

Planning Committee

(4th Meeting)

25th April 2024Part A (Non-Exempt)

All members were present, with the exception of Connétables K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour, D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence, M.O'D. Troy of St. Clement and Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity, from whom apologies had been received.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity (Chair) (not present for item Nos. A1-A7)  
 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement (Vice Chair)  
 Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen  
 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South  
 Deputy S. M. Ahier of St. Helier North  
 Connétable M. Labey of Grouville

In attendance –

C. Jones, Planning Applications Manager  
 W. Johnson, Senior Planner  
 L. Davies, Planner  
 J. Gibbins, Trainee Planner  
 A. Elliott, Trainee Planner  
 T. Venter, Planner  
 G. Vasselin, Planner  
 S. de Gouveia, Planner  
 L. Plumley, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (item Nos. A1 – A7)  
 H. Roche, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (item Nos. A8 – A18)

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

Fields Nos. 26, 26A, 26B, part 36, 37, 38, 39 and 54, La Rue de Sorel  
 St. John: proposed construction of renewable energy generating station.

P/2023/0408

A1. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A8 of 11th April 2024, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the construction of a renewable energy generating station on Field Nos. 26, 26A, 26B, part 36, 37, 38, 39 and 54, La Rue de Sorel, St. John. The Committee had visited the site on 9th 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. 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 3 months of the date of approval, the application would be re-presented to the Committee. The Committee delegated authority to the Department to grant planning permission on completion of the POA. Members recalled that the agricultural quality of the soil had been considered relevant to the determination of the application and requested that this be added to the reasons for approval.

Le Chêne, La  
Longue Rue,  
St. Martin:  
proposed  
demolition of  
conservatory  
and  
construction of  
extension  
(RFR).

A2. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A19 of 11th April 2024, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition of various structures at the property known as Le Chêne, La Longue Rue, St. Martin and the construction of a 2 storey extension to the south, north and east elevations, along with the reconfiguration of the internal layout. General landscaping around the site was also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 9th 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.

P/2023/1180

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.

No. 9 Bath  
Street, St.  
Helier:  
proposed  
installation of  
awning,  
privacy  
screens,  
speakers,  
external lights  
and heaters.  
(RETROSPEC  
TIVE) (RFR).

A3. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A18 of 11th April 2024, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought retrospective permission for the installation of an awning, 2 x privacy screens, 2 x speakers, 5 x lights and 2 x heaters (all external) at the property known as No. 9 Bath Street, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 9th 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.

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

P/2023/0902

The Barkley  
Club, Field  
No. 494, La  
Rue des  
Buttes, St.  
Martin:  
proposed  
canine day care  
centre.

A4. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A3 of 19th May 2016, of the Committee as previously constituted, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition of existing equine facilities (an office, tack room, food store and stables) and the subdivision of the application site to provide canine care facilities. This would include the construction of a canine day care centre with roof mounted photovoltaic solar panels to the north of the site and an equine stable to the south-east, along with changes to an existing car parking area and associated landscaping enhancements on Field No. 494, La Rue des Buttes, St. Martin. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd April 2024.

P/2024/0019

Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement, Vice Chair, acted as Chair for the duration of this item, in the absence of Connétable P. B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was an agricultural field of approximately 15 vergées situated in the Green Zone and Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies SP2, SP3, SP5, SP6, PL5, GD1, GD2, GD10, NE1, NE3, ERE1, ERE2, ERE5, ERE7, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER6, and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to

relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance relating to Landscape and Seascape Character Guidance (2023).

The Committee was apprised of the relevant planning history of the site which included permission for equine use and facilities (application No. P/2016/0009 referred) with a condition requiring the removal of the equine facilities in the event that they were no longer required. The Committee was advised that there were various residences in the vicinity of the application site with additional development likely to take place in the near future due to 2 nearby fields (Nos. 410 and 489) having been rezoned for housing.

The Committee noted that the application site had been used as a canine day care centre without planning permission since August 2022, leading to complaints from neighbours to the Environmental Health Department about the level of noise generated by barking dogs, which were under investigation. The matter had been referred to the Compliance Team and the Committee noted that the applicant now wished to formalise the use of the application site for canine day care purposes. The proposals included the construction of a purpose-built structure to provide a customer reception, staff areas, storage, plant rooms and an indoor dog play/run area; enlargement of the existing parking area; and the sub-division of paddocks into individual areas for different activities/types of dogs. The southern part of the application site would remain in equine use and the construction of a new stable block was proposed. The Committee was advised that the applicant had a smallholder licence entitling them to occupy up to 20 vergées of restricted agricultural land and it was noted that a similar facility including kennelling was in operation to the south-east of the application site (application No. P/2020/1520 referred).

The Committee further noted that the Land Controls Section strongly objected to the application on the basis of the loss of agricultural land and the Parish of St. Martin had raised concerns regarding the traffic implications of the proposals.

