

Planning Committee

(5th Meeting)

16th May 2024Part A (Non-Exempt)

All members were present, with the exception of Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South and Connétables K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour, M. Labey of Grouville and D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence, from whom apologies had been received.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity (Chair)
 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement (Vice Chair)
 Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen
 Connétable M.O'D. Troy of St. Clement
 Deputy S. M. Ahier of St. Helier North
 Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity

In attendance –

C. Jones, Planning Applications Manager
 W. Johnson, Senior Planner
 L. Davies, Planner
 T. Venter, Planner
 G. Vasselin, Planner
 S. de Gouveia, Planner
 R. Hampson, Planner
 P. Ilangovan, Trainee Planner
 S. Sellers, Trainee Planner
 K. L. Slack, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe
 (item Nos. A1 – A6)
 H. Roche, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe
 (item Nos. A7 – A14)

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

Pumping
 Station,
 Elysée,
 Stafford Lane,
 St. Helier:
 proposed
 change of
 use/extension
 of commercial
 store to self-
 catering
 accommodation
 (RFR).

P/2023/1077

A1. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A11 of 25th April 2024, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the change of use of an existing commercial store and the construction of a first floor extension to create a 2 bedroom unit of self-catering accommodation at the site known as the Pumping Station, Elysée, Stafford Lane, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd April 2024.

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.

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. Members recalled that redundancy of the employment use had also been considered and requested that this be added to the reasons for approval.

Field No.
1109, La
Grande Route
de St. Jean, St.
John: proposed
construction of
37 new
affordable
dwellings.

A2. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the construction of 3 x 2 bedroom, 31 x 3 bedroom, and 3 x 4 bedroom dwellings, with associated car parking and gardens, on Field No. 1109, La Grande Route de St. Jean, St. John. New vehicular and pedestrian access points, landscape works, and communal open space would also be created. The Committee had visited the site on 14th May 2024.

Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity did not participate in the determination of this application.

P/2024/0050

A site plan, drawings, and a 3-dimensional model were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in a Zoned Affordable Housing Site, Water Pollution Safeguard Area and within the vicinity of a Grade 2 Listed flint chipping area (JN0184). The site had been designated for affordable housing in the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP7, PL3, GD1, GD2, GD3, GD6, GD10, NE1, NE2, NE3, HE1, HE5, H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, CI8, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT3, TT4, WER1, WER6, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) as follows: Development Briefs – Affordable Housing Sites (2023) (Development Briefs), Residential Space Standards (2023), Residential Parking Standards (2023), Density Standards (2023), and Advice Note – Planning Obligation Agreements (2017).

The Committee noted that the application site was situated adjacent to Sion Village, in close proximity to a number of local services and amenities, and the Grade One Listed Sion Methodist Church was situated to the north. Residential properties in the centre of the Village also included a number of Grade 3 and 4 Listed Buildings (Casa Mariana, Noirmont House, Sion Lodge, Rosedale, Sion House, and Chapel House).

The Committee was informed that permission was sought for the construction of 37 affordable homes with associated landscaping and vehicular and pedestrian access. It was also proposed to create an area of communal open space along the northern boundary of the site, which would be ceded to the Parish of St. John. The Committee was advised that the proposed development was supported in principle under Policy H5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, and that the scheme would comprise a tenure split of 45 per cent of social rented dwellings and 55 per cent for purchase on the open market. The proposed mix of the dwellings was considered to satisfy the requirements of Policies H2, H3 and H4 and to deliver the overarching objective of the Development Briefs (2023) SPG. The proposed design aligned with the context of the area, and the private amenity space for each property met the minimum requirements outlined in the Residential Space Standards (2023) SPG, which satisfied Policies GD1, GD6 and H1. The Committee was informed that the adjacent Sion Methodist Church housed maternity roosts of Grey long-eared and Pipistrelle bats, which were fully protected under the Wildlife (Jersey) Law 2021, and ecological buffers along the northern, eastern and southern boundaries had been incorporated into the scheme in response. The proposals had also been amended to remove one 3 bedroom dwelling from the northwest corner to better safeguard the biodiversity and green infrastructure of the site, and the scheme was therefore considered to satisfy the requirements of Policies NE1, NE2 and NE3. The car parking provision was in accordance with the Residential Parking Standards (2023) SPG and the scheme was considered to comply with Policy TT4. The Committee was advised that the requirements of Policies TT1, TT2 and TT3 had also been satisfied by a contribution to traffic calming improvements, the provision of a new bus shelter, and the enhancement of the No. 5 bus service. A Public Art statement had been provided in accordance with Policy GD10, with the provision of public art to be secured by planning condition.

The Historic Environment Team (HET) had concluded that the settings of the Listed Buildings in the vicinity of the site would be altered by the development, but its size, design and layout would mitigate these impacts, and the proposed area of open space between the site and Sion Methodist Church would enhance views of the latter. The Committee was advised that the proposed construction materials were considered to further mitigate the impacts on the character of the area and the proposals were therefore considered to satisfy the requirements of Policy HE1, and a condition which would require an evaluation of the archaeological interest in the site prior to construction had been recommended by HET. The level of community engagement was considered proportionate to the size of the proposed development, in accordance with Policy GD2, and there would be no discharge to the public foul sewer network until the Drainage section of the Infrastructure and Environment Department (I and E) had provided written confirmation of a network connection, in accordance with Policy WER7. The drainage arrangements had been approved by the Department on the condition that none of the proposed dwellings would be occupied prior to the completion of the West Hill development project in January 2026.

A Planning Obligation Agreement (POA) would be entered into to ensure that the landscape of the site, particularly the boundary buffer zones, would be retained, managed, and maintained appropriately, and to ensure that the tenure split would be preserved to ensure that the dwellings remained as affordable homes in perpetuity. The POA would also guarantee the provision of the traffic calming and accessibility measures, the bus shelter, and the enhancement of the bus service, as well as an ecological monitoring programme during the construction and post development, the scope of which would be determined by the Land Resource Management team, I and E. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the Department report and on the basis of the entering into of a POA, as detailed above and in the Department report. In the event that a suitable POA was not agreed within 6 months of the decision, the application would be returned to the Committee for further consideration.

