

## **PLANNING AND BUILDING (JERSEY) LAW 2002**

### **Appeal under Article 108 against a decision made under Article 19 to refuse planning permission**

#### **REPORT TO THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

made under Article 115(5)  
by D A Hainsworth LL.B(Hons) FRSA Solicitor  
the inspector nominated under Article 113(2) from the list of persons appointed  
under Article 107

---

#### **Appellant:**

Roberto Lora

#### **Application reference number and date:**

P/2022/1308 dated 1 November 2022

#### **Decision Notice date:**

18 May 2023

#### **Site address:**

Hotel Savoy, 37 Rouge Bouillon, St Helier JE2 3ZA

#### **Development proposed:**

Demolish existing development and construct 53 residential units with associated facilities and landscaping.

#### **Inspector's site visit date:**

2 October 2023

#### **Hearing date:**

5 October 2023

---

#### **Introduction and procedural matters**

1. This is an appeal against the Planning Committee's decision to refuse planning permission for the development described above on 18 May 2023. The decision was made in accordance with the recommendation of the Infrastructure and Environment Department, for the following reasons:-

"1. Insufficient information has been submitted to assess the impact on protected spaces [*sic*] and mitigate the negative impacts of the development on species and their nesting sites throughout the works and following completion. Therefore, the application has not adequately demonstrated that

it would not cause unacceptable harm to ecological interests, contrary to Policies SP5 and NE1 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022.

2. By virtue of its design, siting, scale, height, and proximity to neighbouring properties, the proposal would result in unreasonable harm to the amenities of the occupants of the existing residential units to the North and South-East, contrary to Policies SP3, PL1, GD1, GD6, H1 and H2 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022.

3. The proposed development by virtue of its design, mass, scale and siting would be dominant and intrusive, is poorly related to neighbouring buildings thereby causing harm to the character of the area, street scene, and setting of Listed Buildings and therefore fails to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP3, SP4, PL1, GD1, GD6, GD7 and HE1 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022.

4. The internal layout of the proposed residential units would lead to cramped, unpractical, low quality residential units and lack of private amenity space that do not meet the Minimum Specification for New Housing Developments that would be harmful to the living conditions of occupiers of the residential units and result in an unacceptable overdevelopment of the site which is contrary to Policies SP3, PL1, GD6, H1, H2 and H4 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022.

5. The proposed development provides insufficient electric charging points therefore the development fails to adequately promote alternative lower carbon forms of transport, contrary to the requirements of Policies SP1, SP3, TT1 and TT2 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022.

6. The proposed development would not provide good quality adequate play space for the occupants and their families to ensure the health and wellbeing of future generations and is therefore considered contrary to Policies SP3, CI6 and CI8 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022.

7. Insufficient information has been submitted in relation to the landscaping detail and its continued maintenance, and therefore the proposed scheme is not considered to integrate the development into the landscape and character of the area, contrary to the requirements of Policies SP3, PL1, GD6 and GD8 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022.

8. Inconsistent drawings have been submitted and therefore it is not possible for the Department to assess the quality of design and harm on the amenities of neighbouring properties and the living conditions of occupiers of the residential units, contrary to the requirements of Policies SP3, PL1, GD1, GD6, H1 and H2 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022."

2. Several of the reasons for refusal refer to the "requirements" of the Bridging Island Plan. As I have recorded in previous appeal reports, describing policies in the Plan as having "requirements" is incorrect. It implies that a decision to refuse is mandated by the policy, which is never the case since the Plan states in its Introduction that the policies exist "to guide development" and the wording of the policies generally reflects this approach. The issue could easily have been addressed when the reasons were drafted by omitting the words "the requirements of".
3. Some of the reasons for refusal in this instance were caused by confusion about what application plans and documents had been submitted. This matter

was discussed at the hearing and a consolidated set of application plans was subsequently provided by the applicant. These plans were published on the Planning Register and the Department and the interested party have commented on them. The consolidated plans include minor post-decision amendments that show the electric charging points in the car-parking area, as referred to in the Transport Assessment and Sustainability Statement submitted with the application.