The Committee was advised that the application was considered problematic on several fronts. The proposals would result in a substantial new non-agricultural development in the Green Zone and the permanent loss of a significant amount of protected agricultural land. The proposed canine day care centre building would measure 417 square metres, representing an increase in footprint of 132 per cent compared to the existing structures (including covered outdoor areas). Significant noise emissions would be generated, causing unreasonable harm to the amenities of nearby and future residents. No transport assessment or travel plan had been provided, despite the potential for significantly increased vehicle movements and insufficient information had been provided regarding the impact of the proposals on the public foul sewer network. Consequently, the application was recommended for refusal on the basis that it was contrary to Policies SP2, SP5, SP6, PL5, NE3, GD1, GD6, ERE1, ERE2, TT1 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

The application had generated a significant amount of public interest and all representations received in connexion with the application had been included within the Committee's agenda packs. A number of late submissions were noted, including a transport statement and an operational statement which had been provided by the applicant.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] of the Environmental Health Department regarding noise complaints. Following a complaint from a nearby resident in August 2022, about noise generated by dogs barking on the application site, an investigation had been undertaken. This included the completion of a log by the complainant detailing occurrences of barking and the installation of

audio recording equipment on their property. [REDACTED] explained that the frequency, duration and character of noise was taken into account when assessing the impact and noted that the barking appeared to be intermittent and predominantly occurred on weekdays as opposed to weekends. It was confirmed that the source of the noise could accurately be pinpointed, and that the investigation was ongoing, a further complaint having been received.

The Committee heard from the applicant's architect, [REDACTED] of Godel Architects, who explained that the applicant had been required to relocate a successful business at short notice and wished to regularise the situation. The application had been submitted following careful consideration and engagement with the Department and would allow the continued provision of a valuable service. [REDACTED] outlined the challenge of accommodating this type of business on the Island and highlighted the design quality as well as the significant ecological enhancements that were proposed. He noted that the Rural Economy team supported the proposals and urged the Committee to grant permission.

The applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Duffell Planning Limited, advised the Committee that the commercial equine livery business remained in operation and would continue to do so. The condition requiring the removal of the equine facilities was therefore not applicable. The proposals complied with policy ERE7, and the land was not considered to be viable for agricultural purposes, as evidenced by the non-agricultural use and rezoning of nearby fields. The applicant's own noise surveys had not identified any nuisance and the transport assessment had concluded that the proposals complied with policy TT1 and would have little or no impact on road safety. With regard to drainage, only one additional toilet was proposed, and this could be connected to the foul sewer network. [REDACTED] highlighted the need for high quality canine care facilities in the Island and stated that when considered in the round, the proposals complied with the policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Concluding, she urged the Committee to adopt a pragmatic approach and support the application.

The applicant, [REDACTED] addressed the Committee, [REDACTED] background and experience. The canine day care business had been established during the COVID 19 lockdown and provided valuable employment as well as canine care and training services. [REDACTED] noted that there had been 20 dogs and 3 horses on site at the time of the Committee's visit and highlighted the increasing demand for canine care facilities in the Island since the pandemic. The business had many loyal clients and a long waiting list. Whilst sympathetic to neighbours' concerns, the intention was to provide well-designed, purpose-built facilities which met the needs of the animals in her care. It was challenging to find appropriate sites to accommodate this type of business and [REDACTED] explained that the proposals would enable her to continue providing a much needed and valuable service.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] He stated that the sound of dogs barking was not unusual in the countryside, along with noise from cattle, horses and other agricultural activities, all of which were to be expected in a rural setting. [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] and it was unrealistic to expect dogs not to bark. He noted that no additional traffic or noise would be generated due to the proposals and that a similar facility also operated nearby. The business provided a valuable service to Islanders and their dogs, and he urged the Committee to support the application.

In response to a question from the Committee, the applicant confirmed that the existing equine use would continue on a commercial basis. It was also confirmed

that the majority of clients took advantage of the dog collection and delivery service which was offered; no dogs remained on the premises overnight; the business employed [REDACTED] and improvements were required to the car parking area to enable vehicles including horse boxes to turn and exit safely. The premises usually accommodated up to 30 dogs, with a maximum of 35 on site at any one time, with a staff ratio of 1 to 8. Dog grooming facilities indicated on the plans were intended solely for the use of the day care business.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen and Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South, endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report. In doing so, members recommended that the applicant work with the Department to formulate revised proposals and indicated that it would have been preferable for separate applications to be submitted in respect of 1) the proposed change of use and 2) the proposed canine care facilities. Attention was also drawn to the findings of an Independent Planning Inspector in connexion with a similar proposal in St. Ouen, which had been refused by the Minister following an appeal (application P/2022/1724 and Ministerial Decision MD-ENV-2024-290 referred).