A total of 35 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] Drainage Engineers, I and E, who advised that the drainage work would be divided into distinct phases, the first of which would involve an investigation of the network to ensure sufficient downstream capacity to support the proposed development and any maintenance issues identified as part of the investigative phase would be rectified by quarter one of 2026. If it was concluded that the sewer network did not have sufficient capacity, [REDACTED] advised that it would be upgraded as part of a second phase for which additional funding would be required if the installation of attenuation tanks was necessary.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] Natural Environment Officer, Land Resource Management, I and E, who advised that the applicant had agreed to extend the boundaries of the site to provide a dense ecological buffer, which would support the maternity bat roosts in the Church, but he acknowledged that the roosts might still be detrimentally impacted as a result of the proposed development. It had been proposed to begin planting in the buffer at the earliest opportunity, which would facilitate between 2 – 3 years of growth during the construction phase, as it was acknowledged that the planted foliage would take between 10 – 15 years to mature fully. [REDACTED] highlighted that the removal of a proposed dwelling from the northwest corner represented a significant contribution to protecting biodiversity and meeting the requirements of the development brief and advised that I and E would monitor the light levels at the site and the management of the boundary features after construction.

██████████ Head of Strategic Housing and Regeneration, Strategic Policy, Planning and Performance, Cabinet Office, advised that only using urban areas would not meet the Island's significant demand for housing, and the scheme represented the first proposed development on a rural site rezoned for affordable housing in the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. ██████████ apprised the Committee of the 2,500 applications received for access to the Assisted Purchase Pathway and the 750 applications for social rented housing via the Affordable Housing Gateway, with both schemes being delivered by Andium Homes Limited. It was highlighted that many of the applicants had requested 3 bedroom homes, as a lack of supply and low turnover rates of such properties had led to overcrowding in one and 2 bedroom houses, and the Committee was advised that the proposed development would help to alleviate these pressures.

The Committee heard from ██████████ Principal Transport Planner, I and E, who advised that I and E and the Parish of St. John comprised the highway authorities in the area, with each holding a responsibility for the management of highway issues. ██████████ reiterated that the proposed car parking provision was compliant with the Residential Parking Standards (2023) SPG, and that measures to prevent overspill car parking would be implemented and managed by the relevant authorities. Addressing concerns in relation to the provision of only one car parking space per dwelling, ██████████ stated that it was anticipated that residents would assess their needs prior to purchase, and he drew attention to the viability of alternative forms of transport from the site to town, to include public transport, cycling and walking, together with the proximity of the site to local amenities. In response to a question from the Committee, ██████████ advised that the parking spaces provided would likely be suitable for disabled users due to generous surrounding boundaries.

██████████ St. John addressed the Committee and recalled that the Parish of St. John had requested an area of open space for community use within the plans, but that an offer had not yet been formally presented. The Committee was advised that any offer would need to be approved by the Parish Assembly, and the Connétable wished to ascertain the views of parishioners on how the space should be utilised. The Comité Rurale had been consulted regarding the plans and 2 open engagement sessions with the public had been held. The Connétable maintained that whilst the car parking provisions met the standards outlined in the SPG, he would prefer to see more visitor spaces added, and he concluded by declaring his support for the proposed development in line with the Parish's responsibility to provide social housing for families.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agents, ██████████ ██████████ of MS Planning, who confirmed that 16 car parking spaces which were compliant ██████████. The agents advised that the plans had been developed in conjunction with neighbours and other key stakeholders, and that the development would be constructed in a single phase with a build period of 18 months. The agents concluded by highlighting that the development would enable the provision of affordable housing, a key priority of the Government of Jersey, and that it would represent the first of the sites rezoned for that purpose in the 2022 Bridging Island Plan to be actioned.

Having considered the matter, the Committee decided to grant permission 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 above. The Committee also wished to include an additional condition, which would vary the Permitted Development Rights to exclude the construction of extensions under the General Development Order 2011 to mitigate contravening the minimum indoor and outdoor spaces as per the Residential Space Standards (2023) which had been

proposed as part of the scheme.

Champs Verts,
La Rue
Militaire, St.
Ouen:
proposed new
dwelling.

A3. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A5 of 12th October 2023, of the Committee as previously constituted, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the construction of a 2 bedroom dwelling with associated landscaping and the removal and relocation of an existing stable block at the property known as Champs Verts, La Rue Militaire, St. Ouen. The Committee had visited the site on 14th May 2024.

P/2024/0102

Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen 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 of the Local Centre of St. Ouen's Village, a Water Pollution Safeguard Area, and Sustainable Transport Zone 5. Policies SP2, SP3, PL3, GD1, GD6, NE1, H1, H2, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The relevant planning history of the site was noted, which included previous approvals for the construction of the existing stable block as part of a wider development also comprising 2 new residential dwellings to the east of the application site (completed - P/2020/1631 referred) and for the relocation of the existing stable block to the south of the site (not yet implemented - P/2022/1568 referred). The construction of a larger, detached 2 storey, 3 bedroom dwelling had subsequently been refused by the Committee (P/2023/0170 referred) on the basis that it would result in the overdevelopment of the site, impacting on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Concerns had also existed regarding the poor quality of the proposed living accommodation.

The Committee was informed that permission was sought for the construction of a new detached 2 storey, 2 bedroom dwelling towards the centre of the site, with a south-facing principal elevation. The removal and relocation of the existing stable block to the south of the site was required to provide space for the development. The Committee was advised that proposals for new residential development in the Built-Up Area were supported under the provisions of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, particularly on 'windfall' development sites. The proposed dwelling and associated amenity space met the approved standards for new dwellings and the overall scale and impact of the proposed development had been reduced to address the Committee's previous concerns. The design, appearance, scale, and impact on the character of the area were considered acceptable. The impact on neighbouring properties was acknowledged but the scheme was not considered to cause unreasonable harm on this site in the Built-Up Area. Implications for travel and transport, which included a small incursion into Field No. 524 to the south to facilitate the development, were also considered acceptable, as was the resulting loss of agricultural land. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the Department report.

