



[REDACTED]
Healey & Baker
P.O. Box 254
Colomberie Close
St. Helier
JE4 8TT

9047/G

6 March 1998

Dear [REDACTED]

Field 1007, La Grande Route de St. Jean, St. John

I refer to your request of 8 January 1998 on behalf of your client [REDACTED] to alter Condition 5 of the above permit for the new shed which makes the permission personal to [REDACTED]

The Planning and Environment Committee considered your request at its meeting on 4 March but decided to maintain the above condition. They considered that the original consent for the new shed was only approved on the basis of [REDACTED] personal circumstances - i.e. his need for such a shed, and that if he did not require such a large building he should have sought permission for, and built, a smaller one. They therefore considered that such a request was wholly unacceptable and decided to maintain Condition 5 in its present form. Therefore, notwithstanding that enquiries of this nature are market rather than client led, the building can only be occupied by [REDACTED]

I am also instructed to request you to remove a 'To Let' sign which has appeared on the site bearing your Company name and to pass on the Committee's views that the current untidy state of the site is unacceptable and should be tidied up as soon as possible. In this regard we would be keen to know when the contract for the building works is due to be completed since Condition 9 of the permit dated 15 May 1997 expressly forbids the storage of goods or materials outside the building.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]
Senior Planner

m9047g

[REDACTED]

Your Ref: 9047/G

Our Ref: [REDACTED]

03 DEC 2001

9047/G

30th November 2001

[REDACTED]
Planning & Building Services
South Hill
St Helier
JE2 4US

Dear [REDACTED]

Application Address: Field 1007, La Grande Route de St Jean, St John

Certain correspondence which has passed between [REDACTED] of your Department and my client, [REDACTED] has been passed to me. I have been asked to review the conditions attached to the permit in relation to the construction of the two storey house, single storey garage and steel frame storage building with service road at the above named property.

I see that there has been some revision to the permit. I am asked in particular to advise in relation to condition 5 which states as follows:-

"The storage shed and its curtilage to the north side of the site shall only be used by [REDACTED] in connection with his removals, clearance and storage business (known as [REDACTED] and shall not be sold, let, gifted or otherwise transferred to any other party unless it is subject to written approval from the Planning and Environment Committee. The house and its curtilage to the southern part of the site shall remain the property of [REDACTED] or heirs and shall not be sold, gifted or otherwise transferred to any third party unless the subject of written approval from the Planning and Environment Committee." (sic)

Transfer = letter
Build = [unclear]
Site = [unclear]

[REDACTED]

Your Ref: 9047/G

Our Ref: [REDACTED]

8th February 2002

[REDACTED]
Planning & Building Services
South Hill
St Helier
JE2 4US

Dear [REDACTED]

Field 1007, St John

Our client: [REDACTED]

I write further to my letters of the 30th November 2001 and 15th January 2002. I note that I have not received a reply to either letter. May I please now hear from you by return?

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]



Planning & Building Services

South Hill
St Helier
Jersey JE2 4US

Telephone 01534 725511
Facsimile 01534 768952
www.planning.gov.je

[REDACTED]
Benest & Syvret
Royal Court Chambers
10 Hill Street
St Helier
JE1 1BS

[REDACTED]
D/1996/0752
9047/G/0/0

Dear [REDACTED]

12th February 2002

Field 1007, La Grande Route de St. Jean, St. John

Thank you for your letters concerning the Condition no. 5 and its restrictions on usage and transfer.

I apologise for the delay in being able to reply, but having considered the history of this most unusual case I confirm that your clients belief with regard to the Department's stance on the issue of letting is correct. The Committee considered that the letting of the business would be a transfer in the meaning of the Condition.

As I have said this is a most unusual case, and Planning Permission was only granted originally on the basis of special circumstances put forward by, and on behalf of, your client. With this in mind, it was only appropriate that conditions were applied to the Permission to ensure that it related to the circumstances that were put forward. If those circumstances do not prevail, then the basis on which the decision to approve the application was made, has fundamentally changed.

If you have any alternative suggestion at how the Committee's requirements could be addressed, then you are welcome to put these forward for consideration.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Principal Planner
Direct Dial [REDACTED]

LIR
[REDACTED]