Field Nos. 908  
and 912, La  
Rue d'Olive,  
St. Mary:  
Proposed  
construction of  
renewable  
energy  
generating  
station.

P/2023/1221

A5. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which proposed the construction of a renewable energy generating station and ancillary infrastructure, landscaping and biodiversity enhancements on Field Nos. 908 and 912, La Rue d'Olive, St. Mary. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd April 2024.

Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement, Vice Chair, advised the Committee of discussions he had had with the applicant in connexion with planning application reference No. P/2022/1095. The Committee did not consider that the nature of these discussions constituted a conflict of interest and Deputy Curtis acted as Chair for the duration of this item, in the absence of Connétable P. B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Protected Coastal Area adjacent to the Coastal National Park and a Water Pollution Safeguard Area. The site formed part of the Interior Agricultural Plateau and North Coast Farmland. Policies SP1, SP2, SP4, SP5, SP7, PL5, GD1, GD2, GD3, GD6, NE1, NE2, NE3, HE1, HE5, ERE1, WER6, ME6, TT2, TT5, UI1 and UI2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance relating to Landscape and Seascape Character Guidance (2023).

The Committee noted that the application site comprised 2 agricultural fields of approximately 37 vergées, with vehicular access via a private road off La Rue d'Olive. Residential properties to the north-west included a Grade 3 Listed Building (La Chaumière) and a Grade 4 Listed Building (Le Hurel). Residential and commercial buildings to the south included a Grade 3 Listed Building (La Tombette) and a large storage shed.

The Committee was informed that permission was sought for the installation of ground-mounted fixed tilt photovoltaic panels for a period of 40 years, together with a substation, inverter, transformer station, grid connection infrastructure, grid cable route, site accesses and security measures. The panels would generate approximately 2.5 Megawatts (MW) of power and formed part of proposals designed to accelerate the Island's renewable energy generation capability. The application was the third such site being brought forward by Jersey Electricity Plc (JE) (application Nos. P/2023/0408 and P/2022/1095 referred) and would support energy sovereignty aims as well as the Carbon Neutral Strategy's low-carbon energy policy. The maximum height of the solar panels would be approximately 2.5 metres above ground level



The Committee heard from [REDACTED] who outlined the strategic need for the proposals given the Island energy context and recent global developments. Jersey relied heavily on imported power and the current contractual arrangements with France [REDACTED]. In order to meet Jersey's energy sovereignty aims and decarbonisation agenda, there was an urgent need to accelerate the Island's renewable energy generation capability through both roof and ground mounted solar arrays. The proposals would also help to address energy price volatility. [REDACTED] highlighted the robust site selection process that had been undertaken and noted that there were few suitable sites remaining. The proposals would deliver significant environmental and landscape benefits and the land would remain in agricultural use. In concluding, [REDACTED] reminded the Committee that the proposals were temporary in nature, and he urged Members to support the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Steedman Planning, who highlighted JE's rigorous approach to site assessment and selection. An Environmental Impact Assessment had been undertaken and soil quality, flood risk and lighting had all been considered in detail. She noted that no bats had been recorded on the site, but additional surveys would be undertaken in this connexion. In the absence of a published local agricultural land classification system, an Agricultural Impact Statement had been prepared and it was crucial to note that the agricultural use would continue and that the land would benefit from a lower intensity of use. The proposals would result in net biodiversity gains and there had been no objections from statutory consultees. [REDACTED] outlined the challenges inherent in siting large-scale infrastructure developments of this nature in Jersey and sought to reassure the Committee that all relevant matters had been taken into account. In concluding, she reminded the Committee of the benefits of the proposals and urged the Committee to grant permission.

The following responses to questions from the Committee were noted –

- the possibility of using derelict greenhouse sites had been explored by the applicant but posed significant challenges, including costly remediation;
- no concerns had been raised regarding potential impacts on breeding birds and the proposed biodiversity enhancements included measures which would benefit the same;
- vegetation beneath the proposed solar panels would not be adversely affected as the design of the panels allowed sufficient light (up to 80 per cent) to pass through them;
- the site, along with 2 other previously approved solar array sites, would be used for grazing sheep by a local shepherd with a flock of around 80 sheep, with the flock being rotated around the sites;
- alternative agricultural uses were also being considered by the applicant;
- in the event that any issues relating to water run off were identified, measures would be put in place to address the same; and,
- no concrete would be used on site, with metal pilings being used to mount the panels into the ground.

Having considered the matter, the Committee, with the exception of Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen, who expressed concern regarding the use of agricultural land for the purposes proposed, 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 directed that additional conditions be imposed requiring the applicant to submit a robust agricultural plan for the site within 6 months and to determine the current levels of potato cyst nematodes on the site in order to provide a baseline for

future comparisons.

Seaford, La  
Route des  
Pelles, St.  
Martin:  
proposed  
alterations to  
fenestration.