9 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] to the west of the application site. She drew attention to the number of recent developments in close proximity to her property. Whilst acknowledging that the proposals represented an improvement compared to the previously refused application, [REDACTED] remained concerned about the overbearing impact on her property. [REDACTED] stated that the drawings did not illustrate the full impact of the proposals on neighbouring properties, and she expressed particular concern in relation to the outlook from her [REDACTED] window. The Committee had

been unable to access [REDACTED] property during its site visit.

[REDACTED] the applicant's agent, addressed the Committee, noting that the site presented an opportunity for a 'windfall' development and that the proposals sought to address concerns raised in relation to the previously refused application. The footprint of the proposed dwelling had been reduced by 30 per cent, re-oriented on a north/south axis and moved further away from the site boundaries. A reduction in the overall height was noted and the number of habitable rooms had been reduced from 7 to 4. The size and placement of windows had been carefully considered to address overlooking, and [REDACTED] advised that 2 small high-level windows which were required for escape purposes could be obscure glazed if necessary. The incursion into Field No. 524 (which would remain in agricultural use) would provide a safer access route to the property and was considered acceptable. It was noted that planting would provide screening. In response to a question from the Committee, [REDACTED] confirmed that the applicant was willing to consider revisions to the proposed colour palette and finish, stating that this could be imposed by way of condition.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Deputies A.F. Curtis of St. Clement, Vice Chair, and A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity, decided to grant permission, subject to the conditions detailed within the Department report, and on the basis of the imposition of an additional condition in respect of the colour palette and finish of the development.

Nude Food
Dunes, La
Route de la
Pulente, St.
Brelade:
proposed
entrance
canopy and
installation of
extraction flue
(RFR).

A4. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the installation of a new entrance canopy and signage at the restaurant premises known as Nude Food Dunes, La Route de la Pulente, St. Brelade. The Committee was asked to concurrently consider a retrospective application which sought permission for the installation of an extraction flue through the kitchen roof of the property. The Committee had visited the site on 14th May 2024.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Protected Coastal Area and the Coastal National Park. Policies SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, PL5, GD6, NE3 and ER4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

RP/2024/0137

The relevant planning history of the site was noted, which included a previously approved application for an entrance canopy to the east of the restaurant premises (P/2022/0455 referred). The Committee was advised that permission was sought for a redesigned entrance canopy which would encase and conceal an extract flue and include signage. The previously approved plans had included a timber canopy structure on the paved area alongside the vehicle parking area, with the kitchen being located directly beneath the paved area due to design of the restaurant. During the construction phase, it had become necessary for a mechanical extract flue to be installed through the kitchen roof extending upwards through the paved area. The unauthorised flue had subsequently become the subject of a compliance investigation. The proposals sought to regularise the position by constructing a new canopy structure to encase the flue, which would replace the temporary protective timber housing that was in place. The Committee was advised that a contemporary design of similar size and visual impact to the original was proposed, using complementary materials, and that a menu display stand would also be installed. The proposals were considered acceptable having regard to the requirements of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, and the application was consequently recommended for approval.

9 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] Managing Director of Les Ormes, a holiday and leisure facility which included 6 nearby properties. [REDACTED] was also a local resident and noted that the majority of neighbours had objected to the proposals. He expressed concern about the gradual, incremental development of the site, which had originally been a public toilet, noting that the original intention had been for a small, low-level café with a modest canopy. The Committee was advised that the greatest concern for residents was the potential use of the roof of the structure as a seating area for patrons, facilitated by the approval of the application under consideration. [REDACTED] also expressed concern that approval would act as a catalyst for further development and that the nearest property at Les Ormes, which was 22 metres away, would be affected by odour nuisance. [REDACTED] questioned the commercial viability of the restaurant due to the limited number of covers, its proximity to other beachfront restaurants and the provision of car parking. He also believed that the proposed canopy structure, which he considered to be unnecessary, would not be robust enough to withstand a storm. Finally, he drew attention to the fact that the public toilets remained closed, despite a requirement for these to remain open while the restaurant was closed. Mr. L. Davies, Planner, advised that that the Department would investigate this matter.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Director of the applicant company, who advised that the situation had been inherited from the previous owners of the restaurant, and he advised of the intention to sell the property to remunerate creditors and reopen a restaurant on the premises. [REDACTED] stated that the proposed canopy would incorporate the flue and enhance the previously approved self-service counter, which would facilitate a takeaway service with a touch screen menu. In response to questions from the Committee, [REDACTED] advised that approval of the scheme and the additional features would improve the service provision of the restaurant, and that the proposed canopy replaced an existing and previously approved structure.

The Committee concluded that the application did not align with Policies GD6 and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, and that it would be detrimental to the seascape and landscape character of the Coastal National Park. In doing so, the Committee considered that insufficient evidence had been provided that ventilation could not be provided through a different location. Concerns regarding the lighting associated with the menu display screen were also noted. Consequently, the Committee, with the exception of Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North, refused permission for the seasons set out above.

Having recognised that its decision was contrary to the Department's recommendation, the Committee noted that the application would be re-presented at the next scheduled meeting for formal decision confirmation and to set out the reasons for refusal.

Holme Grown Limited,
Fauvic Nurseries, La Rue au Long, Grouville:
proposed variation of planning conditions and reconfiguration to include a restaurant area.

A5. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the variation of 3 conditions attached to the planning consent for the premises known as Holme Grown Limited (Holme Grown), Fauvic Nurseries, La Rue au Long, Grouville (application No. P/2009/0267 referred). The Committee had visited the site on 14th May 2024.

Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement, Vice Chair 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 Green Zone and comprised agricultural land. Policies GD1, GD6, ERE1, ER1, ER2, ERE2, NE1, NE2, NE3, PL5, SP1, SP2, SP3, SP5, TT1 and TT2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to the

Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Assessment (JILSA).

