have the time to maintain gardens that is probably a bigger issued than land pressures (which frankly is a joke - there is plenty of land) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People have very little time or energy to spend on vegetable gardens and, if economic, growth does happen on the scale I hope for, then that time will become even less. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	
Schemes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To me this is not a significant issue in the Falklands - as many individuals have family and friends with whom they can obtain fresh produce or work within their gardens. Perhaps this would be better served by introducing a scheme in which people can offer to work in other's gardens for a share of the produce? There are a lot of gardens that are currently not maintained by the owners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We also need to recognise that the cost of fruit & veg is very high and likely to rise and FIG should encourage its tenants to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

grow their own through the provision of sufficient land for garden plots.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If we are to tackle the high cost of imported vegetables and grow our own (as was the intention of the import substitution plan) then we have to tackle it on an industrial scale rather than rely on gardens/allotments. What we should be doing instead is providing an industrial scale solution. Large industrial polytunnels for example, heated with excess power should be run as a business. The Israelis seem to be pretty good at this. It needs tackling for many good reasons. I recently bought two tomatoes that had been grown locally for £1.87. The following week I bought (in the UK) six larger and "better" tomatoes for 50 pence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If people want to do some gardening, there are quite a few semi-disused gardens around town. Individuals can approach the owners if they may be used for a period. These plots are often already set up and sheltered. New allotments may be expensive to create, and I am not sure there will be great demand. However, if a group of people interested in this would like to develop a plot, they can form a club, ask for a specific plot from FIG for say 10 years, and show that there is a case. There are a few areas where this could happen and I would welcome proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	
Against		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fig had allotments which are now the Tax/Malvina carpark. They were not used for more than 19 years. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FIG should not get involved. . 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wouldn't favour these. I have seen allotments in UK and they always look very untidy and half neglected. Maybe some help/assistance should be given to people in camp, or Stanley for that matter, who might want to grow vegetables for sale (what has happened to the Fitzroy gardens) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although we have a garden on our plot that would be big enough to hold a polytunnel we would give up potential family areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
Summary		

Equal views for and against allotments. Recognition that modern lifestyle does not allow time to tend large gardens but ultimately having/not having allotment is personal choice. Concern that allotments would just be left untidy and unkempt as per story in UK.

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014		
GREENSPACE		
Policy		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What needs to be in place are robust policies to ensure that adequate standards or amenity are achieved, design guidance to achieve coherence and a sense of place, and that development is properly serviced before it is occupied. 	• C	• TP10
Supportive		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I feel green space makes Stanley what it is. Its important for tourists who enjoy the very special feel of Stanley, but more important for the health of the people who live here. Space for children to play, and an environment where people might choose to walk rather than always driving. I understand the need for the town to grow but not at the expense of its very unique identity. This is a critical time to make careful decisions to protect the vey nature of what Stanley is. 	• C	• TP10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes lots of them! 	• B	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think all of the above are very important - leaving open space provision would be my priority, but only if it was then used/cared for as opposed to remaining as a scrubby piece of camp and tall grass between houses. 	• C	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All three are of equal importance in terms of maintaining an appropriate level of green space within the town which people can enjoy and walk/cycle through without difficulty and providing adequate recreational facilities to improve the health and fitness of the population. 	• B	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greenspace already allocated must be maintained 	• B	
Specific sites		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The smaller greenspaces H2, H6, H8, H10, H12) should be kept as green space. Building on every available piece of land would ruin the look of Stanley, preserving green space is of paramount importance. 	• B	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I believe that the whole section between Goss Road and H Jones Road (green space east of 7 Goss Road) should remain green space and not half housing and half green space 	• C	• TP10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The section between Sapper Hill Road and the new 	• C	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

development should be green space or possibly allotments and not become a commercial areas as shown on the town plan		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> East Stanley was well planned initially. Original green areas that have been re-allocated for development should be returned to green area status if they have not been built on. The area to the west of 17 Goss Road was all designated green space. Now the south part of this plot has been designated for development. It can still revert to green space. Whilst everyone was informed of the town plan several years ago, the re-designation of some plots in 2009 was not so widely publicised. Unfortunately the green areas that have been built on cannot be reclaimed. This was a mistake. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rocky green space in front of the Sapper Hill Development should be left as green space - not kept available for more properties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
Seafront		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harbour side green area. Whilst not everyone gets the view of Stanley Harbour from their homes, it should be available as far as possible for the full length from a strip of green area running the whole length of the harbour. Anyone should be able to walk along. This should be made law as far as possible. The industrial area from around FIPASS to past boxer bridge should be modified in such a way that this is possible with a strip about the width of Victory Green where ever possible and certainly a right of way should be preserved. It is currently a pleasant walk from East Stanley to the Seamen's Mission and that should be preserved. Unfortunately there are a couple of homes and the FIC dock area in the way as you continue West. Existing grassy areas should be preserved an the FIC should be banned from stacking their containers so high that they block the view of the harbour entirely when you walk along in front of their offices. As you advance towards Moody Brook there should be a public right of way along the harbour front. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't allow anymore private development along the sea front. This should all be open to the public. Do no develop Stanley Common into an industrial area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be lovely to ensure no more development between the front road and the harbour and footpaths and benches built to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

allow easier access around this area.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some years ago, there was a law or regulation passed in Council that no building shall take place on the strip of land between the beach and Ross Road West from the 1914/18 memorial to the Beaver Hangar. I just wish to remind planners of this. Also, there were restrictions enforced on building to the West of the Beaver Hangar, on the waterfront strip of land and this seems to have gone by the board. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would like to see the issue of the waterfront development being brought into the vision. A number of locations on the front where small vessels and visiting yachts can moor and use shore facilities etc. The chartering business has been growing operation from Stanley over the last 15 years but there are serious limitations in terms of shore services provided. As an island nation, easy access from and to water is crucial. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP10
New developments		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring new significant housing developments contain on-site public open space provision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP10 TP3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All new developments should include public open space. The original plan for Sapper Hill development was fantastic and this is what should have been built. Not the dreadful cost cutting design we have ended up with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When planning developments (especially at the current density of new developments) on site open space is essential for health and wellbeing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
Infill		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I feel all infill of greenspace in Stanley should be stopped. The identity of Stanley has changed dramatically over the last twenty years. How many houses have been built on green space over this time? Sometimes it appears that any backyard is suitable for another house. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If planning didn't allow so much over building in the green areas of Stanley back gardens etc there wouldn't be a need for this even being up for discussion...it has spoilt the beautiful spacious look of our town we have so much land so why!! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A7. Yes but infill development has already happened and it would be wrong to change policies now just because there is "oil money" paying for it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A7 - the development of Stanley is already out of control, with buildings being situated in green space e.g. people's back gardens. This is ruining the feel and look of Stanley. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
Against		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am not sure we need to provide "green corridors" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<p>Summary Calls for greenspace areas to be maintained/increased and to remain as such. Particular concerns regarding the strip between seafront and Ross Road – number of comments stating that this must be maintained development free. Comments that there is no need to develop every space in Stanley when we are surrounded by land. Calls for infill to stop.</p>		
<p>INFRASTRUCTURE</p>		
Current situation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The infrastructure we currently have is in some cases in a poor state we need to get that sorted before rushing [into new projects] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	TP11 TP12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within the islands we appear to always adopt a quickest/cheapest fix approach to infrastructure projects with little thought given to the future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> other actions', invest in Stanley infrastructure eg development of Stanley Airport to be able to hand international flights etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
Sapper Hill		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the infrastructure for the first two 'loops' at sappers hill have already been provided – in the next phases I would advise that the roads are made wider. As a retained firefighter, it concerns me that we took the Fire Engine up around the existing plots and we struggled to manoeuvre, any serious incident there is no chance of getting there quickly or getting two appliances. The road connecting these houses to the front road by the beaver hanger is an excellent idea. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP2 TP6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> And roads shouldn't be as narrow as those in the Sapper Hill development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
Additional route to West Stanley		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed road connecting sapper hill development to the westernmost end of Ross Road should also branch south and connect with the bypass [MPA Road] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP2 TP11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I believe that a road connecting the Sapper Hill development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>with West Stanley is vital - currently there is no access to West Stanley other than Ross Road.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The population of Stanley west of the 1914/18 memorial is growing very quickly with additional Moody Brook housing and those at Mink Park. Should Ross Road in the area of the memorial ever be closed for some reason (accident, gorse fire or parades) there is no alternative route for traffic. It was proposed some time ago that road would be built somewhere in the region of Racecourse Road East, between the Racecourse Cottages up over the ridge up onto the road between FICS and the Power House. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<p>Location of school</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why not develop the area to the west of FICS and build a new school there – there could be access from both Racecourse Road end and the current access to FICS. It would allow facilities to be shared without small children having to cross a busy road. The Training Centre area would be a very bleak spot, especially in winter, to drop off and pick up small children. It would mean the removal of the ‘forest’ but the only use that provides is shelter for kids to smoke and, particularly the eastern section, could be a fire hazard being so close to the FICS. Furthermore, as the town grows, surely the training centre should be kept for future expansion of power and water facilities. Sporting facilities – could the Racecourse area be used for this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why is the new school being placed near the power station surely it would make more sense to build it up by the community school there’s enough space through the small forest, also gives the children more safety and can walk to facilities to pool etc without going on a main road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<p>Sports/Leisure facilities</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sports facilities I would wish to see usage data for our current facilities before funding more or larger facilities. I am not convinced that we need more facilities but would be happy to be proved wrong. I would suggest there are other infrastructure priorities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need for a proper and better sports facilities is key to the development of our younger generation to be able to take part 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

