

Planning Committee

(13th Meeting)

16th January 2025Part A (Non-Exempt)

All members were present, with the exception of Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity, from whom apologies had been received.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity (Chair)  
 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement (Vice Chair)  
 Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North  
 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South  
 Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen  
 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour  
 Connétable M. Labey of Grouville  
 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence  
 Connétable M.O'D. Troy of St. Clement

In attendance –

C. Jones, Interim Planning Applications Manager  
 C. Carter, Planning Applications Manager  
 S. De Gouveia, Planner  
 G. Vasselin, Planner  
 J. Gibbins, Planner  
 S. Sellors, Trainee Planner  
 T. Ingle, Principal Historic Environment Officer  
 L. Plumley, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A1 – A8 only)  
 S. Nibbs, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A1 – A8 only)  
 H. Roche, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A9 and A10 only)  
 E. Patterson, Assistant Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A9 and A10 only)

Note: The Minutes of this meeting comprise Part A only.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Minutes.  | A1. The Minutes of the meeting held on 5th December 2024, were taken as read and were confirmed.  |
| Field No. 1404, La Grande Route de St. Jean, Trinity: proposed construction of 16 new affordable dwellings. | <p>A2. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A4 of 5th December 2024, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the construction of 16 affordable homes with refuse and cycle storage and associated car parking, on Field No. 1404, La Grande Route de St. Jean, Trinity. New vehicular and pedestrian access points, landscape works, and public open space were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 3rd December 2024.</p> <p>Connétables M. Labey of Grouville and D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence did not participate in the decision confirmation, having not been present at the previous meeting.</p> |

P/2024/1065 The Committee recalled that it had been minded to refuse permission, contrary to the Department's recommendation. Consequently, the application had been re-presented for formal decision confirmation and to set out the specific reasons for refusal.

The Committee confirmed refusal of the application for the reasons set out in the Department report.

Nos. 3-7  
Devonshire  
Place,  
St. Helier:  
proposed  
demolition and  
redevelopment  
(RFR).

A3. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A12 of 5th December 2024, considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which sought permission for the demolition of a light industrial unit at Nos. 3-7 Devonshire Place, St. Helier. It had been proposed to replace the structure with a 3 storey building comprising 3 x 2 bedroom residential units with car parking, amenity space, refuse and bicycle storage, together with new hard and soft landscaping and ecological enhancements. The Committee had visited the site on 3rd December 2024.

P/2023/0220

Connétables M. Labey of Grouville and D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence did not participate in the decision confirmation, having not been present at the previous meeting.

The Committee recalled that it had been minded to grant permission, contrary to the Department's recommendation. Consequently, the application had been re-presented for formal decision confirmation and to set out the specific reasons for approval and the conditions which were to be attached to the permit. Additionally, the entering into by the applicant of a Planning Obligation Agreement (POA) was required and details in respect of the same were set out in the Department report.

The Committee confirmed approval of the application for the reasons set out in the Department report and on the basis of the conditions detailed therein, subject to the applicant entering into a suitable POA, as outlined in the report. In the event that a suitable POA could not be agreed within 6 months of the date of approval, the application would be re-presented to the Committee. The Committee delegated authority to the Department for the grant of planning permission on completion of the POA.

Le Feugrel  
Farm,  
La Rue du  
Feugerel,  
St. John:  
proposed  
construction of  
agricultural  
storage shed.

A4. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the construction of an agricultural storage shed, landscaping enhancements and hardstanding at the property known as Le Feugrel Farm, La Rue du Feugerel, St. John. The Committee had visited the site on 14th January 2025.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site consisted of an agricultural field (Field No. 1013, La Rue du Feugerel, St. John) situated in the Green Zone, which was used in connexion with an agricultural business. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP5, SP6, PL5, GD1, GD6, ERE1, ERE5, NE1, NE3 and WER5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

P/2024/0773

The Committee was advised that the application site had been the subject of enforcement proceedings (ENF/2015/000017 and ENF/2024/00004 referred) due to the degradation in the appearance of the site and the placing of unauthorised sheds, hardstanding, vehicles, building materials and clutter within Field No. 1013. Whilst the aforementioned issues had largely been resolved, the removal of the hardstanding was dependent upon the outcome of the application under consideration.