P/2023/1342

The Committee was informed that condition No. one, which had been imposed based on the business circumstances of the applicant at the time, made the use of the site personal to the applicant and his family and it was proposed to extend the benefit to any other individuals or entities with a legitimate interest in the land. The Committee was advised that the viability and permanence of Holme Grown would likely be increased by this extension, in accordance with the principles of the Bridging Island Plan and the variation of the condition was considered acceptable. Condition No. 2 prevented the farm shop and café from being sold or leased separately from the remainder of the farm holding, on the basis that these were ancillary to the primary use. The removal of this condition was proposed, and this would, in turn, require a change of use from agricultural to retail. The Committee was advised that the dissociation of the farm shop and café from the farm holding was contrary to the principles of Policy ERE1, which sought to protect agricultural land use. A separate planning application would be required in this respect for assessment against Policy ER2, which did not support the change of use. It was also considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the retail function of other existing centres, contrary to Policy ER2, and the variation of condition No. 2 was consequently not supported. Condition No. 3 imposed restrictions on the proportion of the retail floor area that could be used for local (50 per cent) and imported produce (40 per cent), with a maximum of 10 per cent to be used for associated goods, such as accessories and equipment. The scheme sought to remove the percentage element from the condition and use guidelines which would see the farm shop prioritising locally sourced produce. A reasonable proportion of the total retail floor area would be reserved for imported produce and other retail offerings. The Committee was advised that the proposed new wording was vague and risked diminishing the use of the primary floor space use for local produce. It could also result in the farm shop premises being classified as entirely retail and no longer ancillary to the main agricultural use, negating the principles on which the original approval had been (P/2009/0267) granted. Additionally, the proposal to reconfigure the farm shop to include a restaurant with an accompanying al fresco area was not considered to be acceptable on the basis that the subdivision of the premises for other uses would further reduce the designated ancillary retail area percentage proportions.

The Committee was advised that the scheme was not considered detrimental to neighbouring amenities and was compliant with Policy GD1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. However, the established predominantly agricultural setting would be impacted by the amendment of the conditions, contrary to Policies GD6, NE3 and PL5. The Department was of the view that the retail use could be accommodated elsewhere on the Island, and that the potential harm would outweigh the benefits of the proposals. Furthermore, the location of the site was considered to be unsustainable in terms of public transport links, which would result in reliance on private motor vehicles for transport to and from the site. The scheme also gave rise to concerns regarding traffic intensification and congestion in the area, which would exacerbate the impact on the junction road to the northeast of the site, contrary to Policies TT1 and TT2. The application was accordingly recommended for refusal.

A total of 16 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] who advised that traffic associated with Holme Grown had already increased exponentially and was concerned that the expansion of the retail business would exacerbate the issue. [REDACTED] acknowledged the value of the business for the community but stressed that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and drew attention to fatalities that had occurred as a result of road traffic accidents in the area.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], who explained the significance of the application for Jersey Hospice Care and Islanders. It was noted that it had been agreed that a Jersey Hospice Care charity shop could occupy a portion of the reconfigured farm shop. [REDACTED] advised the Committee of Jersey Hospice Care's annual running costs [REDACTED] and the support provided. The Committee was advised that the company had experienced financial losses in recent years and the diversification of its income was therefore vital to ensure continued and expanded service provision. [REDACTED] advised that Jersey Hospice's current retail units raised approximately [REDACTED] and he hoped that a further [REDACTED] would be raised by establishing a retail unit on the Holme Grown site. [REDACTED] suggested that Island wide vehicle trips would be reduced as the site would provide a retail facility in the east of the Island. [REDACTED] advised that all items sold would be sourced from local donations, which would prevent contributions to landfill at La Collette, and he highlighted the positive experiences of the volunteers who worked across the company's other retail locations.

[REDACTED] addressed the Committee and drew attention to the economic impact of the application, which he had discussed with the Department for the Economy. [REDACTED] advised that the proposals would enable Holme Grown to continue to be relevant to consumers and would improve the productivity of the business, which he maintained would be negatively impacted if the application was not supported.

[REDACTED] addressed the Committee and highlighted the importance of the business for the local community, which had provided a number of valuable services over its 20 year history. The recycling facilities at the site had been particularly beneficial as they had reduced the cost of kerbside recycling, which had been reflected in the Parish rates. [REDACTED] advised that the only butcher in the east of the Island operated from Holme Grown, and he highlighted the popularity of the café. Reference was also made to the outcome of the upcoming debate in the States Assembly on assisted dying (P.18/2024 referred) and the potential impact on the services of Jersey Hospice. The Committee was also advised that discussions were ongoing with regard to using the site as a polling station for the Parish, given the provision of on-site car parking, and the [REDACTED] urged the Committee to consider the impact on the community.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] the applicant, who echoed the views of [REDACTED] and advised that an application for a new building on the site had been refused on 16th March 2023. The current application followed on from discussions to determine what could be achieved using the existing infrastructure on the site. [REDACTED] apprised the Committee of the various community services offered by the business, referring to the operation as a 'hub' for the east of the Island.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] who advised that the farm had been established by the [REDACTED] and outlined the range of facilities and community services that the business offered, including the provision of 100 car parking spaces. [REDACTED] advised that permission was sought for a minor change to address the onerous nature of the conditions which had been imposed in respect of planning application reference P/2009/0267. He argued that the restrictions had hindered the ability of the business to explore alternative uses in order to adjust to market demands and economic downturn. [REDACTED] clarified that there would be no new development under the proposals, as the application sought to vary the original planning approval conditions, and that there would be no visual impact as the existing infrastructure would be retained. Addressing the concerns of the Department, [REDACTED]

advised that traffic associated with the existing use of the site was already established, and if Holme Grown ceased to operate traffic would be redirected to St. Helier. He also drew attention to the fact that the Highways section of the Infrastructure and Environment Department had not objected to the proposals on the grounds of traffic intensification and that the presumption against development in the Green Zone was not relevant as the site already housed an established farm shop and café. The Committee was advised that issues with regard to waste disposal would only be relevant if sufficient disposal facilities were unavailable, and it was highlighted that a recycling facility was located on-site, and that Jersey Hospice had agreed to assist with this. ██████████ concluded by stating that the scheme would not have any impact on the character of the area or the functions of neighbouring retail operations, and that Holme Grown acted as a cornerstone of the community which should be supported.