A6. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the replacement of 9 doors and one window to the south elevation and the replacement of 2 windows with French doors to the west elevation of the property known as Seaford, La Route des Pelles, St. Martin. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd April 2024.

It was noted that whilst the proposed works were of a minor nature, as the applicant was a sitting States Member the Committee was required to determine the application, in accordance with agreed procedures.

RW/2024/0059

Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement, Vice Chair, acted as Chair for the duration of this item, in the absence of Connétable P. B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that Seaford was a Grade 3 Listed Building located in the Protected Coastal Area and a Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies GD1, GD6, NE3, HE1, HE2 and WER5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee was advised that the proposed works were considered appropriate in scale and nature and would not result in any unreasonable harm to the amenities of nearby users. They would not detrimentally impact upon the wider setting of the site or on the character of the surrounding area and were considered to be of a high-quality design. The proposed alterations were minor in scale and were supported by the Historic Environment Team. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval on an unconditional basis.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

No persons present wished to speak for or against the application.

Having considered the matter, the Committee unanimously endorsed the Department recommendation to grant unconditional permission.

Jersey College  
for Girls  
Secondary  
School, Le  
Mont Millais,  
St. Saviour:  
proposed  
replacement of  
telecomm-  
unications  
equipment.

A7. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which proposed the replacement of a telecommunications antenna and the installation of 2 new cabinets within an existing enclosure in the car park of Jersey College for Girls Secondary School, Le Mont Millais, St. Saviour. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd April 2024.

Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement, Vice Chair, acted as Chair for the duration of this item, in the absence of Connétable P. B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Built-Up Area on the Eastern Cycle Route Network. Policies GD1, GD6, ME3 and UI4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

S/2024/0061

The Committee noted that the proposed replacement antenna would be of a similar design to the existing antenna but with an increase in diameter from 330 to 360 millimetres. The overall height of the mast on which the antenna was mounted would remain at 12.825 metres and the proposed cabinets would not be visible from outside the existing fenced enclosure.

The Committee noted that the Environmental Health Department (EH) had confirmed that no harm to health or amenities would arise from the proposals and, whilst EH had raised no objection to the application, a condition had been proposed



which would require the measurement of the radio frequency of the mast to ensure that it did not breach guidelines. The Department was satisfied that this condition would alleviate any health-related concerns. The Committee noted that EH had advised that current evidence suggested that refusal of applications for mobile base stations on health grounds was unreasonable. Furthermore, such proposals had to be assessed against the policies of the 2022 Island Bridging Plan and were supported by policy UI4. It was noted that the equipment would be subject to International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection certification as a requirement of both licensing and the grant of planning permission.

Consequently, having regard to the requirements of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, the application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the Department report.

A total of 20 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Waddington Architects, who confirmed that the proposed replacement antenna would be of a similar design to the existing antenna and that the proposed cabinets would not be visible from outside the fenced enclosure.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously decided to grant permission, subject to the imposition of the conditions set out in the Department report.

Field No. 11,  
Le Hucquet,  
St. Lawrence:  
proposed  
formation of  
agricultural  
track and  
raised bank  
(RETRO-  
SPECTIVE)  
(RFR).

P/2023/1055

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 retrospective permission for the formation of an agricultural track and raised bank along the eastern edge of Field No. 11, Le Hucquet, St. Lawrence. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd April 2024.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, PL5, GD1, GD6, HE1, NE1, NE3, ERE1 and TT1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant draft Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to landscape and seascape character (2023).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, including an identical application to the current (application P/2023/0026 referred), which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers in April 2023, and a subsequent appeal which had been determined by an independent planning inspector and dismissed in July 2023 (MD-ENV-2023-577 referred).

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the retention of the track would result in the loss of valuable agricultural land which was harmful to the rural economy. Furthermore, the development was not considered to protect or improve the landscape character of the Green Zone. The proposal therefore failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies ERE1 and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

3 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of MS Planning, who advised that the track would be used solely for agricultural purposes to facilitate access to 30 vergées of land. If the Committee maintained refusal of the application

managing the land would be problematic due to the difficulties associated with manoeuvring large agricultural machinery. [REDACTED] added that the applicant had the support of neighbours, who had expressed concerns with regards to the safety impact of large machinery travelling through the narrow lanes in order to gain access to the field. The President of the Jersey Farmers Trading Union (JFTU) had visited the site to assess safety and also supported the application. No objections had been received from the Parish of St. Lawrence or the public. [REDACTED] referred to the recently dismissed appeal which had been refused on the grounds that it sought permission for use of the retrospective track by mixed use traffic (commercial and agricultural), and that the current application removed the commercial use of the track. In addition, the appearance of the site would be improved by the planting of trees along a grass strip, in accordance with Policy NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. [REDACTED] stated that the benefits which would arise outweighed the reasons for refusal and he urged the Committee to overturn the Department's decision.