The Committee noted that permission was sought for the construction of a large

agricultural storage shed, landscaping enhancements and hardstanding within Field No.1013. The proposed shed would have a footprint of 612 square meters and minor ground levelling works were proposed. The Committee was advised that the proposals were not considered incidental or essential to the running of a farm, were not appropriate in the Green Zone and would adversely affect the safety and environment of neighbouring users. The proposals were considered contrary to policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP6, PL5, GD1, ERE1, ERE5 and TT1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and consequently the application was recommended for refusal.

All representations received in connexion with the application had been included in the Committee's agenda pack.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident who objected to the application. He highlighted the distress caused to neighbouring amenities by the parlous state of the site and the failure of the applicant to cease unauthorised activities despite enforcement proceedings. La Rue du Feugerel was a popular Green Lane used by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians which was unsuitable for the quantum of heavy goods vehicles accessing the site. The roadside banks had been damaged and any increase in traffic would result in further harm. [REDACTED] referenced the health impacts of the diesel fumes from tractor engines which were left running and which made it impossible for residents to enjoy their gardens. Vehicles were also cleaned on the site, leading to concerns about water pollution and insufficient information had been provided regarding the drainage impact of the proposals. Turning to safety considerations, [REDACTED] highlighted the risks to all road users, which would only increase if operations on the site were expanded. The proposed use was neither sustainable nor justified in this sensitive location. He suggested that the activities undertaken on the site would be better suited to an industrial setting and noted that the proposals would result in the loss of agricultural land. In concluding, [REDACTED] urged the Committee to reject the proposals and safeguard both the amenities of neighbouring residents and the use of the land for agricultural purposes.

[REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, spoke to outline concerns regarding the mass and scale of the proposed storage shed. The site remained in a deplorable condition despite enforcement proceedings, with fuel tanks and petrol cans being evident. This exemplified the haphazard manner in which activities were conducted on the site and [REDACTED] feared that the situation would be exacerbated if permission was granted. He reminded the Committee that agricultural land was a valuable resource and that a large number of agricultural storage sheds existed in this part of the Island, some of which might be more suited to the proposed use. [REDACTED] noted that the location of the proposed shed, close to residential properties, would result in constant noise and fumes and he urged the Committee not to grant permission due to the impact on neighbouring amenities.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, who echoed concerns expressed by previous speakers. She outlined details of a traffic survey that she had undertaken over a period of one week in the summer of 2024, which showed that the site generated a significant number of vehicle movements. These included fuel tankers, tractors, trucks, vans, and cars, all of which had a detrimental impact on the Green Lane and neighbouring residential amenities. La Rue du Feugerel was a popular walking route and [REDACTED] stated that in the last month, 791 recreational users had been observed. Any expansion of the activities on the site would result in an increase in traffic and compound the existing issues. She urged the Committee to protect Jersey's agricultural land from unsuitable development and reject the proposals.

[REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, addressed the Committee and outlined