Having considered the proposals, the Committee, with the exception of Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity and Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North, approved the application, contrary to the Department recommendation, on the grounds that the scheme was considered to satisfy the requirements of Policy ERE2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. It was noted that the specific wording for the varied conditions of the permit would be confirmed, which would require further dialogue with the applicant.

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.

Field No. 752,
La Route des
Genets, St.
Brelade:
proposed
variation of
planning
condition.

A6. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the variation of a condition of the permit association with planning application reference P/2019/1546, to increase the range of produce which could be sold from the retail unit on Field No. 752, La Route des Genets, St. Brelade. The Committee had visited the site on 14th May 2024.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Green Zone. Policies GD1, GD6, NE3, PL5, ERE2, ER3 and TT2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

RC/2023/1432

The Committee was advised that the condition permitted the exclusive sale of meat produce and eggs sourced from Brooklands Farm. It was recalled that a mobile retail unit on the site had been replaced with a retail unit on the basis that only the sale of fresh produce from the agricultural operation at Brooklands Farm was permitted. The application site was situated outside of the Built-Up Area and permission for development could only be granted under certain circumstances. In this case, the restrictive condition was considered necessary to facilitate the consent. It was noted that the applicant now wished to sell a variety of other produce at the unit, including Jersey Dairy products, local breads and spreads, and seasonal fruit and vegetables. The Committee was advised that, whilst the sale of other food goods to overcome issues of seasonality may be permissible, the desire to vary the condition stemmed from customer demand, and the additional products had no direct relevance to Brooklands Farm and could be purchased elsewhere. As the original consent for the retail unit had been provided on the basis that the produce was directly sourced from Brooklands Farm, and the expansion of retail units in other Green Zone areas was resisted, the proposals were considered to be unacceptable and contrary to policy. Consequently, the application was recommended for refusal on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies PL5, ERE2 and ER3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

76 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] who advised that [REDACTED] (the applicant) had taken over the family business from her father, [REDACTED] acknowledged the relevant planning history of the site but felt that the conditions placed on this successful business were unnecessarily harsh. The Committee was advised that the applicant had installed ramps and accessible car parking spaces on the site.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] who advised that the applicant was passionate about farming and wished to sell more produce from the successful enterprise, which had been established as a part of the community. [REDACTED] advised that the farm shop was also popular with visitors, and a petition in support of the application contained 1,000 signatures. The Committee was advised that the floor area of the retail unit was less than 31 square metres, and [REDACTED] understood that the condition for the operation of the farm shop provided that there was no restriction on the type of items sold, as long as they were considered ancillary to the farm. [REDACTED] advised that the applicant had been approached by several small businesses selling a number of Genuine Jersey products, which could not be purchased in supermarkets, to offer these products at the farm shop, providing a vital outlet for these businesses. It was proposed that 75 per cent of the products sold would be sourced from Brooklands Farm, with the remaining 25 per cent being Genuine Jersey products, which could be enforced by condition. [REDACTED] concluded by stating that he did not believe the application to be necessary and highlighted Policies SP1, SP4, SP5, SP6, ER3 and ER2 as offering support for the proposals.

[REDACTED] addressed the Committee, in her capacity as [REDACTED] attention to Article 19 (3) of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002, which provided that the Committee could grant planning permission where a proposed development was inconsistent with the Bridging Island Plan if it was satisfied that there was sufficient justification for doing so. She referenced an earlier approval for the variation of certain conditions attached to the permit in respect of Holme Grown, Grouville. [REDACTED] advised that supply chain issues had impacted local produce as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic, and that it was often uncommercial for local suppliers to sell through supermarkets due to packaging demands. The Committee was also reminded that the States had recently approved increased funding for the agriculture industry (P.74/2023 referred).

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] who apprised the Committee of a new food and drink marketing strategy for the Island. [REDACTED] referenced carbon neutrality commitments in the context of the application and advised that there would be no material change to the structure of the original condition, as meat products would still be sold primarily.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] who clarified that, with the exception of one field which was used to house chickens, the remaining land at Brooklands Farm was occupied by 84 pigs. She advised that the closure of the abattoir had led to an increase in the number of piglets.

Having considered the matter, the Committee approved the application, contrary to the Department recommendation, on the basis of the imposition of a condition which would designate specific amounts of retail floor space to the storage and sale of the Genuine Jersey products.

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.

Aurum, La
Rue de
l'Étocquet, St.
John: proposed
construction of
garage, store
and accomm-
odation (RFR).

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 and which sought permission for the construction of a garage and store with ancillary accommodation to the north elevation of the property known as Aurum, La Rue de l'Étocquet, St. John. The Committee had visited the site on 14th May 2024.

Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity did not participate in the determination of this application.

P/2023/1268

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area, Protected Open Space, Protected Coastal Area and Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies GD1, GD6, HE2, NE3, C17 and SP3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant draft Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Density Standards (2022).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, including a similar application (reference P/2022/0512), which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers in July 2022.

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the excessive scale, mass, footprint and design of the scheme would have a dominant and intrusive impact on the main dwelling and the wider area. Furthermore, the scheme failed to demonstrate that the loss of Protected Open Space would provide wider community benefits. The proposal therefore failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies GD6, C17 and H2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, SPG relating to Density and the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (JILSCA). It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] who advised that the proposed extension was intended to provide independent accommodation for family use, and the design approach took cues from the principal dwelling. Turning to the encroachment into Protected Open Space, [REDACTED] noted that this would involve a very small area measuring 9 square metres. Moreover, he believed that the designation was no longer relevant given the redevelopment of the area in 2012. [REDACTED] referenced the St. Helier Open Space Audit (2018) and suggested that an Island wide open space audit would have result in the removal of the designation of this particular area as Protected Open space.

Mr. C. Jones, Planning Applications Manager, addressed the Committee and confirmed that the application site was in the Built-Up Area and only partly infringed the area designated as Protected Open Space.

The Committee, with the exception of Deputy A. F. Curtis of St. Clement, was minded to support the application, contrary to the Department recommendation, on the basis that the scheme was considered to comply with Policy GD6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The Committee directed that a condition be attached to the permit restricting the use of the unit to single occupancy and by family members only.