The Committee was addressed by the applicant. [REDACTED] advised that the application proposed a safe access to the field and that the site would develop pot holes and fall in to disrepair if the proposed track was not permitted. [REDACTED] informed the Committee of the impact of a refusal on his working relationships with the [REDACTED]. The access via La Chasse L'Est was too narrow to accommodate large machinery and was detrimental to the safety of residents of with vehicles passing close to residential dwellings. The proposed track would also alleviate the issue of large agricultural vehicles using an access route utilised by other commercial vehicles and the occupants of staff accommodation associated with Willow Farm. Turning to the issue of the loss of agricultural land, [REDACTED] pointed out that approval would facilitate access to maintain 30 vergées of land and that Jersey Trees for Life had started to plant saplings along the raised bank to the west of the track.

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

St. Quay, La Grande Route de la Cote, St. Clement:  
proposed creation of vehicular access/car parking (RFR).

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 creation of vehicular access and car parking to the north-west elevation at the property known as St. Quay, La Grande Route de la Cote, St. Clement. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd April 2024.

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

P/2023/1110

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area and that Policies GD1, GD6, TT1, TT2 and TT4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant draft Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to residential parking standards (2023).

The Committee was advised that permission was sought to remove the front, north-west facing boundary wall to create vehicular access and 2 car parking spaces in the existing garden area of the property. The application had been refused on the grounds that the proposed parking arrangement failed to provide adequate on-site manoeuvring space and visibility splays which would be harmful to the amenities of road users and pedestrians. The removal of the front boundary wall would also have

a detrimental impact on and fail to preserve, the existing established character of the site and the wider area. Therefore, the proposal failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies GD1, GD6, and TT4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and SPG relating to residential parking standards. 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 [REDACTED] who advised that permission was sought for 2 car parking spaces [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] There was no authorised car parking directly outside of the dwelling and the nearest car park was situated at Green Island beach, which was impractical.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Wildbore Hands Limited, who referenced section 3.4 of the Access on to the Highway – Standards and Guidance (2019). This allowed for access without turning if the visibility of traffic on the road met the standards outlined in section 5.0 and the 85th percentile speed on the main road was under 35 miles per hour. He added that La Grande Route de la Cote was a 30 mile per hour zone and a road traffic survey had been undertaken which indicated that under 400 vehicles per hour used the road. [REDACTED] stated that, in his opinion, the Department had placed too much reliance on the Infrastructure and Environment Transport Report, which did not follow the approved guidance. He also drew attention to other approved developments where similar access arrangements had been approved. The Committee was informed that the scheme had the support of neighbours [REDACTED] of the application site and, in connexion with the detrimental impact on the street scene, [REDACTED] noted [REDACTED].

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 expressed sympathy for the circumstances of the applicant.

No. 49 St.  
Marks Road  
St. Helier:  
proposed part  
conversion of  
garage/  
construction of  
extension/  
change of use.  
(RFR).

P/2023/1058

A10. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A23 of 15th April 2010, 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 conversion of part of an existing garage to provide a shower room on the ground floor at No. 49 St. Marks Road St. Helier. The construction of a first floor extension to the garage and the change use of an existing residential ancillary use to an occupational therapy studio on the first floor were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd April 2024.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was a Grade 3 Listed Building situated in the Built-Up Area and Inland Flood Risk Zone. Policies GD1, GD6, HE1, EO1, EO2, SP2, SP4, SP6, TT2, TT4, WER2 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant draft Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to residential parking standards (2023).

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds of the scale, design and mass of the proposed development, which were considered incongruous in the street scene. The development would fail to preserve the character of the Listed Building and the wider area and would have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring amenities. Furthermore, the intensification of use of the vehicular access would have a detrimental impact on the Listed Building, vehicular

traffic and pedestrians. Consequently, the application failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies GD1, GD6, HE1, EO1, EO2, SP3, SP4, TT1, TT2 and TT4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

5 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that the proposed development would block the only natural light into the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] suggested that consideration could be given to developing the large garden area, which she noted was being used as a car park with vehicles arriving and departing throughout the day.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who advised that the development would have an overbearing impact [REDACTED] and that car parking within the garden area of the property resulted in increased traffic on the narrow Byron Lane. Furthermore, [REDACTED] drew attention to the constraints of Policy HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and added that it had not been demonstrated that an alternative arrangement had been explored.