in games and not feel behind all the other countries taking part.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Start small - Stanley currently can be an unpleasant experience for the walker/cyclist as well as downright dangerous when vying with 4x4 traffic travelling at speed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be great if there were more walking/cycling paths, for instance from Stanley to Surf Bay on the waterfront, and perhaps the same from the west end of Stanley to Moody Brook. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a need for larger centrally located facilities for the entire community to enjoy. Improving the potential for cycling/walking around Stanley would be nice but I would think be difficult/costly due to the narrow roads and verges. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think we also need larger facilities (not necessarily centrally located) – the “big shed” idea which can cater for a number of different indoor activities on a scale greater than the current gymnasium is particularly interesting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More facilities for children/families is essential - there is nothing to do or encourage people to go on the evenings/weekends. An indoor entertainment centre would be very popular with cafe, play centre, cinema, bowling alley etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think walking around Stanley is currently, fine, the areas that don't have pavements either side of the road have very little traffic (except the bypass). Larger facilities centrally located would be great, but would cost a lot, and I would rather see that money go on other capital projects, so it could be something to ask the private sector to develop - can't see it making enough money. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> or "cycle lanes". Pathways for people to walk along have already been provided quite sensibly (Sapper Hill Phase 5 for example. People tend not to cycle for good reasons - the climate is not helpful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't see that there's an issue for walking/cycling around Stanley (apart from lack of street lights in some areas). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Go for growth, and encourage expansion. There is a desperate need for things which make life worth living including proper culture, art, proper drama, music, a proper selection of restaurants and the need for entertainment for all especially the young to include cinemas, proper youth clubs, a swimming pool 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

that is actually open etc. Without the introduction of a wider diversity of people and badly needed expertise in most areas these finer things will never be achieved.		
Sewage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sewage disposal needs to be addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some change is already required as though we are still pre oil there are a lot of resources that are stretched by our natural growth. . Another example is the sewage system PWD spends a lot of time clearing and fixing the pump stations due to having reached capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
Transport		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The transport infrastructure is very important both economically and socially. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP3 TP11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the small population, a hub based system for transportation is by far the most efficient and should be encouraged by FIG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<p>Summary Calls for grid iron road system to be reinstated and width of roads to be increased. Particular dislike for loopy, narrow roads. Suggestions about possible sites for new school, power station. Some discussion on the virtue of additional sports facilities with recognition that outdoor exercising (cycling) is difficult both due to traffic and climate. Island-wide transport connection and provision is also a hot topic. Considerable support for a link road from Sapper Hill to West Stanley, with some suggesting this branch to the south to connect to MPA road.</p>		
CAMP		
Work		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If FIGs desire for the repopulation of the camp is indeed serious encourage work in camp (e.g. the abattoir should've been at Goose Green) by tax breaks and other means, enable people to make a meaningful investment by enabling them to build homes in camp 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED and passed on to relevant FIG department/Committee
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A8 people can't live in camp if there is no work - there is no work because FIG keeping all the development in/around Stanley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main reason for lack of Camp population is that there is little economic activity that can be done there other than existing farming and tourism, neither of which require many people. The only way the population will really increase is if there are things people can do there to earn a living. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish an industry. As previous. People wouldn't move to camp for the sake of it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That is very rosy and an unreal vision of Camp. Without some new industry camp will continue to decline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify a serious source of jobs (20-30) that can be concentrated in camp and the rest will follow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPA or Stanley will be the obvious providers of jobs so in the short term Fitzroy or Goose Green are prime REZ. Building on the theory of jobs first infrastructure next. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
Infrastructure		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once roads and ferries are able to make it possible for heavy vehicles to move island-wide, year round, development of the camp will be achievable, and will allow businesses to move to the camp. Make the whole of the camp an Enterprise Zone (it is highly unlikely that new tourism destinations will be in a large (as any) settlement. Tourism is likely to be one of the few industries that oil will expand. Areas where there is clear potential in business development. The assumption that creating REZs in existing large settlements does not mean that they will create more jobs. It is difficult to see how REZs will create an environment suitable for anything other than minor development. Fox Bay being a case in point. Better to create incentives to encourage any meaningful development anywhere in the camp. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rather than artificially supporting camp give camp the transport links to afford industry to thrive, whether farming, tourism, service industries or manufacturing. Don't subsidise, it is demoralising. Simpler to give the opportunity to people to make their own way. I would rather open up camp and allow it to develop its own way but if we are to have REZ have two in case one fails. Don't put all your eggs in one basket. You need people to kick it off, use existing infrastructure,. Stanley/MPA always expect a "pull", save money and use existing infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The investment in the ferry must be a major factor in addition to the cost of maintaining roads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing infrastructure, road network, available land, proximity to ferry and MPA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport infrastructure will be important, no matter what. The road network opened up camp dramatically, but as we develop, the quality of those roads/tracks cannot handle the increase in traffic. Selected settlements could become hubs like they once were, but some are dead ends as money has been pumped into places like Fox Bay for years but nothing has changed, no increase in population, and no viable houses for people to live in. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is difficult to get your product to town when your transport system changes with the seasons. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anywhere, water supply will be a key issue. Some industries also require extra water. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The more accessible camp is, the more likely people are to base themselves there. There is also a natural role for FIG in terms of that basic infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am not so confident in my answers to this question as I am a townie but it seems without good infrastructure connecting settlements, business won't be able to be supplied and send goods out/trade etc. Giving priority to settlements before individual farmsteads seems to be more efficient. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key areas to receive priority investment and other things will follow, in the right places other developments will follow automatically once a hub is established. Needs to start with tourism related businesses. Lodges/self catering developments/shop/leisure facilities. Infrastructure needs to be provided to kick start i.e. water & service provisions in key locations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The infrastructure within the FLH Farms should be looked into especially water and electricity and supply housing plots on these farms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 15 years I don't think it would be unreasonable to expect there to be a black-topped road from Stanley to New Haven and if Fox Bay does become a successful REZ then a black-topped road from Port Howard to Fox Bay at the very least. A second vessel to support ferry crossing and outer island servicing would also be a requirement. Improvement in transport infrastructure would enable an element of commuting which would support the relocation of some functions into the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