concerns regarding the use and condition of the site. As a longstanding resident and former farm worker, she found the degradation in the appearance of the site difficult to witness. The proposals would result in the industrialisation of the site and cause further harm to neighbouring amenities, which were already severely impacted by the unauthorised use of the site. Residents were subject to noise, shouting, foul language and pollution from diesel fumes. She noted that whilst agricultural vehicles could be expected in this location, the current use impacted neighbours to an unreasonable degree, particularly in the summer, when they had to keep their doors and windows closed due to the noise and fumes emanating from the site. In concluding, [REDACTED] urged the Committee not to legitimise the unauthorised use of the site.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED], who outlined his background as a farmer and the owner/operator of 2 agricultural businesses (a contracting business supporting the dairy industry and a hay and haylage business providing animal feed). He had been operating from the site for 10 years, as had his father before him, and there was a genuine connexion to a nearby farm building which had been in his family for generations. Storing hay bales outside was not ideal and resulted in financial losses and the proposals would provide much-needed dry storage for hay and machinery, with the added benefit of improving the visual appearance of the site. The use of plastic to cover hay bales would be reduced, resulting in environmental benefits. [REDACTED] explained that other sites had been considered but the application site presented the only viable option. He planned to re-use an existing shed from another site for sustainability and affordability reasons. The site was ideally located for his purposes and there would be no significant increase in traffic movements as the current use would continue in any case. In concluding, [REDACTED] referenced a previously approved development at Le Tacheron Farm (planning application reference P/2022/1449 and Minute No. A15 of 18th May 2023, of the Committee as previously constituted, referred) which was of a similar nature, and urged members to continue supporting Jersey's agricultural industry by granting permission.

[REDACTED] of Cowley Dairy Farm addressed the Committee in support of the proposals. He explained that the applicant provided essential services to smaller dairy farms, including Cowley Dairy Farm, and made a valuable contribution to the rural economy. Appropriate storage was required for the agricultural vehicles and machinery associated with the business and this would improve the efficiency of operations. Agricultural buildings played a key role in farming and it was disingenuous to suggest that they were akin to industrial facilities. [REDACTED] argued that the proposed location was ideal for the intended use and the loss of agricultural buildings over time meant that there were no other suitable premises available. In concluding, he urged the Committee to support Jersey's rural economy and approve the proposals.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] of KR Synergy, a transport consultancy, who noted that 2 transport technical notes had been submitted as part of the application. A transport survey, undertaken in compliance with data protection requirements, showed that the site generated a maximum of 22 trips per day related to farming activity, including 8 tractor trips. There would be no increase in traffic levels or changes to the type of vehicles which would access the site. Consequently, there would be no impact on road safety and accordingly t no basis for refusing the application on these grounds. In response to a question from the Committee, [REDACTED] confirmed that the transport survey had been undertaken in November 2024.

The applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of MS Planning, addressed the Committee and highlighted the need to support young farmers. [REDACTED] managed 1,750

vergées of agricultural land, farming another 87 vergées in his own right and provided essential services to the rural economy. Alternative sites had been explored but these were not suitable for a variety of reasons and the proposed location was considered to be the only viable option. In addition, the site was connected to [REDACTED] family farm holding and was ideally located. The proposals were supported by the agricultural industry and the Government of Jersey's Rural Economy Team. [REDACTED] noted that the 2022 Bridging Island Plan supported development of this nature and the proposals would result in the re-use of an existing shed. [REDACTED] repeated that a similar application had previously been approved at Le Tacheron Farm and requested consistency of approach.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North, Connétables K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour, M. Labey of Grouville, and D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence, decided to endorse the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report.

Site adjacent to public toilets, La Route de la Haule, St. Brelade: proposed construction of beach kiosk.

P/2024/0999

A5. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the construction of a fully accessible beach kiosk adjacent to the public toilets on the promenade La Route de la Haule, St. Brelade. The Committee had visited the site on 14th January 2025.

Connétable M.O. Troy of St. Clement did not participate in the determination of this application.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site consisted of an area of land adjacent to the public toilets situated on the promenade along La Route de la Haule. The site was located in the Protected Coastal Area (PCA) and Sustainable Transport Zone 6. Policies SP2, SP3, SP5, SP6, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, ER4, ERE2, TT1, TT2, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant and attention was drawn to Supplementary Planning Guidance relating to Landscape and Seascape Character Guidance (July 2023).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, including a previous application for the construction of a kiosk with associated seating, which had been withdrawn (planning application reference P/2023/1337 referred).