4. The hearing on 5 October 2023 considered three supplementary planning guidance (SPG) documents published by the Minister in July 2023, entitled *St Helier design guidance*, *Density standards* and *Making more homes affordable*. Later in October 2023, the Minister published additional SPG documents entitled *Residential space standards* and *Residential parking standards*. The parties were consulted about the additional SPGs and invited to comment in writing in relation to their application to the development. All the parties have responded; their responses have been published on the Planning Register and circulated for further comment. The appellant's response includes revised floorplans and detailed changes to the internal layout of the development, which have been drawn up in order to make it comply with the new standards contained in the additional SPGs.
5. None of the matters referred to in paragraphs 3 and 4 above has entailed a fundamental change to the application that was considered by the Planning Committee and none of them adversely affects any important planning considerations that have arisen. The hearing process and the subsequent process of publication, consultation and re-consultation relating to these matters have ensured that there has been no procedural unfairness. I have therefore accepted all the new material for consideration in my report, applying the principles set out by the High Court of Justice in England in *Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v SSE* [JPL, 1982, P37] as refined in *Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney* [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin).

### **Description of the site and its surroundings**

6. The Savoy Hotel is a large hotel that has been much extended over the years. Its height ranges from a single storey to three storeys and the site extends from Rouge Bouillon on the eastern side to Roussel Mews on the western side. The Hotel has a large car park at the front with 'in and out' facilities on Rouge Bouillon. The Hotel buildings extend up to the boundaries of the site on the other three sides.
7. The area as a whole contains a mixture of building styles and land uses, including public utilities. Residential properties adjoin the Hotel on its northern and southern sides and on the opposite side of Roussel Mews. There are modern redevelopment projects as well as listed buildings in the vicinity.
8. The Bridging Island Plan places the Hotel within the built-up area and within St Helier, the primary centre for the Island's development needs. The Hotel is also within the green backdrop zone and within Character Area 10 : Town Edges and Slopes of the St Helier Urban Character Appraisal Review 2021. In addition, it is in sustainable transport zone 2 and within the eastern cycle route network development corridor.

## **The proposed development**

9. The Hotel would be demolished and the site cleared. The 53 residential units would be built around a central amenity space; 8 of them would be designated 'affordable' in accordance with the SPG *Making more homes affordable*. It has been accepted that the tests in Policy GD5 (Demolition and replacement of buildings) would be satisfied.
10. The height of the development would vary between two and five storeys. Although it would be higher and bulkier overall than the existing Hotel, the variations in levels result in parts of it being lower than the existing building. Part of the site would be excavated to provide a basement area for parking, storage, bins and plant. Some parts of the roof areas would be used as amenity space and others for the installation of solar panels. The development would extend further forwards than the Hotel, up to the building line on Rouge Bouillon formed by the buildings to the north of the site, but well behind the buildings to the south which extend almost up to the road. Imaginative proposals have been submitted for a series of on-site public art commissions.
11. Vehicular access would be from Rouge Bouillon. Surface parking spaces for visitors would be provided at the front. The footway on Rouge Bouillon would be widened and a bus stop and bus layby would be provided. A new boundary wall would be required on Rouge Bouillon; this would be constructed further back from the road, using granite from the existing boundary wall. Pedestrian and cycle routes would be provided throughout the development. Further details of the landscaping of the development are outstanding at present.

## **The case for the Infrastructure and Environment Department**

12. The Department's position at the time of their committee report was as stated in the reasons for refusal. However, the Department stated in the report that there is no objection in principle to residential development on the site, since this is in accordance with the strategic and locational policies of the Bridging Island Plan. They indicated that the demolition of the Hotel and the associated loss of visitor accommodation is acceptable in principle and that the height of the development would be within the parameters indicated in the Plan and in the St Helier Urban Character Appraisal Review.
13. The Department's position at the time of my report, after discussion at the hearing and consideration of the matters referred to in paragraphs 3 and 4 above, is as follows. The development remains acceptable in principle for the reasons set out in paragraph 12 above. Some of the reasons for refusal have been addressed or can be dealt with by planning conditions. The development would comply with the level of parking provision indicated by the *Residential parking standards* SPG but not with some of the detailed standards indicated in the *Residential space standards* SPG. The Department remains of the view that permission for the development should be refused for the reasons outlined in paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 6 of the decision notice.