camp until they become established and housing and other infrastructure becomes available at those sites.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camp will only be a viable alternative to Stanley for living and working if there are suitable road and internet communications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
Communications		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Before a footloose industry will develop you need better communication services, such as the internet and its speed, to encourage these sort of businesses out in Camp. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication networks have to be good if you want people to live in remote areas - we can see that not many people do it because of the isolation. I wouldn't want to see FIG relocating operations to Camp, this will just add to the cost of an already expensive government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved telecoms so as to make it easier for people to tele-communicate effectively or to run a knowledge-based business. There may be people who want to live in camp but don't want to farm. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
Building		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of building a house in camp vs. its final value is an issue that will limit housing (plus availability of finance/loans to facilitate it) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camp should be minimal as it is very expensive to build in camp. The delivery charge for store is a real surprise when you get the invoice! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage more house building in the identified settlements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
Incentives		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide tax incentives for folk to work in camp, the further away from main settlement hubs, less income tax on each tax scale. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am not sure about manipulating social change through things such as tax breaks (which is I guess the thrust of this section) REZs should not simply rely on tax breaks which can change with Governments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I don't think it should be all give, give, give to camp. How the different measures affect the whole community is important 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incentives for moving individuals and businesses to Camp where viable. Either financial or offering training or apprenticeships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> REZ have their place and can clearly be promoted. However some incentives could be applied to the wider camp area. Tourism is an obvious industry which could contribute to getting more people into camp. Such ventures might happen at one of the REZ currently identified but equally there is potential for tourism ventures to happen at a number of other sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rationale for REZ may be various, however as indicated at 7 the incentives should not necessarily be limited to a few REZ there needs to be a whole camp approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The most important factor to be considered is the will to make the changes and support the development. A settlement that requires the least in terms of financial input may not necessarily be the prime location if the existing or potential population has no appetite for the development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
Regulation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No - Camp should be subject to proper regulation in all matters. The present road designation system is an example of creating one world for one and another for campers. This is unjustifiable in a modern society. If there is a similar approach taken/continued to planning and building the divide will increase. Only creating control where there might be the demand by the oil industry is removing the right of control from the people and giving it to big business. However, not to have proper controls and regulation everywhere will put off big business who are obliged to follow commonly observed health and safety and duty of care principles. Stanley should also be subject to more regulation as it is, in reality, scruffy and unkempt in many places. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A8 The level of controls within Camp should be the same as within Stanley. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assumptions are mostly appropriate but I don't think controls concerning camp development should be minimal, there may be fewer things to consider than in town development proposal but there should still be guidelines in place that should be adhered to. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A8. Domestic and light industrial development in Camp should be subject to similar controls as now but any major development must go through the same planning process as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