The Committee noted that permission was sought for a permanent, 5.5 x 4 metre single storey, timber clad structure with a pitched roof design and a small retractable awning to the south elevation. The creation of a level access to the front of the kiosk and the installation of 6 picnic benches for exclusive use by the kiosk were also proposed. It was noted that proposed improvements to the cycle track referenced in the application were the responsibility of the Infrastructure and Environment (I and E) Department and were therefore not a material planning consideration.

The Committee was advised that proposals for new beach kiosks could only be supported where they made use of existing buildings or structures. The proposed development would not protect or improve the character and distinctiveness of the PCA and was not considered demonstrably necessary to meet an overriding public policy objective or need. The proposals were not considered to be of a high quality, with particular regard to accessible design. It was also considered that the proposed development would exacerbate existing safety issues in the area. Consequently, the application was considered contrary to policies ER4, PL5, SP3, SP5, NE1, NE3, GD6, TT1 and TT2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and was recommended for refusal.

All representations received in connexion with the application had been included in the Committee's agenda pack.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Principal Transport Planner, I and E Department. [REDACTED] advised that the proposals would pose significant safety risks for cyclists and pedestrians due to the potential for conflict between user groups. Insufficient information had been provided regarding demand for the facility, traffic levels, servicing arrangements and the impact on the existing car park. The bicycle track was very popular at peak times and it was acknowledged that improvements were needed but funding had not yet been secured. [REDACTED] pointed out that no additional bicycle parking was proposed and that there had been no assessment of the impact on the existing provision. In addition, the site was at risk of shoreline flooding and the proposals would result in logistical challenges and increase the risk of collisions. Consequently, the application could not be supported.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED], who outlined his intention to create a dedicated facility for people with disabilities. A ramp with a smooth (as opposed to cobbled) surface was situated close to the beach and this would provide wheelchair and mobility scooter access. [REDACTED] highlighted the need to improve accessibility for disabled users. Additional bicycle parking could be provided if necessary and he was confident that concerns about traffic and parking could be resolved. The area was well served by public transport, and the proposals had been amended to take account of feedback from statutory consultees. With regards to the risk of flooding, this was not considered to be an issue in the context of the application. The proposals offered a unique opportunity to improve accessibility. In concluding, [REDACTED] expressed his disappointment and frustration with the planning process.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], who noted that the proposals had attracted significant public support and were much needed. He highlighted the benefits of the proposals and noted that the widening of the cycle path would segregate pedestrians and cyclists. There was also ample car parking in the area and a bus stop was located nearby. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to grant permission.

[REDACTED] addressed the Committee in support of the application and emphasised the benefits to those with disabilities. The surface of the nearby path and ramp to the beach was smooth and free of obstructions and concerns about transport and flooding were not considered to be material. The site was ideally located and the proposals responded to the needs of those of with disabilities. In concluding, [REDACTED] urged the Committee to support the proposals.

In response to a question from the Committee, it was confirmed that the application site was owned by Jersey Property Holdings, with whom the applicant had secured a lease agreement.

Due to continued interruptions in proceedings, members of the public were respectfully requested to withdraw from the meeting and the Committee deliberated in private. A representative of the press was permitted to remain.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report. In doing so, the Committee highlighted its commitment to supporting improved facilities for those with disabilities, where such proposals met the required standards. Connétable M. Labey of Grouville referenced personal experience of flooding in the area and expressed concerns about the gradient of the access ramp to the beach and its suitability for wheelchair users.

Les Niemes Farm,  
La Rue des Niemes,  
St. Peter:  
proposed conversion of packing shed to residential unit.

P/2024/0917

A6. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A15 of 11th July 2024, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the redevelopment of an existing packing shed and its conversion to residential use, at the property known as Les Niemes Farm, La Rue des Niemes, St. Peter. The Committee had visited the site on 14th January 2025.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site comprised of a former farm complex in a rural area of St. Peter. The site consisted of the main dwelling known as Les Niemes Farm, a dower cottage, an existing packing area and a converted outbuilding, known as Le Petit Coin. The site was located within the Protected Coastal Area (PCA) and the Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE2, NE3, H9, ERE1, ERE3, ERE4, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER1, WER5, WER6 and WER7 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022 were relevant.