The Committee was addressed by the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of PF+A Architecture Limited, who advised that pre-application advice had indicated that building upwards was the most appropriate solution for the application site. He stated that there would be no overlooking into neighbouring amenities from the proposed first floor extension as patient privacy was essential and that any impact from shadowing would fall on the roof of the neighbouring property. [REDACTED] turned to the car parking arrangements and informed the Committee that a pre-existing condition stated that patients must arrive and depart from the rear of the property. He added that the Historic Environment Team (HET) Report indicated no objections to the scale and mass of the scheme.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Historic Building Consultant, MS Planning, who advised that the application accorded with the tests set out under Policy HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and that the HET had confirmed that the special interest of the Listed Building would be preserved. The HET had raised no objections to the development, and for this reason, he requested that this reason for refusal be removed. [REDACTED] stated that a high quality design was proposed and the HET was satisfied that the Listed Building would not be obscured and also supported the proposed scale and mass. He added that the proposed contrasting materials were not unusual in this context and that the scheme aligned with Policy PL1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

The applicant, [REDACTED] addressed the Committee and advised that considerable work had been undertaken in developing the proposals. Turning to the issue of client parking, [REDACTED] stated that, due to alternative work commitments she would be consulting less from the application site in future.

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 requested that Policies H1, EO1 and EO2 be removed from the reasons for refusal.

St. Helier:  
proposed  
change of  
use/extension  
of commercial  
store to self-  
catering  
accommodation  
(RFR).

P/2023/1077

bedroom self-catering accommodation at the Pumping Station, Elysee, Stafford Lane, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd April 2024.

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 Green Zone and the Eastern Cycle Route Network. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE2, NE3, E11, EV1, H1, TT1, TT2, TT4, ME1, 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 and parking standards (2023), Protection of Employment Land (2012) 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 proposed change of use was not be supported by the 2022 Bridging Island Plan as it did not involve a traditional farm building or a Listed Building. Exceptional circumstances had not been evidenced to justify a reduction in the minimum standards for living accommodation, bedroom size, external storage, or amenity space. The design and height of the proposed building would be harmful to the landscape character of the area and due to insufficient cycle storage, failed to promote lower carbon forms of transport. Furthermore, the scheme failed to provide adequate measures to protect and improve biodiversity. Consequently, the application failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL5, EV1, GD6, H1, PL5, NE1, NE3 and TT2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

2 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent [REDACTED] of Duffell Planning Limited, who advised that the application aligned with the Government's Visitor Economy Strategy (2024) and Policy EV1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. [REDACTED] noted that the accommodation would be situated in close proximity to amenities and the proposed design would result in a visual improvement. With regard to the minimum standards for living accommodation, the Committee was reminded that visitor accommodation and not a permanent residence was proposed. She referenced the recent approval of 6 floating accommodation pods in the St. Helier Marina, which did not meet minimum residential space standards. [REDACTED] added that secure bicycle storage would be provided on site and that, whilst the proposal did not relate to a Listed Building, it presented an opportunity to repurpose a traditional building.

Having considered the matter, the Committee, with the exception of Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South, approved the application, contrary to the Department recommendation, on the basis of the imposition of a condition which would restrict the use of the unit to visitor accommodation.

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 additional conditions which were to be attached to the permit.

Rosedale  
Farm, Le Mont  
Cochon, St.  
Helier:

A12. 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 new pillars and a gate at Rosedale Farm, Le Mont Cochon, St. Helier. The installation of a new

proposed new pillars and gate and installation of fuel vessel, water tank and electrical cabinet (PART RETRO-SPECTIVE) (RFR).

P/2023/1135

liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) vessel, water tank and electrical cabinet with concrete base to the east of the site formed the retrospective aspect of the application. The Committee noted that amended plans had been submitted which sought permission to relocate the proposed pillars and gate further to the south-west. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd April 2024.

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 defined as a Strategic Countryside Access site which included a Grade 3 Listed Building. It was situated in the Green Zone, Inland Flooding Low, Medium and High Risk Areas. Policies SP3, SP4, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, HE1, C19 and WER2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Landscape and Seascape Character (2023).

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the size, design and location of the proposed gates and pillars would be visually dominant and intrusive within the rural landscape. Furthermore, the scale of the gates and pillars would harm the setting of the Listed Building and landscape character of the area. Consequently, the application was contrary to Policies SP3, SP4, GD6, HE1, H9 and NE3 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] of MS Planning Limited, who advised that the proposed gates were intended as security [REDACTED] and the design aligned with Landscape and Seascape Character Supplementary Planning Guidance. [REDACTED] noted the suitability of the proposed location of the gate and its proximity to the Listed Building.

The applicant, [REDACTED] addressed the Committee and outlined the history of [REDACTED] advised that a considerable amount of work had been undertaken to ensure the application complied with the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. He stated that members of the Public regularly used land [REDACTED] to walk dogs, park vehicles and set up camps, giving rise to security concerns. [REDACTED] added that the pillars would be constructed with traditional local granite with handmade steel gates. Turning to the unauthorised installation of the new LPG vessel, water tank and electrical cabinet, [REDACTED] apologised, advising that he had been unaware that planning permission was required for these works. He confirmed that planting and landscaping would be used to screen the equipment.

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 confirmed that it would be minded to support the retrospective works and advised the applicant to submit a new application to regularise the position.