for Stanley.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently if you are within 500m of a designated road you have to put with all of Stanley's planning regs on top of the extra expense of building in camp, plus the fact the bank will only give you a 50% mortgage because you are outside of Stanley boundary. Rules on this are not consistent, so you cannot assume they are. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	
Zones		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other. All areas in Camp should be given equal consideration when proposing new businesses in Camp. To ensure a strong development a wide variety of businesses should be considered and their impact on the surrounding areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I don't agree with the idea of Zones. All of camp should be considered on equal merits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Somewhere else. I would not have zones and allow the free market to establish camp development areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
Location		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An EZ needs to be on the east as well as the west. A and C are also close to the road and Stanley – but that might not matter depending on the proposed projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED and passed to relevant authority
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enterprise zones – think there should be one of the east as well. Goose Green would probably be the best place to develop given that it is the largest farm. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Start by focussing on one REZ on the West and one on the East - many will be put off by the perceived remoteness of the West but would easily consider relocating to an REZ on the East where access to Stanley is easier and quicker by road i.e. Goose Green or Fitzroy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fox Bay has been an REZ for about 20yrs - it isn't working, its time to focus elsewhere. Population size is more important on the west than the east. Services can be created. I made investments/purchase/infrastructure my top 3, but only because I think these should be areas where there are subsidies, rather than the subsidies received by rural businesses currently for other things. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Or Goose Green. Fitzroy doesn't have many residents but it also doesn't have many houses owned by the farm which could create problems. However, it is close enough to mpa/Stanley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>for commuting. Goose Green has more available housing options and land space. The club at Goose Green and general community is the best on the east. Lots of people rent holiday homes there. I'm sure more people could be encouraged to work from there if there was better internet available and options available. I think Port Howard on the west, as it is at the ferry terminal, and fox bay doesn't work as an EZ.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port Howard IS a transport hub for the west, goose green gets loads of visitors. Fitzroy could do. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOTED and passed to relevant authority
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REZs are a very good idea but I don't see why it would be simpler, cheaper and more effective to promote Fitzroy. There is little point in your point 2 as this will reduce the effectiveness and efficiency of an REZ. Choose one location (I would select Fitzroy) where the chances of success are far greater for a number of reasons. Close enough to Stanley, reduced communication costs, potential for linking into grid for power, close to MPA (potential for dormitory village), close enough to Stanley for to have social links and so on. No reliance on ferry or flights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would locate more investment in Fitzroy (beauty and history) Hill Cove (beauty and history) and access to N/West Falkland and Islands of beauty and wildlife interest. San Carlos – historic interest from conflict and also well developed farm already. Also natural beauty and surrounding interest in North East Falkland/Port San Carlos also historic interest. All for development of tourism and related businesses in camp. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Falkland - Goose Green not knowing how the people of Goose Green would feel about it becoming and EDZ, factors which I think would benefit the development are: proximity to the ferry terminal; proximity to a handful of nearby settlements; size of existing settlement and availability of land for further infrastructure growth West Falkland - Hill Cove Not knowing how the people of Hill Cove would feel about it becoming an EDZ, factors which I think would benefit the development are; proximity to a handful of nearby settlements, proximity to some outer islands, size of existing settlement and availability of land for further infrastructure growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port Howard/Hill Cove would be great choices also but the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>issue of land in private ownership could be a stumbling block</p>		<p>relevant authority</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's a difficult choice between Goose Green and Fitzroy - Fitzroy is in perfect situation for easy access from MPA and Stanley, but I think Goose Green has the advantage in that it is a large settlement which would lend itself well to development in all directions. It supported a large community in the past so must have a good water source. The proximity to the ferry terminal means there would be a transient population and also lends itself well as a stepping stone to tourism on the west (Touring holidays etc) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new town either near Goose Green for agriculture/ferry developments or near the future deep water port. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fitzroy as its already becoming a hub for business in Stanley and MPA, its defacto FIG owned and therefore has similar opportunities in that regard, as Fox Bay. Other is defined as the fact that business will drive the location and the associated elements that may need to be put in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Locations in proximity to Stanley/MPA should NOT be considered for Enterprise Zones, as people living in these areas are already to benefit from jobs and services in Stanley and MPA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a Rural Enterprize Zone has been established on the West. I think it is appropriate to have one located on the East. Although I understand that Goose Greens water supply needs to be invested in, the infrastructure is already there. They have a large population for a camp settlement, and have established successful businesses (Such as the Goose Green Galley Cafe). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of small farms are centred on Hill Cove. It does not benefit from the ferry (cf. Port Howard) and both employment opportunities and population growth need to be boosted. It is also needs to encourage young people, as there are very few young families in this part of West Falkland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED and passed to relevant authority
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wages, proximity to mainstream schools for children and cost of building/buying a house in Stanley at retirement do not help to sustain camp life. Fox Bay has been going for some time now. It is time to move elsewhere. There are four farms bought by FIG. Concentrate on them. Try closer to Stanley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>and work outwards as lessons will be learnt as to what may work further from Stanley/MPA and those things that do not work can be stopped. Businesses need to see that required infrastructure/services will be available. Housing needs to be readily available.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity to the source of income for majority of the REZ inhabitants, such farming/inshore fisheries/tourism/other. No point to developing a REZ if it is in a nice place, but everyone needs to travel 30 miles each day to their work. Goose Green seems to me the most logical because of critical mass and facilities already there. In my view the FIMCO could have been constructed close by, and this may have helped both the business and Goose Green development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ranking is somewhat arbitrary and in fact as a general rule those locations with the highest current population will have the highest level of critical mass, lowest infrastructure investment required and minimal investment in water and power supply. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
Fox Bay		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The obsession with developing foxbay is unrealistic, settlement development on the east where people can commute to employment is more realistic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED and passed to relevant authority
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There needs to be an established area for focus of development. Fox Bay has historically been the focus. It has suffered from lack of commitment by policy makers but it has had much of the investment in infrastructure already so it makes sense to continue to develop that area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fox Bay has been invested in heavily over the years with a great many schemes utilised to encourage people to live there - the result is that it is obviously not found to be particularly desirable. A fresh approach nearer the population, especially until roads are of a higher quality must surely be more productive. Why keep flogging a dead horse when there is a fresh one in the stable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fox bay may be the best place to start, I don't know. It would be good if a number of places were studied, key issues such as potential water supply, cost of roads and port facilities be considered and the best chosen to plan to invest in, initially. I also think there should be some flexibility in this in that if due to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>business developments another place starts to develop in this way that has not been foreseen then there is a way to invest in that.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many millions of pounds have been invested in Fox Bay for the last 20+ years businesses have been set up and supported, infrastructure and services provided (still to this day) where other large farms Port Howard, Goose Green & North Arm do the same thing with no specific FIG support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fox bay is the easy option it is Government land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<p>Subsidies</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camp should be supported but propping up inefficient farms/business on an individual basis is not building a 'sustainable' community. Artificial bolstering of camp by relocating FIG operations to camp is a sticky plaster on the issue, not a solution. Most important to support the right places (even if more costly) than to support those that would be cheapest, but less likely to succeed. Do it properly once, rather than badly twice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED and passed to relevant authority
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reason for my "5" is that this sounds like hefty subsidies to individual farms – something FIG has been trying to get away from for many years with the abattoir. There are other things that should be prioritised such as immigration review to enable and assist people to come to the Falklands and live in camp (for example). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be no funding in individual farms as it has been proven that by working hard and little subsidy, a farm can prosper within the present/past economic climate/s. Any investment/hand outs to individual farms should come at a cost - i.e. a share in the business, such that if the business does prosper dividends go back into the public purse to benefit those Tax Payers who supported them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agricultural sector is efficient in terms of its possible potential within the limitations of the Falklands farming environment. FIG greatly facilitates this sector of the industry and the people who wish to make it their living. Further development/population/facilities in camp will be driven by the need for it; trying to create it (Fox Bay) does not and will not work. The RDS is ambitious and should be given fair support, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>however careful examination of previous investments and returns in 'camp matters' should also be carried out. Those that have shown success should be the subject of focus. In terms of FIG investment per capita the camp has been well catered for.</p>		
Business		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Living and working in camp would be a lot more attractive if people could buy their own patch to set up a business rather than rent off a land holder. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED and passed to relevant authority
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It should be remembered that if development in Camp is to be wide ranging there be non-agricultural development. The reference to farmsteads in isolation is not in keeping with this fact. Some "farmsteads" may well become used for other purposes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think that at the moment people are not moving to camp because they have no interest. I do think however that other jobs could be diverted to camp from Stanley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need for an EZ will be driven by business. If there were business opportunities being lost to individuals and companies in Stanley or camp there may be a need for EZ methodology, but if the need is there and its viable why has it not happened? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A8. It worries me that "oil-related development" is being treated as an undesirable concept by FIG. If landowners in Camp want to have oil-related development on their land, they should be encouraged to do so, with the relevant environmental protections and permissions in place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
Miscellaneous		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camp should remain as camp as people get away from town to enjoy the wildlife and freedom so I believe that camp should mainly remain the same. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED and passed to relevant authority
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasons for my choices are mainly as in the previous section. Any REZ chosen has to be given the greatest possible chance of success so that it does not become a white elephant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think camp needs to be developed and encourage more people to live there creating their own larger community and more infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I wouldn't like to see the old settlements turned into industrial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>areas. It really depends on how much industry would go there. I would be sad to see any of the above settlements completely transformed. Would really depend on what would happen to them once they became an REZ</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the REZ works then there is a change of a need for more accommodation for Camp kids in Stanley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<p>Summary General consensus that jobs in the camp are needed before people will move there. Transport and communication infrastructure are of significant importance in facilitating this. Considerable comments that settlements other than Fox Bay should be considered such as Hill Cove or Port Howard on west. Also calls for one of East Falkland – most recommending Fitzroy or Goose Green.</p>		
<p>PUBLIC SERVICES</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved medical services relative to any substantial development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any developments (hotels, shops) should be built with a diverse population in mind with easy access and a user friendly layout. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing services such as education and medical services cannot expand without new income streams to support expansion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No it should be lower. An increase in size by that number 1000 people by 2030 we could not cope with. Schools, hospitals, roads. Stanley would be a hellish place to live. Hence the reason, the oil industry should develop outside of Stanley. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<p>Summary See comments above.</p>		
<p>PORT, INDUSTRY & OIL</p>		
<p>South of Bypass</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development south of the bypass is a concern, current arrangement to the south of FIDF is a complete mess with fly tipping, old vehicles and rubbish and should be stopped. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP2 TP4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If commercial and industrial developments are wanted to the south of the bypass then why not? Servicing would surely be easier than developing linearly, whilst emergency services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>would be able to retain reduced response times. Gordon Lines – should remain as industrial servicing a new deep water port that should be developed within Stanley Harbour. Many of the unsightly businesses up this way should be forced to clean/tidy up their area</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The obvious next place for development is south of the Bypass – this is FIG owned land. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The potential area designated for industrial use to the south of the by-pass road could be significantly larger i.e. go further south. The area has been extensively utilised for peat cutting and therefore has been highly altered from its natural state so it would seem a very good site for development, as opposed to developing greenfield sites elsewhere (i.e. on Navy Point near the proposed new port site). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development next to the south side of the bypass needs screening/hidden if possible or tourists to the airport and gypsy cove will get the impression Stanley being a large scrapyard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I don't see a problem with the outline on the town map for development of south of the bypass. Could the current bypass become residential roads, and we build a new bypass to the south (perhaps joining the current bypass opposite Lookout Industrial Estate link road), thereby making a bypass that once again actually bypasses the town? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<p>Gordon Lines</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gordon Lines just as well as stay as industrial, but some control of appearance would be good. Leading tourists to gypsy Cove via a shabby industrial estate is not a memory we want tourists to go away with. With this in mind perhaps limit its expanse to the link road between the bypass and the Canache? The area around the Camber Dock is hardly unspoilt, so some development may actually improve the place. If it were to be developed, I would prefer to see housing or light industrial use, possibly with some safeguards about design of buildings to be in keeping with the Stanley Harbour waterfront (which this is). Use for laying up of fishing vessels would be acceptable, but runs the risk of associated debris – containers, nets and rubbish being strewn about. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gordon Lines area should be tidied up by tenants and much 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>better regulated. This is the same for other developments in this area. Annual checkups could be done, with penalties or removal for offenders (at offender's cost). I would say no further east than Kiel Canal Road. There is plenty of opportunity to rationalise this area and make it more environmentally friendly, or even just not as ugly with lots of unused scrap. Lessees should be encouraged to erect warehouses in which their business is conducted, with a small outside component.</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">TP1 TP2 TP4 TP5 TP10 TP11 TP12</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondly further development beyond Gordon Lines etc. is fine but the current mess allowed on some of those sites should be subject to much stricter regulation. They should never have become a dumping site for unused plant. Any future release of land to businesses should go hand in hand with government inspections to make sure all regulations are adhered to, and that agreement on visual impacts are not flouted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A4 This is absolutely crazy. Development in the Gordon Lines area and behind Megabid is very sensible and should be encouraged as part of an interim solution. If there is so much concern about oil related development long term then any development can be time limited (at a sensible level, not three years) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A5 - the additional employment land (port warehousing; facilities to support the fishing industry) should also be towards the deep water port. Gordon Line, Megabid, Lookout and Kiel Canal Road should be sufficient for other public and private purposes. Hillside is fully developed and should not be viewed as employment land. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A4 partly agree but immediate future oil support should be allowed at Gordon Lines. In the future this developed land could be used for office support and light industry for the oil or other uses. We could do with another industrial estate to encourage small local businesses, the present oil yards and related hardstanding areas could be developed for this use after a deep water port is constructed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A4 is too restrictive and is stifling current development opportunities. Most potential oil related developments are compatible with other developments and do not preclude 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 		<p>TP1 TP2 TP4 TP5</p>