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, which included a previously refused application for the conversion of the packing shed to provide a 4 bedroom dwelling (planning application reference P/2024/0028 referred).

The Committee was advised that the current application sought permission for the re-orientation of the existing packing shed roof and its conversion to provide a 3 bedroom residential unit, to include the installation of dormer windows, along with various external alterations and hard and soft landscaping.

The Committee noted that there was a presumption against development within the PCA and the development of a non-traditional agricultural buildings constructed before 1960 to provide residential accommodation was not supported. The proposed development was considered harmful to the character of the area and the surrounding landscape and would not deliver demonstrable environmental gains. A proposed dual access track would restrict the means of entry to agricultural land and harm the landscape character of the area. In addition, the proposed vehicular access, driveway and car parking area would have a detrimental impact on the rural character of the area. The private amenity space and external storage were considered to be inadequate and harmful to the living conditions of future occupants. The height of the proposed dormer window and its proximity to the boundary would result in an unreasonable overbearing impact on neighbouring amenities. Consequently, the proposals were considered to be contrary to policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, GD1, GD6, PL5, H1, H9, ERE1, ERE3, and NE3 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022, and the application was recommended for refusal.

It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED], who stated that the agricultural use of the building was redundant. Despite considerable initial interest in using it for storage, the unit remained empty and conversion to residential accommodation was considered to be the only viable option. The roof needed to be raised, and dormer windows added to facilitate the use of the first floor and environmental benefits would arise from the re-use of existing materials. The Committee was assured that the previous reasons for refusal had been addressed and that access to the surrounding agricultural fields would not be impeded by the development. Sufficient private amenity space had been provided and concerns appeared to emanate from confusion regarding the status of land to the north, which was understood to be part of the domestic curtilage and not agricultural land. The applicant was confident that privacy concerns could be overcome.

Responding to a question from the Chair, [REDACTED], Planner, confirmed that sufficient amenity space for the site had not been demonstrated. This was disputed by the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of MAC Architecture, who advised that further information had been provided in this connexion.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Connétables M. Labey of Grouville and M.O'D. Troy of St. Clement, and Deputies A.F. Curtis of St. Clement and T.A. Coles of St. Helier South, decided to grant permission, contrary to the Department recommendation.

As the Committee's decision was contrary to the Department recommendation, it was noted that the application would be re-presented for formal decision confirmation, to include the reasons for approval and the approval of any conditions which were to be attached to the permit.

Field Nos.  
747A / 747B,  
Le Mont Fallu,  
St. Peter:  
proposed  
demolition of  
outbuildings  
and  
construction of  
new  
agricultural  
shed (RFR).  
  
P/2024/0785

A7. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers. The application sought permission for the demolition of existing outbuildings and their replacement with an agricultural/horticultural shed, with associated landscaping, on Field Nos. 747A / 747B, Le Mont Fallu, St. Peter. The Committee had visited the site on 14th January 2025.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Green Zone, Airport Public Safety Zone 2, Airport Noise Zone 3, and was on Primary Route Network and at low risk of inland flooding. Policies SP2, SP4, PL5, GD1, GD5, GD6, NE1, HE1, NE1, NE3, ERE1, ERE5, TT1, WER1, WER2, WER10 and WER11 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant to the application. Attention was also drawn to the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Assessment.

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, including a similar application (planning application No. P/2023/1123 refers), which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers in February 2023.

The Committee noted that permission was sought for the partial demolition of the existing outbuildings within the 2 fields, and the construction of a replacement shed. The outbuildings had suffered storm damage and were in poor condition, with asbestos having been used in their construction. Therefore, it was uneconomical to re-build or repair the outbuildings, which were required for a turf growing enterprise. A strip of land to the south of the application site would be planted as an orchard in order to screen the proposed new shed from the adjacent roadside. A small section of land would also be ceded to the public in order to provide a bus shelter.