## **The case for the interested party**

14. The interested party owns 1 and 2 Gloucester Mews, which are modern flat-roofed semi-detached houses three storeys high. The living accommodation is on the upper floors above the ground-floor garaging and has balconies at first-floor level at the rear. No.1's side wall adjoins the northern boundary of the

Hotel's car park and its garden is next to part of the northern side of the Hotel itself. The boundary between the two properties is marked by a very high granite wall which would be retained if the development proceeds.

15. The interested party's main objection to the proposed development is that it would maximise the development potential of the site contrary to the Plan's principles of good design, so as to affect 1 and 2 Gloucester Mews adversely by (i) creating a sense of overbearing and oppressive enclosure, (ii) reducing levels of privacy, sunlight and daylight unreasonably and (iii) causing light and noise pollution. She has submitted a sun path/ shadow analysis which shows that at certain times the development could result in a substantial increase in the overshadowing of the garden of No.1.

### **Other public comments**

16. A range of opinions has been expressed. The development has been supported by many people because of its design and sustainability and its contribution to housing needs. A similar number of representations have been received that are critical of the development for various reasons, including the loss of the Hotel and the size and design of the development and its impact on the amenities of surrounding residents and the street scape.

### **The case for the appellant**

17. The appellant states that the reasons for refusal are flawed because account was not taken of all the information that had been submitted. He maintains that permission should be granted, having regard to the Bridging Island Plan as a whole and all material considerations, including the guidance referred to in the SPGs. He emphasises in particular how the development complies with the Plan's Strategic Policy Framework and how the pace of housing construction in St Helier is falling far short of what is needed to meet the Plan's objectives.
18. The appellant recognises that this emphasis does not justify the provision of sub-standard development proposals. He asserts that the development proposed in this appeal would not do so, for the following reasons:-
  - The development has been well-designed and respects neighbours' amenities. It would not be dominant or intrusive nor would it harm the street scape or the setting of any listed buildings.
  - A revised northern elevation drawing was submitted at the application stage. This eliminated overlooking and was accompanied by a daylight and sunlight assessment that indicated that the impact on property to the north would be acceptable.
  - The development would be in a sustainable location and would support sustainable travel objectives. The parking provision would accord with the *Residential parking standards* SPG.
  - A broad mix of residential units would be provided. The size of the units meets or exceeds adopted standards. There are no quantitative amenity or play space standards; a reasonable amount of space would be provided by a combination of private gardens, balconies, roof

terraces and communal areas, including children's play provision. Extensive storage space would be provided in the basement.

- Landscaping is shown on the submitted plans, sufficient to integrate the development into this urban environment and appropriate to this part of the green backdrop zone. Further landscaping details can be required by a planning condition.
- The ecological assessment of the Hotel discloses only one issue of concern – a potential roosting site for bats. Further survey work can be required by a planning condition.

### **Inspector's assessments and conclusions**

19. The Law requires that, in general, planning permission should be granted if a proposed development is in accordance with the Bridging Island Plan. The Plan advises in its Introduction how this requirement should be applied:-

“When considering whether a development proposal is in accordance with the plan, it is important to have regard to the plan as a whole and not to treat a policy or proposal in isolation. It is likely that several policies will be relevant to any development proposal and that some policies can, seemingly, pull in different directions. This is not a flaw in the system, but simply a product of a complex and wide-ranging plan, and a reflection of the natural tensions that arise in seeking to meet the community's economic, social and environmental objectives.”

20. These tensions are particularly likely to arise in urban redevelopment projects because of the site-specific constraints involved when compared to greenfield development. Compliance with every detail of planning policies and guidance in such cases may be an unrealisable objective.
21. The Plan's strategy in relation to St Helier was explained by the then Minister in his Foreword to the Plan, as follows:-

“Following the clear direction of the States Assembly to limit the spread of urban development into the surrounding countryside, it [the Plan] encourages the better use of already-developed land, and enables the development of denser, more compact forms of development, which may also include taller buildings, in parts of St Helier that are best able to accommodate them. This means that we can increase our building supply, whilst not losing any more greenfield land, which has been, and still is, a major concern to islanders throughout the development of the plan. Seeking to optimise the density of development, particularly in St Helier, presents a big challenge to maintain the special character and identity of our town and other urban environments; and to provide the essential community infrastructure which ensures that they continue to be good places to live.”