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>alternative uses if/when development moves ahead in Port William. It is not as if there are plans for building an oil refinery on Gordon Lines. Warehousing and lay down areas are required for oil development now. As and when things move forward these will likely be moved to the new port and Gordon Lines would still be required for other commercial purposes.</p>		<p>TP10 TP11 TP12</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the oil, fishing, cruise liners and other industries are displayed for people to view then this piece of land dedicated to industries needs to be kept neat and tidy so visitors of the island can still enjoy their beautiful views of our island instead of having untidy industry sites to look at. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently the area around Gordon Lines looks ugly and I think we should ask if any further development is really needed in this area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<p>Location of industrial developments</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rather than cram everything around town move industry out. Either port William or port harriet. Wind farm area. The abattoir is there and quarry as well as or military range. Looking at the town plan Stanley is being ringed by industrial land. Give us room to breathe. Separate industry and residential otherwise the quality of life will go down. The current oil lay down yards should be earmarked for future housing, not industry. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	<p>TP1 TP2 TP4 TP5 TP10 TP11</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I don't agree with A4 as a certain amount of development has already taken place without it being detrimental to the town – this should be reviewed once Noble have operated their temporary dock for three years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If we allow piecemeal port development within Stanley Harbour, we will ruin the attractive nature of Stanley. There was extensive public consultation on this (and many of the other assumptions above) and the results were very clear and as detailed in the assumption you give. To do otherwise would be to ignore public consultation that has already taken place. I appreciate that currently there is a huge amount of pressure being put on our elected members from people with varying degrees of personal interest. Our elected Members need to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