Having recognised that its decision was contrary to the Department recommendation, the Committee noted that the application would be re-presented at the next scheduled meeting for formal decision confirmation and the approval of any additional conditions.

Turnstone, 6
Fisherman's
Wharf, La
Greve de Lecq,
St. Ouen:
proposed
installation of
windows/
construction of
balcony,
window and
rooflights
(RFR).

P/2023/1274

A8. 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 installation of 2 windows to the east elevation of the property known as Turnstone, 6 Fisherman's Wharf, La Greve de Lecq, St. Ouen. The construction of a balcony and the installation of a dormer window to the north-west elevation and 3 rooflights to the south-west elevation were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 14th May 2024.

Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen 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 Coastal National Park, a Protected Coastal Area, a Water Pollution Safeguard Area and Inland Flooding Low Risk Area. Policies SP3, SP4, SP5, GD1, GD6, PL5, NE3, WER2 and WER5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the design, scale and location of the proposed balcony would be out of keeping with the architecture of the Fisherman's Wharf development and would have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring amenities. Therefore, the proposal failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP3, SP4, GD1 and GD6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and 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 advised that there would be no overlooking from the proposed recessed dormer window, situated to the north-west elevation of into the first floor, obscure glazed bathroom window of the neighbouring property. He added that the inversed dormer window would be obscured from view as it was set back at a considerable height. Turning to the proposed balcony, [REDACTED] noted that the design approach was widely used on Listed Buildings in the United Kingdom. The balcony would be formed on the second floor (attic space) of the property, facing north, with a frameless, black tinted, glass balustrade and would occupy less than 25 per cent of the outside area of the building. [REDACTED] did not believe that the subservient balcony design would appear intrusive or incongruous as it would sit under the roofline, without causing harm to the character of the wider area. He added that Georgian style doors leading to the balcony would be recessed by more than 2 metres causing the least visible impact and he urged the Committee to approve the application.

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

28-34 Hill
Street, St.
Helier:
proposed
construction of
stairwell and
extensions.

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 removal of an existing mansard roof and construction of extensions to the third, fourth and fifth floors of the existing office accommodation property known as 28-34 Hill Street, St. Helier. The construction of an enclosed stairwell to the south elevation was also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 14th May 2024.

(RFR).

P/2023/0594

Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South 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 on the boundary of the Built-Up Area, Retail and Town Uses Area and was on the Eastern Cycle Route Network. Policies SP2, SP4, SP6, PL1, GD1, GD5, GD6, GD7, GD9, GD10, HE1, ER1, EO1, TT2, TT4, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Disposal of Foul Sewerage (2012), St. Helier Design Guidance (2023), Planning Policy Note No. 3: Design Guidelines (1988) and the Southwest St. Helier Planning Framework (2019).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site and was advised that a previous similar application had been refused by the Department under delegated powers on 9th December 2022 (P/2022/1222 referred), on the grounds that it was considered contrary to Policies GD1, GD6, H1 and EO1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds of the scale, mass and height of the proposed development, which were considered incongruous in the street scene. The scheme failed to preserve the character of surrounding Listed Buildings and the wider area. The development would also create increased pressure for on street car parking and failed to contribute positively to the provision of sustainable forms of transport. Furthermore, the proposal failed to demonstrate that refurbishment or repair was not feasible or represented a more sustainable use of land. Provision of art for public benefit had also not been evidenced. Consequently, the application failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies GD5, GD6, GD7, GD9, GD10, SP4, HE1, EO1, TT2 and TT4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and the aims of St. Helier Design Guidance (2023) and Southwest St. Helier Planning Framework (2019). It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

In response to a question from the Committee, the case officer advised that an approved change of use from residential to commercial accommodation application (P/2021/0121 referred) would not be progressed by the applicant as it was intended to maintain the existing commercial lease.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] who drew attention to an aerial view of the application site prior to Storm Ciarán in November 2023. It was noted that the storm had caused considerable damage to the mansard roof area of the building. [REDACTED] advised that the HET had objected to the application on the grounds that the development was situated within the setting of the Grade One Listed historical site of Fort Regent. He noted that the proposed height increase would further erode views across St. Helier from Fort Regent. Turning to the Listed Buildings within the streetscape, [REDACTED] advised that the proposed height of the development would impact on the historic environment. Furthermore, it was noted that the applicant had failed to submit a heritage statement in accordance with Policy HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. In response to a question from the Committee, [REDACTED] confirmed that the external fire escape had not been assessed by the HET.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] who expressed frustration at inconsistencies within the planning process. Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair, requested

that comments be restricted to planning matters.

██████████ advised that the application sought to raise the height of the building by 1.2 metres and to extend floors 4, 5 and 6 by a further 0.9 metres. ██████████ referred to the damage caused to the mansard roof by Storm Ciarán in November 2023, and continuing problems with the mansard during periods of high winds. He advised that the applicant proposed to re-build, rather than repair, the roof, and noted that this would align with the extensive refurbishments which had been undertaken inside the building. Turning to the provision of car parking, ██████████ advised that there was no requirement to make any changes to the existing arrangements and added that there was no requirement to demonstrate provision of art for public benefit. ██████████ stated that the application proposed an extension rather than demolition and that reasons for refusal 2, 3, and 4 appeared to be based on demolition. Furthermore, the 3-dimensional images displayed related to the previous application.

The committee heard from the applicant's agent, ██████████ who advised that the occupants of the building ██████████ were expanding and seeking to invest in St. Helier. He highlighted the fact that the development of office space was supported by Policy E01 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. ██████████ reiterated the points made regarding the poor condition of the mansard roof and added that the proposed development would result in improved energy efficiency and design quality and would make better use of the site. He pointed out that the building currently comprised 6 storeys, 3 of which were situated within the mansard roof. He did not believe that the proposed design would appear dominant in the street scene as the roof would be set back. ██████████ advised that the application sought to redevelop and renew existing office space and he referred to similar approved developments in St. Helier which HET had objected to.

Having considered the application, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report. The Committee was particularly concerned about the impact of the development on the street scene, the historic environment and the northern outlook.