22. This focus on St Helier is manifested in the Plan's strategic policies and in its place-making policies and housing policies. These policies all strongly support, in principle, the redevelopment proposed in this appeal. It is also undisputed that the latest evidence of housing needs shows that there is a substantial shortfall in St Helier in the provision of homes sufficient to meet those needs. Meeting those needs in St Helier is dependent on sites in urban built-up surroundings being brought forward for redevelopment at a greater density

- and, to a limited extent, a greater height; it is implicit in these circumstances that there will usually be a significant change in the impact that those sites have on their surroundings. The SPG *St Helier design guidance* acknowledges in its Introduction that “it is inevitable that St Helier will change”.
23. Hotel Savoy is such a site and the main concern in this appeal is whether the impact of the redevelopment will be within acceptable limits. This is assessed in more detail in the following paragraphs of this report.
  24. The SPG *St Helier design guidance* provides assistance with the interpretation and application of Policies SP3 (Placemaking), PL1 (Development in Town), GD6 (Design quality), GD7 (Tall buildings) and GD9 (Skyline, views and vistas). It places the site in a “least sensitive” area on the outer edge of the town centre, on the slope of the escarpment encircling the town centre (Character Area 10: Town Edges and Slopes). The Savoy Hotel is in urban built-up surroundings on the inner boundary of this area. The SPG indicates that the rising escarpment provides a backdrop for taller buildings that helps to absorb the visual impact of development and it identifies several recent examples of high-density development in the area in the 6-8 storey range that have partially integrated with the wider townscape and landscape. The height guidance in the SPG for this area is “Up to 6 storeys”.
  25. The SPG *Density Standards* provides assistance with the interpretation and application of Policy H2 (Housing density). The SPG indicates that the area containing the Hotel has a “medium-low” level of sensitivity and a capacity to accommodate new, denser and potentially taller forms of development. It identifies a need for development schemes to achieve a minimum level of density and an appropriate mix of types of homes, subject to an assessment in each case of the site’s context, the character of the area and the impact on neighbouring residential amenity. The development would exceed the SPG’s minimum level of density and would have an appropriate mix of types of homes.
  26. The Jersey Architecture Commission were consulted at the application stage. The Commission is an advisory group set up to provide independent, expert advice and guidance on major and sensitive developments. They noted that the redevelopment scheme envisaged a high level of sustainability, used modern features taken from its historic context and aimed to deliver a convivial lifestyle, with flexible ‘lifetime’ homes. The Commission observed that the Hotel already had an overbearing impact at the rear and sides. They considered that the scale of the redevelopment facing Rouge Bouillon at the front looked acceptable as did the height onto Roussel Mews at the rear, but they expressed concerns about its relationship with the neighbours to the north and the south. The appellant has addressed these concerns by stepping parts of the development further back from the northern and southern boundaries and introducing measures to avoid overlooking. The development would generally be further away from these boundaries than the existing Hotel although it would be higher overall.
  27. As to the street scape, the development would maintain the building line established by the buildings to the north and would be set back further than the buildings to the south. Its overall height would be less than the highest part of the Hotel’s front elevation. Although its bulk, viewed from the road, would be greater than the Hotel’s, it would appear as a coherent, well-

designed building compared to the Hotel, which from the road appears as a disparate mix of the original building and various add-ons.

28. The development would not affect the special interest of listed buildings or their settings; Policy HE1 (Protecting listed buildings and places, and their settings) would be complied with. The nearest listed buildings are the group to the north of 1 and 2 Gloucester Mews, the former Colesberg Hotel beyond the modern development on the south side of the Savoy Hotel's car park and the Old Town Arsenal, which is within the complex of police and fire and rescue service buildings on the opposite side of the road from the car park. The special interest in all these listed buildings is architectural and historical. None of the buildings would be directly affected by the development and none of them retain noteworthy parts of their original surrounds, since these have either been built over or cleared for parking use.
29. The appellant consulted neighbouring residents pursuant to Policy GD2 (Community participation in large-scale development proposals). As a result of the consultation, the appellant made additional changes to those referred to in paragraph 26 above in response to concerns raised by occupiers to the north and the south. The Alton Gardens Committee, representing apartment occupiers on the southern boundary, stated that they were now in agreement with the proposals. The interested party to the north remains concerned for the reasons set out in paragraph 15 above.
30. Policy GD1 (Managing the health and wellbeing impact of new development) reads as follows:

"All development proposals must be considered in relation to their potential health, wellbeing and wider amenity impacts, and will only be supported where:

1. the development will not unreasonably harm the amenities of occupants and neighbouring uses, including those of nearby residents, and in particular, will not:
  - a. create a sense of overbearing or oppressive enclosure;
  - b. unreasonably affect the level of privacy to buildings and land that owners and occupiers might expect to enjoy;
  - c. unreasonably affect the level of sunlight and daylight to buildings and land that owners and occupiers might expect to enjoy;
  - d. adversely affect the ... environment of users of buildings and land by virtue of emissions ... including light, noise, ..."
31. Policy GD1 as a whole refers to "unreasonable harm" to amenities and sub-paragraphs b. and c. refer as well to levels of privacy and light that people "might expect to enjoy". When applying the policy in the present case, account should be taken of the following factors. The site is in an urban built-up area in surroundings where development and redevelopment is to be expected and has taken place in the recent past in close proximity to other buildings: there is always the potential for neighbours to experience some future loss of amenity in these circumstances. The site already contains a large building that stands out in its surroundings and has some effect on the nearest neighbours' enjoyment of sunlight. Its current use as a hotel already results in overlooking from bedroom windows, noise from the various activities associated with a flourishing hotel and light emission from many sources.



32. The design of the development has evolved to give full effect to the principles in Policy GD1, with the result that the development would relate comfortably to its surroundings. Careful attention has been paid to the size and proximity of the development where it would be close to neighbouring buildings so as to avoid creating a sense of overbearing or oppressive enclosure. Privacy screens, fencing, high-level windows and obscured glass have been used in the design to maintain levels of privacy. Emissions of noise and light should be less overall than those currently generated by the Hotel. It is acknowledged that some neighbours, including the interested party, will experience some loss of sunlight at certain times of the year, but the loss will be within normally acceptable limits and will not unreasonably affect the level of sunlight that they might expect to enjoy in this location.
33. The SPG *Residential space standards* provides assistance with the consistent application and interpretation of Policy H1 (Housing quality and design) and supersedes all previous guidance on these matters. The appellant has revised the floorplans of the development to meet or exceed the new standards and has supplied detailed drawings showing the internal layout of each unit, the parking space to be provided for each unit and the allocation of bike storage and external storage space for each unit. The number of units will remain the same at 53 but will now consist of 1 bed/2 persons x 8, 2 bed/3 persons x 22, 2 bed/4 persons x 6, 3 bed/4 persons x 10 and 3 bed/5 persons x 7. (Before, it would have consisted of 7 one-bed, 26 two-bed, 16 three-bed and 4 four-bed units.) 6 one-bed and 2 two-bed units have been designated 'affordable', which complies with the call in the SPG *Making more homes affordable* for 15% of the units to be 'affordable'. The open space provision will remain as before, consisting of individual balconies, private gardens, a central courtyard, a community room and roof terraces, including children's play facilities. This accords with the advice in the SPG *Residential space standards* that a combination of open space provision should be made in a mixed residential development of this kind.
34. The SPG *Residential parking standards* provides assistance with the consistent application and interpretation of Policy TT4 (Provision of off-street parking) and supersedes all previous guidance on these matters. The site is in sustainable transport zone 2 ("good accessibility"), where the minimum level of provision advised by the SPG ranges from 0.25 to 0.75 per unit, depending on the size of unit. To comply with the SPG, the appellant has modified the plans for the basement so as to provide 53 (i.e. 1 per unit) car parking spaces with larger dimensions (including disabled parking provision), 6 more visitor parking spaces, electric charging points as recommended and motor cycle and bicycle storage as recommended.
35. My overall conclusion is that the impact of the development will be within acceptable limits; it will satisfy the tests in the various SPGs and be in accordance with the Bridging Island Plan as a whole. This conclusion is subject to the entering into of planning obligation agreements, the principle of which has been accepted by the appellant, relating to the provision of the affordable housing, the provision of the public art and a contribution towards the provision of the Eastern Cycle Route Network. Planning conditions are also required to deal with various outstanding details, as set out in paragraph 36 below, for the reasons stated there.