bear in mind the best interests of the Falklands and everyone who lives here. Doubtless this will lead to some unpopular decision making as far as some minority groups are concerned.		TP12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A4. For the reasons outlined above, I think this policy is wrong - ie, I'm not convinced the business case will exist for a deep water port in Port William. The oil-related development which has taken place within the Gordon Lines area looks far better than the mess that was there before. I think it should continue to be allowed (with the correct planning permissions and environmental controls in place). 	• D	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A5. Yes, keep this area for industrial/commercial development but control it properly - we need to discourage businesses from making a mess as has traditionally (ie pre-oil related activity) been the case in that area for a long time. 	• C	
Camber		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Happy for the Camber to be used much more intensively for ships and pleasure craft alike. It is a port which badly needs refurbishment and blowing new life into. 	• D	TP5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The decision not to allow lay up at the Camber appears prohibitive to local business. 	• D	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The camber should be reconsidered for Fortuna's proposal. 	• D	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camber I would think this is a natural development area for all uses in housing, business development, light industry – use of port for yachts/pleasure and have extension plans for other uses – tourism needs to complete new development plan to link to Stanley – Stanley North – Roads necessary avoiding names in stone. 	• D	
Deep Water Port		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am not convinced Port William is the right place for a deep water port, but if it does go ahead peripheral development of housing and business areas are essential. It would make sense to do this on the north shore and not on the south side of Wireless Ridge. 	• D	• TP5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As for the location of the deep water port, I remain unconvinced that port William is the right spot (dredging required, limited room for manoeuvring, and the negative visual and practical impacts for arriving tourist vessels). 	• D	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to wait on a deep water port development in Port 	• D	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>William. I think improving FIPASS would be money better spent. Will the industries that have developed around the FIPASS area want to move to Port William?</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There clearly has been significant development in the Gordon Lines area which was encouraged by previous policy; in the short to medium term it is almost certainly there to stay. As identified the area is not as tidy as it could be although that problem is not confined to that area. Has it not already been stated that if the port develops in the location then there will inevitably be a lot of supporting facilities to the west? Is this not partly the reason for some of the restrictions in relation to developments at Gordon Lines? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not convinced that the port site is appropriate for either of the industries mentioned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> San Carlos as it has the potential for another port. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unclear how quickly a decision will be taken on port development in P. William and if positive how quickly it will happen. It seems that some other planning and development decisions may need to be made before that becomes clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes subject to some changes. A3. Disagree I do not believe FIG has any intention of creating a deep water port for anyone but the oil industry (i.e. excluding tourism and fishing vessels) and I am not convinced the oil industry itself actually desires a deep water port, particularly in the site being talked about in Port William. If I am wrong and the business case is made for a deep water port at that site, for use by not only the oil industry, I would support the development of adjacent land and a new link road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes subject to some changes. A3 in essence I agree with a port in Port William however to build a deep water port you first need deep water. Engineer Point is as deep if not shallower than FIPASS. It is a complete and utter waste of money (although this appears to be what FIG/Council want to do) to build an entire new port in water that is as deep as the current port. There is also the fact that the new port would be situated at the mouth of quite a large river. It is quite clear that this port has been made up by individuals with NO merchant vessel or port building experience. The oil industry isn't interested in a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>port at Engineer Point and the port would be too shallow for the large cruise vessels to use. Navy Point would be far better option with relatively flat land to the south with easy No. The deep water port has not been approved and I certainly will be objecting strongly if it is. It will ruin Stanley.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development undertaken by business recently should have been better regulated. The lights of the SAAS depo are blinding at night and noise pollution should also be considered with a higher priority than currently, especially if we are looking to build a port in the direction of prevailing winds and the additional noise that it will generate on calm nights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. A3 The Port William concept has still not been proved to be viable which is holding up all development. A clear decision needs to be made providing for an interim solution while long term solutions are properly and thoroughly investigated. There seems to be a belief that there is not enough space in East Stanley for a major port which is utterly wrong. With dredging and suitable development there is plenty of space for the foreseeable future at current oil development levels, should more major oil discoveries be made then the game changes again and should they be made there will be an argument for a separate terminal for oil related work, potentially leaving FIPASS area for tourism and fisheries until then we should continue to develop the Stanley harbour. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. A3 I think the deep water port should have been at Mare Harbour or in another location other than in Port William and the public should have been given the opportunity to select the whereabouts for this: not told where it will be situated and then asked what suggestions they have. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not believe that A3 is realistic the siting of a suitable temporary port where the Noble Pontoon is being sited is all that is needed until the full extent of the impact of oil is established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A4 is sensible but the reference to the deep water port is still in question. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deep water port should be based at Mare Harbour - improve the MPA road rather than build a new road to proposed deep water port in Port William. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A3. I don't believe a new port should be located in Port William because of the cost of getting to the site and additional cost of building the port in more open waters than Stanley Harbour. The large amount of money that would be required for the road and services would be much better spent elsewhere. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The port location needs to be reconsidered. The current FIPASS site has significant room to the east for the provision of a larger facility with no encroachment to the west and there is a lot of land to the south of the bypass road which could accommodate industrial area (the land having been used extensively for peat cutting and therefore already much altered from its natural state). Locating the port where FIPASS is, means no expenditure on getting to the site whereas for Port William a huge amount will need to be spent, just to get there. This is money that could be used for plenty of other things - I don't believe the Islands are that well off that we can afford the exuberance of spending several million pounds just to abate what I believe is an unfounded fear of disturbance to a very small part of the population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AS/A4 I don't think we should rule out Port Smylies. A deep water port is important but unless FIG invest, it will be paid for by the oil industry and may limit the use by industries such as tourism and fishing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As this many not work well - Mare Harbour would be a better location for oil-related deep water port 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A3 after studying the arguments for and against this development I am not convinced that this solution fits all requirements. I would prefer to see a permanent replacement for FIPASS with a similar handling capability and a cargo/oil support facility elsewhere but do not think that Port William is the right location. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasons for choice/detail of changes - I strongly object to A3. A deep water port should NOT be in Port William. A link road should NOT be built 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deep Water port (possibly not the correct assumption to have this rant - but I think assumption needs to be reviewed). The decisions to locate the port outside Stanley Harbour should be reviewed. A permanent fixed deep water port could/should/ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>already but under construction at the east end of the harbour. Granted, some dredging would be required but it will be required in Port William anyway. Build a 2 berth quay, get rid of FIPASS which is an absolute eyesore (and quite frankly an accident waiting to happen) and then expand as needed. The services are already there to support the industries; there would be no need to build a £20M road; the residents of Stanley would continue to see ships in the harbour (something that is part of our history and culture) and the cost would be a fraction of developing of DWP in Port Williams (or elsewhere). Lets start building some permanent, structures that we can be proud of, instead of continuing to go for 'temporary' untidy solutions that are always end up having their lives dragged out and are an embarrassment to the community.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumptions A3 and A4 will likely have to change in line with the reality of the situation - developing a port outside of Stanley is likely to be prohibitively expensive during the 15 year term proposed. A planned and managed approach to development in Stanley Harbour is therefore needed, with a Town Plan that allows for this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I still am not convinced that the port is best located at Port William. Although outside of the Stanley limits, it is only just. The population is still going to be affected by noise and light pollution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is wrong to assume that the port will be at Port William given that it has been demonstrated that the costs will be prohibitive. A new port (i.e. solid quay, not a floating structure) would be more appropriate where FIPASS currently is with additional dredging as required. This would enable current industrial areas to continue being utilised and considerable costs savings, as well as limiting the environmental impact to Stanley Harbour (which has already been subject to years of shipping and sewage). Noise and lighting impacts should be managed to reduce disturbance to local residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<p>FIG's role</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In reality the market will determine the rate of growth. There is no point in FIG trying to predict the unpredictable and attempts to control growth in the past, based on poorly drafted and out of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>date policies, have tended to alienate the private sector. FIG's role should be respond flexibly, to the industry's proposals and facilitate their approval, with carefully balanced environmental controls, to broaden the economic base of the Falklands.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is especially important that plans based on assumptions do not become set in stone, business will drive the development. Properly released and resourced light industrial land for small and start up businesses is the key enabler to a development plan that will work in the Falkland Islands, business will create the development and policy will shape it sufficiently to meet agreed objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A4. "within the main part of Stanley" what does this mean? Currently it seems to include Gordon Lines area. The aversity that FIG shows towards oil-related activities in the "Stanley area" is irrational and I don't believe it reflects the will of the people., If "oil-activity" was properly explained to them. this policy constrains businesses from using their current location and assets and forces them to undertake huge investments in relocated which is utterly inefficient and takes investment funding away from developing and expanding the business. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> However, I don't think that FIG would really be signed up to the opening sentence about the Falklands being a favourable place to do business. FIG's view of business is that it is something that has to be tolerated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
Planning		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any development needs to be carefully controlled with sites developed and fenced before users are allowed to use the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The port facility in P William is crucial for our future - not just the next four years or so. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
Oil		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A8 - I think the development to benefit oil and gas is at risk of getting out of control and not benefiting the people who reside here. What will happen with all these developments once the oil has gone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of the assumptions are based on oil exploitation. At this moment there has been no final decision by the oil companies and to base a development plan on an unestablished assumption could be risky. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not certain that the Falklands have a reputation as a favourable place to do business. Recent problems with oil companies wishing to become involved appear to have created a hostile and difficult policy base for them to work with. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If oil does start flowing then we need to be proactive not reactive, and this is one of our biggest weaknesses, we need to start looking to the future and how this will change the islands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<p>Summary A lot of concern that Port William is not correct location for deep water port. Calls for Gordon Lines to be tidied up and for future developments in the area to be better managed. Development to south of bypass encouraged. Concern that FIG policies are stifling business development and that approach to oil is too reactive when it should be proactive. Support for Camber to be brought back into use. Some concern that Stanley being surrounded by industrial developments with suggestions that it be taken further afield such as Port Harriet.</p>		
<p>TOURISM & HERITAGE</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I largely agree with the conservation boundary but would suggest it could be extended to incorporate listed buildings 3, 15 and 21. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservation area excellent concept. Within this area there should be more considerations when developing or making changes. . General appearance, matching historic character. For example, Miller’s guesthouse should never have been allowed to happen, whereas the Malvina development was generally fine, and the further enhancement at the front in this fashion is very appropriate. Within the conservation area it should never just be about functionality and adhering to rules but always contribute to the general character. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think the conservation area is correct and should be maintained as the original part of town. Historically conserved where possible. Infill should be allowed but controlled to be in keeping and tastefully complimentary to the surrounding properties. Preserve and keep tidy and neat, whatever the building, be housing or business property. It has already started to stray from the “original” types of buildings – would be nice from now on to keep what can possible be kept as Historic Heritage. Infill (new buildings) does look better than old rusty sheds however. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP5 TP5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I guess we are going to have to have change but it would be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>nice to try and retain some of our way of life and traditions; most of the Falklands traditions seem to have been eroded over the years so let's try and keep those we still have.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would urge any planner to respect our heritage of diversity when it comes to housing and the tradition of make do and mend that I value immensely. If someone has recycled materials to make their shed or garage and made a sound structure we should celebrate their ingenuity and environmentally friendly outlook rather than complain that it is not of the same colour or materials as their house. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to retain as much of our heritage/way of life while developing in a way that maintains to a high level the current infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The historic centre of Stanley should be maintained as much as possible and any modern retail, office and hotel hub should be outside the area (Hebe St-Ross Road - Barrack St- Fitzroy Rd) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change is inevitable, but we must try to ensure that what changes are made do not destroy the Falklands that we know. The building of the Historic Dockyard is an example where changes have been made but these changes enhance Stanley while retaining the familiar features. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP5 TP5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to retain as much of our heritage/way of life while developing in a way that maintains to a high level the current infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The vision for Stanley "within a well maintained historic core" would be nice. Unfortunately the recent infill has already affected the historic core quite badly. A lot of work needs to be done because its almost too late. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I believe that the sight of fishing and cruise vessels in the Stanley Harbour are a lovely sight to wake up to. It also gives visiting tourists and dignitaries an insight into how the Falkland Islands receives its income. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do agree with it but I don't think that Stanley would be a safe and more about its historical aspects as it is now and over time I see it as we will lose this things and it will be seen mainly as a business place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Falkland lifestyle is unique and I do not believe that it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>should change. Tourists visit the islands to see how tranquil and peaceful the islands are. If they continue to expand the sappers hill development and introduce a bar and shops it will divide the town. Also I do not think that they should even consider building a new sports facility when the police station is right next to the school and the fire station is in desperate need of a new establishment. The other thing that they need to consider is a home for the increasingly elderly population.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP5 • TP5
<p>Summary Support for preservation of historic core of Stanley, with calls for future business/industry developments to be built elsewhere. Recognition that infill has occurred and opinions vary as to whether this has been to detriment or benefit of townscape.</p>		
STANLEY COMMON & CAPE PEMBROKE		
Cape Pembroke		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cape Pembroke needs to be saved from further damage and rehabilitated to a level that makes it a good tourist destination and something that we will all be proud of. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP5 • SP7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cape Pembroke is very special – we should look after it before it is irreparably damaged. We are very privileged to have such a beautiful and environmentally significant area so close to our home, people need to be educated as to how we are damaging it and how we can look after it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of Cape Pembroke is not a pretty area. A major part of local tradition is kids being able to play on bikes etc. Rather than a few loud-spoken people who can shout loud and make the area inaccessible to everyone. Allow use by everyone, invest in tracks and fence off the really important parts. This allows for a balance for everyone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need actions and fast. The common is currently badly eroded by off road driving around Cape Pembroke. Believe it or not, the blanket peat bogs around Stanley are some of the best developed in the Islands and we are happily destroying them as lay down areas or building unnecessary roads through them. As for what is happening behind Mary Hill...well disgraceful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Friends of Cape Pembroke - Commons sense group. They have come up with suggestions, potential for a warden, lots of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