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the basis that the design and scale of the proposed shed would not protect or improve the landscape character of the Green Zone. Furthermore, the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of, and have a detrimental visual impact on, the nearby Grade 3 Listed Uplands Farm. Consequently, the application was recommended for refusal on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies SP4, PL5, GD6, NE3 and HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

2 representations had been received in support of the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED], who confirmed that the existing shed was dilapidated, and that he wished to replace it with a more suitable structure to support his business, [REDACTED]. He emphasised that no objections to the proposals had been received. [REDACTED] stated that the application was



supported by the Connétable of St. Peter, the Jersey Farmers Union and 9 statutory consultees.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of MS Planning Limited, who confirmed that the proposals would support the diversification of the rural economy. In the absence of a local grower, [REDACTED] had diversified into growing turf and provided a valuable and sustainable service. Of all the statutory consultees, only the Historic Environment Team had raised an objection and this would be addressed by the retention of a granite wall and landscaping. The landscape character of the area had to be considered in the context of the proximity of the site to the airport. The appearance of the application site was unsightly, and the proposals would result in a visual improvement. In concluding, [REDACTED] urged the Committee to support the application.

The Committee heard from Connétable [REDACTED] of St. Peter in support of the application, who confirmed that he had previously visited the site with Deputy [REDACTED] of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter, Chief Minister. Both the Connétable and the Chief Minister supported the application.

[REDACTED], President of the Jersey Farmers Union, spoke in favour of the application and advised the Committee that the proposed shed would secure and encourage rural diversification.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], who outlined his historical connexion to the farm, which had previously been owned by his family. He supported the proposals, which would allow the farm to continue operating and provide a valuable service to the Island.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Principal Historic Environment Officer, Historic Environment Team (HET), who reminded the Committee that Policy HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan was applicable. [REDACTED] advised that the application site was situated close to a Grade 3 Listed asset and the HET remained concerned about the mass and scale of the proposed replacement agricultural shed structure.

Having considered the application, the Committee decided to grant permission, contrary to the Department recommendation. Approval was conditional upon the submission of a landscaping scheme and authority was delegated to the Department for the approval of the timber to be used for the cladding of the shed. It was recognised that the applicant had revised the scheme to reduce the impact of the same. The applicant was also commended for his efforts in improving the appearance of the site by clearing vehicles.

As the Committee's decision was contrary to the Department recommendation, it was noted that the application would be re-presented for formal decision confirmation and the approval of any conditions which were to be attached to the permit.

Le Boulevard,  
La Grande  
Route des  
Sablons,  
Grouville:  
proposed  
replacement  
garages  
(RFR).

A8. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A14 of 20th October 2022, of the Committee as previously constituted, considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers. The application sought permission for the demolition of a detached block of garages and the construction of replacement garages, at the property known as Le Boulevard, Les Grande Route des Sablons, Grouville. The Committee had visited the site on 14th January 2025.

Connétable M.A. Labey of Grouville did not participate in the determination of this

P/2024/0810

application.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area, the Shoreline Zone and was on the Primary Route Network. Policies PL3, GD1, GD5, GD6, GD9, NE1, HE1, TT1 and WER1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, which included an application for the demolition of a number of garages and their replacement with a 2 bedroom dwelling (planning application reference P/2021/1439 referred) which had been refused by the Committee, as previously constituted, in October 2022. A subsequent application (planning application reference P/2022/1721 referred), for the demolition of the garages and their replacement with a one bedroom dwelling, had been withdrawn in May 2023.