### **Inspector's recommendation**

36. I recommend that, subject to the entering into within 6 months of the date of the Minister's decision of a suitable planning obligation under Article 25 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 to (a) deliver at least 15% of the residential units as assisted purchase homes on agreed terms, (b) make a Percentage for Art contribution in accordance with an agreed Public Art Statement and (c) make a contribution at an agreed rate towards the improvement of the Eastern Cycle Route Network, the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for redevelopment at Hotel Savoy, 37 Rouge Bouillon, St Helier JE2 3ZA consisting of the demolition of the existing development and the construction of 53 residential units with associated facilities and landscaping, in accordance with the application P/2022/1308 and the revised plans and documents submitted therewith, subject to the following conditions: -

#### *Standard conditions*

A. The development shall commence within three years of the decision date.

Reason: The development will need to be reconsidered in the light of any material change in circumstances.

B. The development shall be carried out entirely in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed below.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out as approved.

#### *Additional conditions*

1. Prior to the commencement of the development, samples of all the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development, including hard landscaping materials, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Chief Officer. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples and retained as such.

Reason: To protect the character and identity of the area and enhance the setting of the development pursuant to Policy GD6 of the Bridging Island Plan.

2. Prior to the commencement of the development, details shall be submitted to the Chief Officer to demonstrate that the development as approved will outperform the target energy rate (i.e. the minimum energy performance for new dwellings required by building bye-laws) by 20%, using the Jersey Standard Assessment Procedure (JSAP) calculator or the Simplified Building Energy Model (SBEM) tool.

Reason: To comply with Policy ME1 of the Bridging Island Plan

3. Prior to the commencement of the development, a scheme of hard and soft landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Chief Officer. The scheme shall include details of all boundary treatments and indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, identifying those to be retained and setting out measures for their protection

throughout the course of the development. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of any of the units or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner, and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

Reason: To deliver design quality and to protect and improve green infrastructure assets and provide new green infrastructure assets pursuant to Policies GD6 and NE2 of the Bridging Island Plan.

4. Prior to the commencement of the development, full details of a Species Protection and Enhancement Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Chief Officer. The approved plan shall be implemented prior to commencement of the development, continued throughout the development (where applicable) and thereafter retained and maintained as such. Any variations from the approved plan that may be required as a result of findings on site shall be agreed in writing in advance with the Chief Officer prior to implementation.

Reason: To protect biodiversity pursuant to Policy NE1 of the Bridging Island Plan.

5. Prior to the commencement of the development, full details of (a) the use, management and maintenance of communal open space and (b) the play equipment, ground surface treatment and any works of enclosure to be installed in the communal play area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Chief Officer. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first residential occupation of any of the units and thereafter retained as such.

Reason: To provide adequate on-site open space and play space for the units pursuant to Policies CL6 and CL8 of the Bridging Island Plan and paragraphs 4.2.4 and 4.2.5 of the *Residential space standards* SPG.

6. Prior to the commencement of the development, details of all means of the development's externally-mounted illumination, including details of the design and external appearance of the structures housing or mounting the illumination and of the type and intensity of the illumination, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Chief Officer. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first residential occupation of any of the units and thereafter retained as such.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity pursuant to Policies GD1 and GD6 of the Bridging Island Plan.

7. Prior to the commencement of the development, a Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Chief Officer. The Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plan shall be thereafter implemented in full until the completion of the development and any variations shall be agreed in writing by the Chief Officer prior to implementation. The Plan shall secure

an implementation programme of mitigation measures to minimise the adverse effects of the proposal on the environment and neighbours' amenities, and shall include but not be limited to:

- A. A demonstration of compliance with best practice in controlling, monitoring, recording and reporting on any emissions to the environment (including noise, vibration and air, land and water pollution);
- B. Details of a publicised complaints procedure, including office hours and out-of-hours contact numbers;
- C. Details of any proposed crushing or sorting of waste material on site;
- D. Details of delivery, demolition and construction working hours.