things need considering.		
Activities		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of the problems seems to be the youth of today and modern vehicles. 4x4 driving used to be a skill used to get from A to B, before there were any camp roads/tracks, without getting bogged, not the emphasis seems to be on just how much mud it takes to cover a vehicle. Probably best to try and educate them and otherwise don't intervene or all our recreation land will end up off-limits to everyone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SP5
Control/Management		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Falklands/FIG only respects the environment where it is convenient. Most of the time it takes a back seat to growth, convenience and not rocking the boat. I'd like to see a clear objective to minimise our environmental impact through judicious waste management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A proper development plan will have sufficient outline and policy for these matters. Individual issues can be dealt with by the various committees in place referencing the policy. Individual planning permissions can include conditions and formal agreements securing provisioning of greenspace. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't intervene, until it becomes obvious that it is necessary – often things to balance out any perceived problems can iron themselves out without overly restricting activities – trying awareness campaigns (signage etc) can prove useful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An issue that won't resolve itself, therefore someone needs to step in and create some policy and rules concerning the uses of certain areas of environmental interest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As mentioned before, Stanley residents have been enjoying place like Cape Pembroke for many years. If we over-regulate it, it will diminish the quality of life for all but a few. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would suggest erring on the side of caution when it comes to the natural environment in the Falklands as it is a resource that should not be taken for granted. As there is still a lack of ecological research in the islands there is a potential to not fully understand any impacts of recreation and we may not realise negative impacts in time to mitigate them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage community groups such as the 'Friends of Cape Pembroke' to become more actively included in community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

management of these issues		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't start to over-regulate, especially where places like Cape Pembroke are concerned. Residents of Stanley need areas in which they can drive, walk, enjoy and exercise the freedom from regulation that the Falklands give its people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	
Building		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A5. this is at risk of extending on to Stanley Common which should be retained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> But some control needs to taken on the use of parts of the common and if it is taken for building then other options should be offered for grazing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of Stanley Common is disappearing for building there should be other land supplied for this even if this means FIG not continuing with some areas such as Port Harriet as such so this can be returned to Stanley common and be used for activities for all and grazing during the winter for horses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surf Bay, Gypsy Cove and Cape Pembroke are areas used recreationally a lot by people in Stanley, not to mention tourists. This area should be protected from unsightly commercial development and kept for the use of residents. What does "the broad extent of Stanley Common should be retained" mean - probably different things to different people. All of Stanley Common should be retained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are currently destroying common without full consultation with locals and objection to the development of the oil depo's is regarded as too negative a response. I do not want see the oil industry based in Stanley but I do want to see the Islands change in way that are well controlled and will safe guard to appearance of the islands for future generations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas where natural beauty is not destroyed. Existing developments should not expand to a level that prevents development of other areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
Lands Officer		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These need to be reviewed and it needs to include the activities of all using the areas around Stanley. There needs to be more control over what happens on the common and there should be a common ranger employed to manage these areas and especially the grazing and this should continue in all areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<p style="text-align: center; color: red; font-weight: bold;">FORWARDED TO RELEVANT DEPARTMENT</p>