Mount View,
Le Mont de
Gouray, St.
Martin:
proposed
increase in
height of
existing
extension/con-
struction of
decking/
landscaping
(RFR).

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 sought permission for an increase in the height of an existing extension at the property known as Mount View, Le Mont de Gouray, St. Martin. The construction of decking with associated landscaping was also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 14th May 2024.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area of the Green Backdrop Zone, was on the Eastern Cycle Route Network and was a designated Local Centre. Policies SP2, SP3, SP5, PL3, GD1, GD6, GD8, GD9, NE1, NE2 and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant draft Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Residential Space Standards (2023) and the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (JILSCA).

P/2023/1178

The Committee was advised that the application sought permission for the construction of a first floor extension to the north elevation of the existing dwelling. This would facilitate access to a proposed new stepped platform, which would lead to a private decked area to the northern most part of the site. The application had been refused on the grounds that the siting and scale of the proposed extensions would result in a disproportionate enlargement of the dwelling and would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenities. The development, which would be sited above the steep escarpment of the Green Backdrop Zone, would visually dominate the principal dwelling and the street scene and would adversely impact

long and short range views of the Royal Bay of Grouville. Consequently, the application failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP2, SP3, GD1, GD6, GD8 and GD9 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] who advised that the application site comprised a 4 bedroom dwelling with no outside amenity space, failing to meet the requirements of SPG relating to Residential Space Standards, Policies H1 and GD8 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. This absence of amenity space impacted on the wellbeing of the occupants. [REDACTED] noted that the main dwelling was situated in the Built-Up Area, below the steep escarpment of the Green Backdrop Zone and escarpment which would be inaccessible as an amenity space without stairs. The dry-stone granite retaining wall would blend into the setting and planting was proposed along the boundaries of the wall and the chain link fence in order to limit the impact on the landscape. Turning to the proposed first floor extension, [REDACTED] advised that this represented less than a 10 per cent increase in the size of the existing property and that the impact on neighbouring amenities would be marginal. The impact of overlooking to an adjacent property was acknowledged but it was noted that the occupant supported the application. The proposed development would have a positive impact on biodiversity with habitat creation and enhancement, including the removal of invasive and non-native species and the cutting back of scrub by 25 per cent to expose rockface for basking lizards. A planting scheme was also proposed along with woodland management and monitoring of seedlings, which would prevent the area reverting to scrub.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED] who advised that the proposal represented the only viable means of safely utilising the escarpment as an amenity space for the dwelling. [REDACTED] added that the application had the support of neighbours.

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

Les Ormes, La
Rue du Nord,
Trinity:
proposed
demolition/
alteration of
roof
form/extension
(RFR).

RP/2023/1435

A11. 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 proposed amendments to approved application reference P/2021/1811 and sought permission for the demolition of the first floor and alteration of the roof form at the property known as Les Ormes, La Rue du Nord, Trinity. The extension of the ground floor of unit one, together with internal alterations, the installation of roof lights along the front and rear roof slopes of unit 2, alterations to the fenestration and doors of unit 2, to include new windows along the south-west elevation were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 14th May 2024.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity (Chair) and Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity 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 was situated in the Green Zone and Water Pollution Safeguard Area and included a Grade 4 Listed Building. Policies SP2, SP4, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, HE1, HE2, H1, H9, TT2, TT4, WER5, WER6, and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Residential Space Standards (2023), Housing

Outside the Built-Up Area (2023), Parking Standards (2023) and the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (JILSCA).

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the amended plans would introduce design elements which undermined the provisions approved in the original scheme. Furthermore, the partial demolition of the Grade 4 Listed Building would have a harmful impact on its character, setting and the street scene. The proposed additional ground floor windows would impact on the privacy of future occupants and insufficient information had been provided to evidence that the development would not harm the natural environment. Consequently, the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies SP4, GD1, GD6, HE1 and NE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who advised that the amendments to the approved proposal (P/2021/1811) were minor, including the addition of roof lights and roadside windows. With regard to loss of privacy, the roadside window would be 1.5 metres above eye level. He did not believe that the proposed rooflights would have a detrimental impact on the historic environment and were required to increase light levels in the room below. In connexion with the splitting of the barn, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that the buildings had originally been separated and this would assist with the phasing of the project.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who advised that the older, more significant original 18th century façade of the Grade 4 Listed Building would be revealed if the proposed separation of the buildings was approved. The layout would continue to reflect a traditional farm group, with attached and detached barns relating to the farmyard. He added that the barn was the less superior of the 2 buildings and that demolition of the first floor brick wall had been included in the previously approved application, and limited amendments were proposed. [REDACTED] added that Policy HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan allowed for adaptations to Listed Buildings and that the proposition would enhance the historic value of the farm.

The applicant, [REDACTED] addressed the Committee and advised that the farm had been in his family since 1951, and that the proposal would create a complex of family homes. He added that the application sought to restore the oldest building on the farm to its original state.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Deputy S. M. Ahier of St. Helier North, endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report.

Field No. 293,
La Rue de la
Commune, St.
Peter:
proposed
change of use
and reprofiling
of
land/surfaced

A12. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A9 of 23rd February 2023, 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 proposed change of use, reprofiling (to include landscape and drainage works) and the installation of surfaced areas, fencing and gates on Field No. 293, La Rue de la Commune, St. Peter. The Committee had visited the site on 14th May 2024.

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

areas/
installation of
fencing and
gates (RFR).

P/2023/0894

site was situated in the Green Zone, Water Pollution Safeguard Area and Airport Noise Zone 3. Policies SP1, SP2, SP4, SP5, SP6, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE2, NE3, ERE1, CI5, TT2, WER1, WER5, WER6 and WER10 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (JILSCA)

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site and was advised that a previous similar application had been refused by the Department under delegated powers on 23rd February 2023 (P/2022/1204 referred), on the grounds that recreational facilities were protected in accordance with the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The application was also considered contrary to Policy NE3.