Reason: To protect the environment and the neighbourhood pursuant to Policy GD1 of the Bridging Island Plan.

8. Prior to the commencement of the development, details of the proposed footway widening, bus stop and bus layby shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Chief Officer and those facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the first residential occupation of any of the units.

Reason: To contribute to safe and integrated travel pursuant to Policy TT1 of the Bridging Island Plan.

9. Prior to the first residential occupation of any of the units, the works of obscured glazing, fencing and rendering shown on Drawing 7376-01 P20 Revision C Proposed North Elevation shall be installed. The works shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To protect the privacy of neighbours pursuant to Policy GD1 of the Bridging Island Plan.

10. Prior to the first residential occupation of any of the units, the works of obscured glazing and screening shown on Drawing 7376-01 P21 Revision B Proposed South Elevation shall be installed. The works shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To protect the privacy of neighbours pursuant to Policy GD1 of the Bridging Island Plan.

11. Prior to the first residential occupation of any of the units, the vehicle manoeuvring areas, basement storage spaces, car parking spaces, motorcycle and bicycle parking spaces and electric vehicle charging points shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved plans. These facilities shall be retained thereafter for the sole use of the occupiers of the units and their visitors.

Reason: To provide adequate off-street parking spaces and storage spaces in accordance with Policies TT4 and H1 of the Bridging Island Plan.

12. The approved Amended Site Waste Management Plan shall be maintained throughout the development as a living document and waste management

shall be implemented in full accordance with it. Any variations from the Plan shall be agreed in advance in writing with the Chief Officer prior to implementation.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Policy WER1 of the Bridging Island Plan.

13. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Planning and Building (General Development) (Jersey) Order 2011 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no work falling within Class A.1(a) and (b) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 to the Order shall be carried out at any dwelling-house within the development other than that expressly authorised by this permission.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity pursuant to Policies GD1 and GD6 of the Bridging Island Plan.

*Approved plans and documents*

Existing Drawings:

7376-01 S1 Location Plan  
7376-01 S2 Existing Site Plan  
7376-01 S3 Existing Ground Floor plan  
7376-01 S4 Existing First Floor Plan  
7376-01 S5 Existing Second Floor Plan  
7376-01 S6 Existing Elevations 1  
7376-01 S7 Existing Elevations 2  
7376-01 S8 Existing Sections AA BB

Proposed Drawings:

7376-01 Flat Layouts Revised  
7376-01 P1 Rev. A Proposed Site Plan  
7376-01 P2 Proposed Demolition Plan  
7376-01 P3 Rev. C Proposed Basement Floor Plan  
7376-01 P4 Rev. C Proposed Ground Floor Plan  
7376-01 P5 Rev. C Proposed First Floor Plan  
7376-01 P6 Rev. C Proposed Second Floor Plan  
7376-01 P7 Rev. C Proposed Third Floor Plan  
7376-01 P8 Rev. C Proposed Fourth Plan  
7376-01 P9 Rev. C Proposed Roof Plan  
7376-01 P10 Rev. A Proposed East Elevation  
7376-01 P11 Rev. A Proposed West Elevation  
7376-01 P14 Rev A Proposed Site Section AA  
7376-01 P15 Rev A Proposed Site Section BB  
7376-01 P16 Rev. A Proposed Site Section CC & DD  
7376-01 P20 Rev. C Proposed North Elevation  
7376-01 P21 Rev. B Proposed South Elevation  
7376-01 P22 Rev. A Courtyard Elevations  
7376-01 P23 Proposed Front Wall Plan  
7376-01 P24 Proposed Environment Mitigation  
7376-01 P70 Rev. A Revised Section 1  
7376-01 P71 Rev. A Revised Section 2  
7376-01 P72 Rev. A Revised Section 3

7376-01 P73 Rev. A Revised Section 4

Schedules & Reports:

Public Art Statement for The Savoy Hotel  
Amended Site Waste Management Plan – Savoy Hotel  
Initial Ecological Assessment Report The Savoy Hotel  
Residential Travel Plan Savoy Hotel

Dated 22 January 2024

*D.A.Hainsworth*

Inspector