

Phase 2 Land Use Plan Review Call for Sites Assessment

Reference: PA/104

Site name: Fort Albert and Bunkers and Tunnel and Field

AY Parcel(s): AY 1936

Submission Type: Protection/enhancement

Source: Private



ARUP  **STATES OF ALDERNEY**



Proposals

Summary of respondent's proposal:

Protection of Fort Albert (including its bunkers and field), reflecting its role in the occupation of the Island during WWII and in particular the suffering of forced labour. Protection should provide long term preservation and sensitive interpretation.

Planning history and other context: N/A

Accordance with the Land Use Plan Evidence Base

Does the proposal accord with the Vision Statement?	Yes	Protection of the site would accord with the vision, which seeks to value and protect the Island's unique cultural environment. It also accords with the guiding principle which seeks to value, protect and sustainably manage the Island's built and cultural heritage.
Does the proposal accord with the Housing Strategy?	Partial	The Housing Strategy states that housing should be provided to meet existing and future housings needs on the Island (Recommendation 1). Whilst the Strategy does not reference the future use of forts, one of the potential future uses of Fort Albert could be a mixed use scheme including housing. Redevelopment of Fort Albert for housing and protection of the adjacent bunkers and tunnel are not incompatible but would require consideration.

Phase 2 Land Use Plan Review Call for Sites Assessment

Reference: PA/104

Site name: Fort Albert and Bunkers and Tunnel and Field

Does the proposal accord with the Economic Development Strategy?	Partial	<p>The Economic Development Strategy recommends that the Land Use Plan should support a range of types of tourism, particularly supporting niche tourism (Recommendation 27). The Strategy identifies that heritage tourism, and particularly military heritage, is a niche market which is currently operating on Alderney, but for which more could be done to support the market. The proposal to provide protection for the site (in combination with protection afforded to other sites of significance) would therefore accord with the Economic Development Strategy.</p> <p>Recommendation 86 of the Economic Development Strategy states that further consideration to the range and mix of uses which might be appropriate within individual forts. Redevelopment of Fort Albert and its wider protection are not incompatible but would require consideration.</p>
--	---------	---

Phase 2 Land Use Plan Review Call for Sites Assessment

Reference: PA/104

Site name: Fort Albert and Bunkers and Tunnel and Field

Does the proposal accord with the Natural Environment Strategy?	Yes	The eastern parts of this site contain habitats which fall under the regional and local tiers of the hierarchy of environmental designations set out in the Natural Environment Strategy (see Map F.5 and Map F.6 in the Natural Environment Strategy). Protection of the site for its heritage value would need to align with the protection of these habitats, and may provide opportunities for joint protection and management.
---	-----	---

Phase 2 Land Use Plan Review Call for Sites Assessment

Reference: PA/104

Site name: Fort Albert and Bunkers and Tunnel and Field

<p>Does the proposal accord with the Built Environment and Heritage Strategy?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Fort Albert itself is currently registered (B/100), but the 'red line' does not include the whole extent of the submitted site. The Built Environment and Heritage Strategy recommends that additional heritage assets should be added to the Register of Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments (see for example Recommendation 13 and Recommendation 36), and that Register entries for pre-World War II buildings and structures which have World War II constructions should be reviewed and (where warranted) updated to make reference to these additions and their significance (Recommendation 16). Recommendation 12 also recommends that the 'red line' of existing entries should be reviewed and, where appropriate, updated to ensure the area provides clarity on the features to be protected.</p> <p>The site boundaries provided in the submission do not match with the proposed additions / alterations of Fort Albert and associated WWII constructions made in the Built Environment and Heritage Strategy (MH/004).</p> <p>The Strategy does not make reference to the site's importance as a location of forced labour suffering. Recommendation 19 states that the Building and Development Control Committee should continue to engage with relevant stakeholders who hold research and other evidence to support an improved understanding of the importance of sites of war time relevance. It also recommends that further consideration should be given to the need for additional protection, policies and procedures that might be required for such areas, to ensure that these assets are afforded the same level of protection and reflect best practice from other jurisdictions (Recommendation 22).</p> <p>The site also falls within, and contributes to, Area of Landscape Value LV02 (North east corner of Albert, Bibette Head, Saye Beach, north-east of Lager Norderney to the west front of Chateau L'Etoc).</p> <p>The proposed use therefore aligns with the recommendations of the Built Environment and Heritage Strategy.</p>
---	------------	---

Phase 2 Land Use Plan Review Call for Sites Assessment

Reference: PA/104

Site name: Fort Albert and Bunkers and Tunnel and Field

Assessment of Suitability, Availability and Achievability

Is the site suitable for the proposed purpose?	Yes	<p>The site links Victorian and wartime history, and is a good example of how the Germans used existing defensive structures. The submission states that a large amount of forced labour was undertaken at Fort Albert during the occupation, and that markings and graffiti can be seen in bricks around the entrance to the Fort.</p> <p>Given the historical importance of the site (not just during the occupation but also its Victorian heritage), and the good condition of the assets, it is considered that protection of the site is justified. Pending registration on the Register of Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments, interim policy protection will be afforded through the Land Use Plan.</p>
Is the site available for the proposed purpose?	Yes, with mitigation	<p>The site is in the ownership of the States of Alderney. Recommendation 5 of the Built Environment and Heritage Strategy stated that the States should act as a 'leader' in expanding the Register, by registering their own assets first.</p> <p>Fort Albert is currently used for storage for the States of Alderney, as well as by the Shooting Club. Protection of the site may require relocation of these uses, or changes to the way they are managed.</p>

Phase 2 Land Use Plan Review Call for Sites Assessment

Reference: PA/104

Site name: Fort Albert and Bunkers and Tunnel and Field

Is the site achievable for the proposed purpose?	Yes, with mitigation	The site could be protected through inclusion on the Register of Historic Buildings, subject to the consultation and publication processes set out in the Building and Development Control (Alderney) Law, 2002 (this would be undertaken outside of the Land Use Plan review process).
--	----------------------	---

Any other comments	
--------------------	--

Conclusions

Does the proposal accord with the emerging Land Use Plan?	Yes, with mitigation	<p>Inclusion on the Register of Historic Buildings is subject to the consultation and publication processes set out in the Building and Development Control (Alderney) Law, 2002. The description included in the Register should include reference to the importance of the site in relation to the suffering of forced labour. In the interim, the site will be afforded policy protection through the Land Use Plan.</p> <p>Any works required to ensure the long term preservation of the heritage assets should be undertaken with regard to the important habitats present on the site.</p>
Indicative development capacity (if applicable)	N/A	