Rosedale Farm, Le Mont Cochon, St. Helier: proposed construction of property maintenance

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 construction of a single storey property maintenance store to the west of the property known as Rosedale Farm, Le Mont Cochon, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd April 2024.

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

store (RFR).

this application.

P/2023/1164

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site comprised several Grade 3 Listed Buildings, was a designated Strategic Countryside Access site and was situated in the Green Zone and the Inland Flooding Low, Medium and High Risk Areas. Policies SP3, SP4, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, HE1, CI9, WER1, WER2 and WER6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to the relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Landscape and Seascape Character (2023).

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the scale and location of the proposed maintenance store would be visually dominant within the rural landscape setting, which would result in harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings and landscape character of the surrounding area. The Historic Environment Team (HET) had objected to the application on the grounds that insufficient justification had been provided for the scale and mass of the proposed structure. Furthermore, the Drainage Division of the Infrastructure and Environment Department had requested additional information in relation to the capacity and integrity of the existing septic tank. As such, the application failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP3, SP4, GD6, HE1 and NE3 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] of MS Planning Limited, who advised that the structure would be the equivalent of a garden shed and was necessary for the maintenance of all the land and gardens at Rosedale Farm, which comprised 27 vergées. The proposed store was required to house items such as livestock food, a tractor, trailer and other machinery along with staff welfare facilities and a restroom. He noted that the dark green corrugated roof of the store was appropriate in this context and that the store would be screened from the Listed Building by an existing garage and tennis court. Consequently, it would not be visible from any public vantage point or have a detrimental impact on the landscape and seascape character of the setting.

The applicant, [REDACTED] addressed the Committee and outlined details of rewilding works which were underway at Rosedale Farm and reiterated that the proposed store was required for land maintenance machinery.

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

In response to a question from the applicant, the Committee advised that it was not permitted to provide planning advice and that the applicant should liaise with the Department.

Les Ruettes  
and Les  
Ruettes  
Cottage, Les  
Ruettes, St.  
Martin:  
proposed  
demolition and  
redevelopment  
/ landscape

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 demolition of all structures at the properties known as Les Ruettes and Les Ruettes Cottage, Les Ruettes, St. Martin and the construction of 2 x 4 bedroom, 2 storey dwellings to the west. Revised access arrangements were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd April 2024.

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

enhancements /  
revised access  
(RFR).

P/2023/0853

the duration of this item.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and a Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL5, GD1, GD5, GD6, HE1, NE1, NE2, NE3, H1, H2, H9, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER1, 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), Residential Parking Standards (2023), Landscape and Seascape Character (2023), and Housing outside the Built-Up Area (2023).

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the proposed scale, mass, position and orientation of the development would result in an unacceptable visual impact, which failed to protect or improve the landscape character of the surrounding area, contrary to Policies SP3, SP4, PL5, NE3, H9 and GD6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and the Landscape and Seascape Character Guidance (2023) and Housing outside the Built Up Area (2023) SPG. The design of the proposed dwellings was not considered to be in keeping with the setting or established architectural character of the area, resulting in a development which was visually incompatible with the landscape character, contrary to Policies SP3, SP4 and GD6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Furthermore, the design, siting and scale of the proposed dwellings failed to protect or improve the setting of Listed Buildings in the vicinity of the site, and the scheme did not take account of the historic context or sensitive nature of the landscape, contrary to Policies SP4 and HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and relevant SPG. Consequently, 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 [REDACTED] who advised that the proposed scheme would replace 2 existing dwellings which were in poor condition and had suffered damage caused by Storm Ciarán in November 2023. [REDACTED] added that considerable work had been undertaken in order to ensure the scheme complied with the relevant policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and that the application was supported by neighbours.

The applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of MS Planning, addressed the Committee and reiterated that the proposed development was supported by neighbours. He advised that the scheme was modest, aligned with the relevant policy context and was situated over 100 metres away from the Listed Building. There would be no increase in floor space or extension into the adjacent field and no objections had been received. Turning to the design of the proposed dwellings, [REDACTED] provided examples of similar approved developments within the Green Zone, which in his opinion, improved the countryside setting. [REDACTED] noted that the Department had suggested that the applicant could mitigate the damaged landscape caused by Storm Ciarán.

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

Halfa, Beach  
Road, St.  
Saviour:  
proposed

A15. 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 construction of a detached garage and rooftop terrace to the east of the property known as Halfa,



construction of  
garage with  
rooftop terrace  
(RFR).

P/2023/0236

Beach Road, St. Saviour. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd April 2024.

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

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site comprised a Grade 3 Listed Building situated within the Built-Up Area on the Eastern Cycle Route Corridor. Policies SP2, GD1, GD6, HE1, TT2 and TT4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) as follows: St. Helier Design Guidance (2023), draft Residential Space Standards (2023), draft Residential Parking Standards (2023), and Advice Note 6 - Managing Change in Historic Buildings (2008).

