#### Phase . . . Call f

	nd Use Plan Review es Assessment	1 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Real I
Reference:	PA/101	Toske AS	
Site name:	Harbour Office	and the second	
AY Parcel(s):	AY 0219	and the second se	A Converse - 2
Submission Type:	Protection/enhancement		
Source:	Private		

YES

-

Γ

## Proposals

Summary of respondent's proposal:	Protection of the bunker under the current Harbour Office, 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:	Permission to rebuild the Harbour Master Office was approved in 2010 (B3008).

#### cordance with the Land Use Plan Evidence Base ٨٥

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 the Braye area, it is zoned in the Land Use Plan 2016 for a variety of uses including residential.	
Does the proposal accord with the Economic Development Strategy?	Yes	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.	
		D142	

# Phase 2 Land Use Plan Review Call for Sites Assessment

Reference:PA/101Site name:Harbour Office

Does the proposal accord with the Natural Environment Strategy?	N/A	The site is located within the Central Building Area, no species or habitats identified in the hierarchy of environmental designations are present and the site is not designated as one of the 'green lungs'.
Does the proposal accord with the Built Environment and Heritage Strategy?	Yes	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). The Strategy recognises the value of the harbour area (MH/008), and recommends that it is added to the Register on the basis of its World War II history. However, 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). The site falls within the Braye and Grosnez Peninsula Conservation Area (C/002). The site also falls within, and contributes to, landscape area LV01 (The inner harbour, Commercial Quay, Maggie's Bay and Douglas Quay and across the bay to the west front of Fort Albert). The proposed use therefore aligns with the recommendations of the Built Environment and Heritage Strategy.

### Assessment of Suitability, Availability and Achievability

Assessment of outability	, / Wallabi	ity and Aomovability
Is the site suitable for the proposed purpose?	Yes	The site contains a naval wireless bunker complex, now underneath the (post-war) Harbour Office. Included in this covered complex were a small personnel shelter, a Tobruk pit, a machine gun bunker and a small concrete observation dome. The Built Environment and Heritage Strategy notes that a Flak position and a second Tobruk pit were destroyed during the construction of the Harbour Office and the Sailing Club. There is also a blocked up entrance to a tunnel on site. The walls of the bunker display German writing and original wood panels. German measurements for the harbour can also be seen.

# Phase 2 Land Use Plan Review Call for Sites Assessment

Reference:PA/101Site name:Harbour Office

Is the site available for the proposed purpose?	Yes	The site is in the ownership of the States of Alderney. Recommendation 5 of the Built Environment and Heritage Strategy stated that the States to should act as a 'leader' in expanding the Register, by registering their own assets first.
		The Harbour Office is located immediately above the bunker. It is not anticipated that protection of the site would materially impact on the operation of the Harbour Office.
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	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.
Indicative development capacity (if applicable)		N/A