The proposed development sought to utilise land which had formerly been agricultural and was situated within the Green Zone for vehicle storage, contrary to Policy ERE1. The application failed to demonstrate that the scheme would protect the or improve the character of the area and the policy exceptions under Policy NE3 had not been met. The development also failed to evidence exceptional circumstances to justify the loss of agricultural land and the impact upon the agricultural industry, contrary to the relevant Policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and SPG relating to the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (JILSCA). Consequently, the application had been refused for the above reasons, and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED] who advised that the Jacksons site on La Rue Fondon, St. Peter lacked space for expansion, which had resulted in various locations being utilised for the storage of cars. The application site would provide one central area for car storage, consequently reducing vehicle movements around the Island. [REDACTED] stated that Field No. 293 had been neglected in recent years as the land was no longer used for sporting activities. The proposed landscaping would transform the land and improve its appearance and the outlook from neighbouring sites. He added that the adjacent Barchester Care Home was supportive of the application.

The Committee was addressed by [REDACTED] who advised that the proposed scheme, which was supported by the Roads Committee, would reduce traffic on La Rue des Vignes and the surrounding narrow lanes. [REDACTED] noted that the application site comprised former agricultural land which had been used as storage during the construction of a nearby care home in the past and was in poor condition. He added that the proposal would clear the site of unsightly debris and the temporary nature of the use meant that the land could be restored for agricultural uses in the future. Should the application be approved, Jacksons had committed to the restoration of a public footpath in the Parish of St. Peter.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent [REDACTED] who referred to the 2020 Employment Study, which had formed part of the evidence base for the Bridging Island Plan, and which recognised the need for land to support businesses outside of the Built-Up Area. [REDACTED] advised that the proposed scheme was required by Jacksons in order for the business to operate efficiently and effectively, in accordance with Policy SP6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The proposal would reduce traffic in the area and increase productivity. The application site was in close proximity to Jacksons' existing site and would be enclosed with hedging and planting.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Deputy S. M. Ahier of St. Helier North, endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for

the reasons set out in the Department report. The Committee was particularly concerned that the land should be restored and returned to agricultural use.

The
Workshop, La
Rue de la
Hague, St.
Peter:
proposed
demolition and
redevelopment
/ landscape
enhancements /
revised access
(RFR).

P/2023/1146

A13. 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 proposed demolition of an existing workshop and the construction of a new workshop with landscaping at the site known as The Workshop, La Rue de la Hague, St. Peter. An alternative access arrangement was also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 14th May 2024.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone, Water Pollution Safeguard Area and Airport Noise Zone 3. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, PL5, GD1, GD5, GD6, NE1, NE2, NE3, EI1, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER6, WER7 and WER10 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant draft Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (JILSCA) and the Protection of Employment Land (2012).

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the proposed mass, position and design of the scheme would be visually dominant within the Green Zone, resulting in harm to the landscape character. The proposed redevelopment of the site for light industrial use in an unsustainable location outside of the Built-Up Area failed to support rural diversification or make use of an existing building. Finally, the proposal failed to evidence sufficient car parking provision or manoeuvring space, which would have an impact on highway safety. Consequently, the application was considered contrary to Policies SP1, SP2, SP4, SP5, GD6, NE3, PL5, EI1, TT1 and TT4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] who advised that the application site had been occupied by Battrick and Boylens Builders since the 1960s for 'light industrial' use. The proposed new workshop would be used for the design and prototyping of engineered components and structures for the marine and general industry sectors on the ground floor level and the upper level would be used for administration purposes. [REDACTED] drew attention to the provisions of Policy SP6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The proposed workshop would have a small footprint and would be set back on the application site, with a 25 per cent reduction in floorspace arising and the provision of new access arrangements. [REDACTED] advised that the proposed design used carefully selected materials and the scheme would address existing overlooking to neighbouring amenities. There had been no objections from the public and the application was supported by neighbours. [REDACTED] added that the applicant was willing to accept conditions in connexion with outside storage and hours of operation. In response a question from the Committee, he confirmed that the new workshop would be insulated in order to minimise noise impact.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen, decided to grant permission, in accordance with Policies EI1, GD5 and SP6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. In doing so the Committee advised that the permit would be subject to the imposition of conditions as follows; the restriction of outside storage use, cladding to be approved by the Department and a restriction on operating hours to between 7.30 am to 6.00 pm on weekdays, 8.00 am to 12.00 pm on Saturdays and no operation on Sundays and public holidays.

Having recognised that its decision was contrary to the Department's recommendation, the Committee noted that the application would be re-presented at the next scheduled meeting for formal decision confirmation and the approval of the above and any additional conditions which were to be attached to the permit.

No. 1 Hautbois
Gardens, St.
Helier:
proposed
conversion
(RFR).

A14. 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 proposed conversion of a 2 generation home comprising 2 x 2 bedroom dwellings, to a 4 bedroom dwelling at the property known as No. 1 Hautbois Gardens, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 14th May 2024.

P/2023/1075

Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South did not participate in the determination of this application.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application was situated within the Built-Up Area, Primary Centre, Town of St. Helier and the Green Backdrop Zone. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, PL1, GD1, GD6, GD8, H1, H2, H3, H4, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant draft Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Residential Space Standards (2023) and Residential Parking Standards (2023).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, which included an application for the conversion of a 4 bedroom dwelling to a 2 x 2 bedroom dwelling which had been approved in August 2004 (P/2004/1540 referred).

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the scheme would result in the unacceptable loss of a 2 bedroom unit of accommodation within a Primary Centre. Furthermore, requirements with regard to the provision of outside storage had not been achieved. Consequently, the proposal failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP3, H1 and H3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and 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's agent, [REDACTED] who referred to the original approved planning application (P/2004/1540) and advised that the applicant wished to reinstate the 4 bedroom dwelling which had previously existed. With regard to the reason for refusal relating to the loss of a 2 bedroom unit, [REDACTED] noted that there was significant demand for larger properties in the Island, and he urged the Committee to grant permission.

The applicant, [REDACTED] addressed the Committee and advised that she had been unaware that the reinstatement of the property as a single dwelling would give rise to planning issues. [REDACTED] added that the dwelling would continue to be used as a family home if permission was granted.

Having considered the application, the Committee decided to grant permission, in accordance with Policy H3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, 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.