The Committee was advised that the application site was situated within close proximity to the Grade one Listed Building known as 'the Guard House and La Rocque Tower'. The Historic Environment Team (HET) had objected to the proposal on the grounds that the design, height and roof form of the replacement garages would have a detrimental visual impact on, and would fail to protect, the setting of the Listed Building. It was noted that the proposed addition of a public bus shelter would not alleviate concerns with regards to the design of the units and their potential harm to the historic environment. Consequently, it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application on the basis that it was contrary to Policy HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

3 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Principal Historic Environment Officer, HET, who confirmed that the Guard House was of historic military significance. [REDACTED] confirmed that she had previously sought more information from the applicant with regard to the scheme and had raised concerns regarding the height and scale of the replacement garage units. Unlike the existing garage units, the replacement garages would be overly dominant when approaching the site from the south, thereby impacting on the views of the Listed Building, as well as adversely affecting the backdrop from the north. As a result, the proposal was contrary to Policy HE1 and could not be supported.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Principal Transport Planner, Infrastructure and Environment Department, who confirmed that the Transport Team supported the proposals, due to the provision of a recessed bus stop and associated shelter, which would improve pedestrian safety. It was noted that a collision had been recorded nearby, involving a bus and a pedestrian.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], owner of a designated Site of Special Interest, which neighboured the application site. Whilst he did not object to the proposals in principle, he expressed concerns regarding the potential impact on his property of changes to ground level, noting that no details had been provided. He also acknowledged the heritage concerns raised by the HET.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] of J Design Consultants, on behalf of the applicant. It was noted that the garages had fallen into disrepair and the proposals would enhance the surrounding area and would give rise to public benefits. He advised the Committee that the proposed design carefully considered the heritage context of the Guard House and La Rocque Tower. The pitched slate roof design complimented the character of the area, and the proposed replacement garages would provide much needed car parking. The proposals aligned with the policies of

the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and optimised the use of the site. The proposed development was both necessary and proportionate. The benefits would outweigh the heritage concerns and enhance the functionality and character of the area by providing both parking for Le Boulevard and a sheltered bus stop. In concluding, he urged the Committee to grant permission.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] a resident of Le Boulevard, who advised that the garages were dilapidated and that a sheltered bus stop was required for convenience and safety reasons. She confirmed that the nearest bus stop was exposed to the elements, directly on the main road, and was hampered by a lack of street lighting. With regard to the garages, it was her understanding that these would be replaced on a like-for-like basis and would allow residents to park safely on the site and charge electric vehicles.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report.

Land to the north of St. Michael, La Route du Petit Clos, St. Helier: proposed demolition and construction of dwelling (RFR).

P/2024/0776

A9. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which sought permission for the demolition of a shed and greenhouse and the construction of a 2 bedroom residential dwelling on land to the north of the property known as St. Michael, La Route du Petit Clos, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 14th January 2025.

Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North did not participate in the determination of this application.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area and Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL4, GD1, GD6, NE1, H1, H2, H3, H4, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER1, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Parking and Residential Space Standards (2023).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, which included a similar application (planning application reference P/2022/1124 referred), which had been withdrawn in November 2022. An application to convert a garage to habitable space, including an extension, pergola and car parking, (planning application reference P/2021/0852 referred), had been approved by the Department under delegated powers in October 2021.

The Committee was advised that the site comprised part of the former garden of the property known as St. Michael. Permission was sought for the demolition of the outbuildings located therein and the construction of a 2 bedroom single storey residential dwelling with a garden and car parking. The creation of a new vehicular access through the car parking area of Clos Le Gallais to the north was also proposed.

The Committee noted that development within the Built-Up Area was supported by Policies SP1, SP2 and PL4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The application met the required minimum space standards and would contribute to the Island's housing stock. Notwithstanding this, due to its mass, size and design, the proposed scheme would be visually dominant, incongruous and would not contribute positively to the character of the area. The proposals would result in overdevelopment of the site and concerns were noted regarding the impact of overbearing and overlooking on the amenities of neighbouring properties, drainage and the disposal of construction

waste. Consequently, the proposals failed to meet the requirements of Policies SP3, SP4, GD1, GD6, WER1, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

11 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], owner of the property known as St. Michael, who expressed concerns in connexion with the level at which the proposed building would be constructed, adding that this information was not clear on the submitted plans. [REDACTED] also stated that his privacy would be impacted by overlooking from the rear windows of the proposed building.