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the scale, mass and visual appearance of the development was considered to adversely impact the character and the setting of the Grade 3 Listed Building and was considered to constitute an overdevelopment of the site. The demand for on-street parking would be enhanced by the scheme, with the loss of an existing car parking space, and the proposed replacement garage was considered to be inadequate. The proposed scale and design of the garage, specifically in relation to the rooftop terrace and parapet walls, would significantly harm the amenities of neighbouring properties due to a loss of light and privacy and an overbearing impact. As such, the application failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP4, GD1, GD6, HE1 and TT4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and the requirements of the draft Residential Parking Standards (2023) SPG and 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 [REDACTED] who advised that the development would result in loss of privacy [REDACTED] noise disturbance and would have an overbearing impact.

The applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Gallaher Architects, addressed the Committee and advised that the Grade 3 Listed Building status related mainly to the front façade of the property, with less restrictions at the rear. He noted that the proposed garage would be constructed over an existing car parking space and would result in only a partial loss of the rear garden area. [REDACTED] added that, on balance, the garage could be pushed back slightly and that the overlooking could be addressed by planting trees. He noted that the application site was overlooked by the first floor of the adjacent property. Turning to the planning application process, [REDACTED] was dissatisfied with the length of time which had elapsed since the submission of the application and its determination.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED] who referenced another property in close proximity where a similar development had been undertaken. He added that considerable effort had been expended to ensure that the development did not have an adverse impact on privacy or neighbouring amenities.

Having considered the application, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report, with the exception of reason 2 (loss of existing car parking space and inadequate garage size).

Bonne Nuit  
Apartments,

A17. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under

Les Charrieres de Bonne Nuit, St. John: proposed conversion of storage building to tourist accommodation unit (RFR).

RP/2023/1029

delegated powers and which sought permission for the proposed conversion of an existing storage building to a 2 bedroom tourist accommodation unit in the garden of the property known as Bonne Nuit Apartments, Les Charrieres de Bonne Nuit, St. John. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd April 2024.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Coastal National Park and Protected Coastal Area. Policies SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, PL5, GD1, GD5, GD6, NE1, NE3, HE1, EV1, TT1, TT2, WER1, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site and was advised that a previous application to convert the storage building to tourist accommodation had been refused on 1st June 2023 (P/2023/0153 referred), on the grounds that the application was considered contrary to Policy EV1. Furthermore, there was insufficient information to demonstrate the protection and mitigation of adverse impacts on ecology and biodiversity and that the foul sewer network could cope with increased loading.

The Committee was advised that the application under consideration had been refused on the grounds that the proposed demolition of the existing storage building and subsequent construction of a new unit of tourist accommodation did not align with the provisions of Policy EV1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The design of the proposed accommodation unit was not considered to be of a sufficiently high standard, and the applicant had failed to provide adequate information to demonstrate the protection and mitigation of adverse impacts on ecology and biodiversity within the site. The Drainage Division of the Infrastructure and Environment Department had objected to the scheme on the basis of a lack of occupancy figures to facilitate a drainage modelling assessment and sufficient information regarding surface water drainage. Furthermore, there was insufficient and misleading information with regard to the depiction of site levels and the extent of excavation and reprofiling of the site which may be required. As such, the application failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies EV1, SP4, SP5, GD6, NE1, NE3 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

7 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] of HD Planning and Design who referred to the unauthorised removal of trees by the applicant, which was contrary to Policy NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. He added that the Historic Environment Team did not appear to have assessed the application, contrary to Policy HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and the current application did not address the previous reasons for refusal.

The applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of J Design Limited, addressed the Committee and advised that the existing store would be converted and not reconstructed, as suggested by the Department. He stated that the site had previously accommodated a hotel and the existing pool and amenities would remain in place. [REDACTED] acknowledged that whilst the store was not a Listed Building or a farm building, the application accorded with Policy H1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. [REDACTED] added that the applicant was willing to work with the Department to achieve a more sensitive proposal if the Committee was minded to overturn the decision to refuse permission.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED] who advised that the scheme sought to secure a beneficial use which would improve the appearance of an area of unused land.

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

Planning and  
Building Law  
(Jersey) 2002:  
recommendati  
ons in  
accordance  
with Article  
9A.

A18. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A17 of 22nd February 2024, received the draft annual report, which it was required to present to the States Assembly in accordance with Article 9A of the Planning and Building Law (Jersey) 2002.

The Committee recalled that it had made various recommendations to the Minister for the Environment arising from its assessment of the application of planning policy and details of the same were included within the report. It was noted that these related to policies GD5, ERE3, H9 and H10 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Recommendations had also been made in relation to fisheries, agriculture and aquaculture staff accommodation, loss of tourism beds and appropriate locations for dog care facilities.

Having considered the content of the report, the Committee accordingly approved the same, subject to minor amendment, and requested that the necessary arrangements be made for it to be presented to the States.