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

as it is beneficial but needs managing properly.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would like to see somebody in charge of the common around Stanley full time and look after all areas including fencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E 	
Stanley Common		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A6 - Stanley Common should be expanded to encompass Port Harriet, Two Sisters and Mount Longdon camps. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First of all Stanley common should stay as Stanley common as Stanley is rapidly running out of green space. And I think the housing development should be sorted out as there are loads of students who are away in the uk in college or university and when they come back they will want to start a family and build a house but can't as there isn't any land. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Common is there for the community to enjoy and should be able to do so within reason 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An access route needs to be left for landowners to gain access to their plots to the south and west of the FIDF complex, from the proposed industrial area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	
<p>Summary Acknowledgement that there is an issue with current uses and calls for some control but not excessive i.e. prefer the use of education/signage as opposed to closing areas off.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workers Camps 		
Integrate		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I dislike the idea of temporary camp. It implies a segregated area (like MPA) I would rather have integrated people. Use Stanley facilities and have the accommodations open not in the normal street plan. Bedsits would be all that's required. They should be part of town. Lookout Lodge is an example of not what to have. The government bedsits on Jeremy Moore Avenue are much better. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brings greater economic benefit. Integrate don't segregate is the lesson from other jurisdictions (Norway) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [if within Stanley] means they will spend more money in the local economy so the islands will get a greater benefit from the construction activity. It will possibly mean more integration into the community and a greater chance that some will settle here. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We should try to integrate all new arrivals into our community, and not create ghettos. If we cut workers off from the town's services, they are more likely to turn to alcohol out of boredom. Also, if temporary camps are in Stanley, then (like the Brewster accommodation) they can more easily be given a productive use in future - perhaps providing more starter homes for young people or as community centres. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	TP8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They need other services as well and its also a boost to local business. The temporary accommodation could be provided from an outside source as in they come in and set up run it and take it away when they are done just as they do at other oil and gas projects. No cost to our gov and cleaned up after. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each project would need to be viewed on an individual basis, perhaps dependent on size and location. There should not be a move to exclude temporary workers from the community as this would cause an unnecessary divide. These people will be working to bring wealth to the Islands and should be treated as the rest of the population. Stanley has coped with construction workers in its midst in the past when it was much smaller (and less worldly) and could to a certain degree again 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think workers should be able to be included in the community. If accommodations are built in these sites then that is all they can be used for. If these facilities are built properly and to standard (en-suite shower/bathrooms specificall) then they could also be used for single contractors in the future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
Re-use		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If temporary camps would be built close to or in Stanley, the risk exists they will not be temporary. Better to construct temporary camps on site and remove them once the job is done (like the road camps for instance). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary accommodation should be temporary - siting a temporary accommodation camp close to or within Stanley would provide opportunity to make parts or all of it permanent when the project is complete so for the sake of reducing in-fill and buildings that don't fit within the style of the town I think temporary camps should be located at the project site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to assist with the management of possible social and environmental problems. Camps should be of a decent quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

(see St. Helena Airport temporary accommodation) and removed at project completion for possible use elsewhere for other projects or selling off as fishing cabins, farm accommodation etc, subject to strict policy adherence i.e. use, locations, siting etc		
At project site		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cut down on travelling time - worked for MPA construction this project could be no bigger than that - camp could be used as offices (and some accommodation if necessary) etc once the construction phase is completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A number of smaller 'camps' dotted around Stanley would be better than one large one. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camps should be located at sites as required outside of Stanley but in a central area if for Stanley based projects or projects in close range of Stanley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That is a very tricky question and I can see arguments for either approach. I guess it will depend on where the construction project is located and how the workers integrate into the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do feel quite mean saying this. It could depend on the numbers but a large accommodation block of single workers who are here temporarily are not likely to enhance any neighbourhood. On the positive side, it will probably reduce the cost/accident risk of being transported to and from work every day and the workers will be able to come to town for a break. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
Summary General acceptance that such camps will be needed but no definitive opinion on whether they should be within Stanley, near the project site or elsewhere.		
Development		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For new developments there should new areas developed as soon as possible. Always containing room for social development i.e. shops, playgrounds, greenspaces etc as well. And trees and greenery. There is plenty of space and land. No need to squeeze everything in. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q20: All of the above apply but as we are looking forward in terms of development a) is the most important and b) c) should 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>be part of the FIG town maintenance programme which is the most valuable role of FIG in these matters.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stanley cannot really spread eastwards and the exposed nature of the land to the south of the bypass road leaves little alternative than to head west. Any westward development should also accommodate retail and office use and suitably landscaped would sit well with the greenspace afforded by the Golf Course and coastal strip to the north of moody brook road. Not industrial which can sit to the south of the bypass . The development of Bennetts paddock for housing, retail and offices would provide a natural progression of Stanley along the sea front. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set up a new town to move some of FIG operations to, a new town could be designed to best modern practices and would not change the heritage of the traditional settlements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOTED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In terms of growth models I think there is a missing option which is encouraging growth up a rate/level which provides maximum benefit and limits negative consequences. A utilitarian approach, if you like. This is especially relevant to the oil industry where too much development (or too rapid a pace of change) is likely to result in significant social and environmental impacts. Hence also the need for an SEA at some stage down the line, assuming a transition to an exploitation phase. The recreational requirement is understated although this may fall into the infrastructure Plan. My feeling is that the Town Plan should also include the full extent of Stanley Common. This is subject to numerous (and often conflicting) demands. A terrestrial EIZ system would provide some assurance that development would not result in unacceptable environmental impact and that planners are consulted early in relation to locational decisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage expansion but have long term plans and aims to tailor growth to the best advantage for all islanders and for a sustainable economy in the future. Immigration should be encouraged for keyworkers but not mass immigration that would greatly change the local demographic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think it is inevitable that there will be change, abreast of it so that it happens in the way we want. I think controlling it at 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

levels we manage doesn't exclude growth and expansion, as both of those we can manage but at a certain pace and keeping this growing together		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misc 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is inevitable that change will happen, but we do have the control as to what is acceptable, and what is not. The Falklands as it was some say gone, but the spirit and sense of community has not. I wouldn't advocate C or D (Q1) because we don't want to turn into an ugly oil boom town with no sense of community, but lots of money around (for some, not all). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to enforce properly marked address No's on properties and streets. People who are not familiar with old Stanley struggle to find houses i.e. Emergency services / hospital drivers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stanley House and its grounds should be developed as a community centre where locals and visitors alike can use it. The kids should be moved into more suitable and modern accommodation such as maybe the boys in one house and the girls in another house side-by-side with a communal living/eating area joining the properties. . 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. I would like to see more than one main settlement. I do not see how an oil industry on your door step will help to improve the look of Stanley. Stanley will remain the main administrative Centre for the Falkland Islands. It will be the main port of call for tourist ships visting the Falklands. The oil industry will develop away from the capital to ensure the Falkland Islands retains its image of a clean and environmentally friendly place to live. Industrial development will happen away from Stanley, close to the airport to prevent minimal impact of drunken oil workers and transient works on the local population. This will be given road access but there would be agreements in place that by the end of the economic life of the oil industry the site will be removed and returned to its near original state. A second main settlement will be developed on West Falklands. This could be based around an animal market. Some government departments could move to camp such as the agricultural department and the PWD roads to give alternative employment to people not engaged in tourism. Primary and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D 	

Development Plan Consultation comments – Oct 2014

<p>secondary schools should be built to allow families to remain in the settlement on the West as their children grow.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Everyday Falkland Islanders should be able to participate fully in the economic development of the resources of this land, including camp (particularly in wildlife hotspots). If that means designating National Parks and then resuming surrounding land and transport hubs for resale to new businesses then do that rather than leave it to the dubious efforts of the 80 odd Falkland fiefdoms who may or may not have their own interests at heart. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agriculture should focus on niche markets rather than trying to compete in developed markets. Exercise the natural provenance of the Falklands rather than try to build industries other neighbouring nations already do much better and with scale that can't be replicated here. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If we had people in positions who were forward thinkers then a 20 yr plan should have been in place 10 yrs ago and we would not be in the predicament now of housing shortages and buildings that are in need of replacement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our economy may be strong at the moment but it relies entirely on resources that are governed by the external forces of nature (fishing/tourism/agriculture). We have been lucky so far. However, we need to grow and expand not only to protect our financial independence but also to protect our current levels of political independence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have to accept change and it is unlikely that we would actually be able to control it to levels we can manage (with current capacity for management). What we should do is ensure that we have the resources (management capacity) to accommodate and steer the change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	