[REDACTED], owner of a neighbouring property, addressed the Committee, outlining concerns with regard to overlooking and the overbearing height of the proposed building.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Duffell Planning Limited, who advised that the proposed dwelling would be a modest, assisted living bungalow. The site had been selected as it bordered existing housing stock, and the proposed building would blend with the character of the area. Turning to the reasons for refusal, [REDACTED] advised that the new dwelling would be single storey and consequently would not be overbearing or result in overlooking issues. She added that Policy GD1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan allowed for a degree of harm, and the decision on whether this was unreasonable or not was key. [REDACTED] concluded that the drainage issues could be addressed and that the only construction waste generated from the site would emit from the demolished outbuildings.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED] of the Jersey Homes Trust (JHT), who advised that JHT currently had only one assisted living bungalow within its housing stock. The proposed new assisted living dwelling was an urgently required facility as demand for such properties outweighed supply. [REDACTED] added that the site had been selected on the basis that the community environment of the area would be an important aspect for the occupants of an assisted living property.

The Committee discussed the application and expressed particular concern with regard to the overbearing height of the proposed new dwelling and the lack of sufficient wheelchair access for an assisted living property.

Having considered the application, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report.

Le Parquet,  
La Rue du  
Nord, Trinity:  
various works  
(RFR).

S/2024/0985

A10. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which proposed to raise the garage roof and alter the pitch to create a home office at the property known as Le Parquet, La Rue du Nord, Trinity. It was further proposed to install a first floor window, apply horizontal cladding and alter the ground floor fenestration. The Committee noted that the application represented a revision to planning application reference P/2023/1397, which had been approved by the Department, under delegated powers in March 2024. The Committee had visited the site on 14th January 2025.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair, did not participate in the determination of this application. Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement, Vice Chair, acted as Chair for the duration of this item.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application

site was a Grade 3 Listed Building situated in the Green Zone, the Water Pollution Safeguard Area and was in an area which was at low risk of inland flooding. Policies SP1 - SP5, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, HE1, EO1, WER2, WER5 and WER6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant to the application. Attention was drawn to Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in relation to Parking Guidelines (1988), Advice Note No.15 - Businesses run from home, the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (2023) and Draft residential parking standards (2023).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, which included an approved application to demolish an existing garage and outbuildings and construct a new double garage to the south-east of the application site (planning application reference P/2023/1397 referred).

The Committee was advised that permission was sought for a revision to the scheme, to raise of the roof of the previously approved garage by 1.22 metres in order to create office space. Whilst the proposed space was described as a home office, it was intended that business associates would work from the office. Consequently, the office use had been assessed as commercial.

The application had been refused on the grounds that the creation of commercial office space within the countryside failed to promote a sustainable pattern of development or protect the Island's landscape character. The increase in height of the approved garage would be disproportionate to the scale of the garage, and result in an overly large and dominant building within the landscape. Furthermore, the proposal was considered to be harmful to the setting of the Grade 3 Listed Building. Consequently, the application failed to meet the requirements of Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, PL5, GD6, EO1, HE1, NE3 and TT2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, and the application was recommended for refusal.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Principal Historic Environment Officer, Historic Environment Team (HET). [REDACTED] advised that the HET did not support the application on the grounds that the upward extension of the previously approved garage would result in an incongruous and dominant building within the setting of the Listed Building. She encouraged the rationalisation of existing space within the principal dwelling to accommodate the office space required.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of JS Livingston Architectural Services, who advised that his client wished to create a clear separation between work and domestic life. [REDACTED] argued that the application should not have been assessed as commercial office space. The area was intended for use as a home office by the applicant and this was evident by the omission of toilet facilities. [REDACTED] referred to the recent extension of a property near the application site, where the height of the building had been increased by more than that which was being proposed. He added that bicycle storage and electric vehicle charging points could be accommodated within the new garage.

Having considered the application, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report. In doing so, the Committee accepted that the proposed office was not for commercial use.