

Planning Committee

(1st Meeting)

22nd February 2024Part A (Non-Exempt)

All members were present with the exception of Connétable M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement, from whom apologies had been received.

Connétable P. B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair
 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour
 Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen
 Connétable D. W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence (items A1 – A8 only)
 Deputy A. F. Curtis of St. Clement
 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South
 Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (items A1 – A8 and A12 – A17 only)

In attendance –

C. Jones, Planning Applications Manager
 L. Davies, Planner
 G. Vasselin, Planner
 T. Venter, Planner
 R. Hampson, Planner
 J. Gibbins, Trainee Planner
 A. Elliott, Trainee Planner
 S. de Gouveia, Planner
 M. Popa, Trainee Planner
 H. Roche, Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (item Nos. A1 – A8)
 K. M. Larbalestier, Principal Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (item Nos. A9 – A16)
 C. Feam, Assistant Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (item Nos. A9 – A16)

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

Minutes.

A1. The Minutes of the meeting held on 11th January 2024, were taken as read and were confirmed.

Pumping
 Station Le
 Mont de
 Gouray, Le
 Mont de
 Gouray, St.
 Martin:
 proposed
 demolition and

A2. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A6 of 11th January 2024, considered a report in connexion with an application which proposed the demolition of a pumping station at Le Mont de Gouray, St. Martin, and the construction on the site of a 3 storey, 3 bedroom dwelling with a roof terrace. The Committee had visited the site on 9th January 2024.

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

redevelopment
(RFR).

refusal.

P/2023/0221

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

Les Homets,
La Grande
Route de
Sablons,
Grouville:
proposed
demolition and
redevelopment.

A3. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A10 of 7th December 2023, of the Committee as previously constituted, considered a report which proposed the demolition of a 2 storey dwelling at Les Homets, La Grande Route des Sablons, Grouville, and its replacement with 2 new dwellings. The Committee had visited the site on 20th February 2024.

Connétable D. W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence did not participate in the determination of this application.

P/2023/0530

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area of the Shoreline Zone and was on the Eastern Cycle Route Corridor. Policies SP1, 2, 3, 4, 7, PL3, GD1, GD5, GD6, NE1, HE1, H1, 2, 3, 4, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER6, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant to the application. The Committee's attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), as follows: SPG3 – parking standards for new development (1988), SPG6 – a minimum specification for new housing developments (2009), density standards, draft SPG in relation to residential space and parking standards and the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (JILSCA).

The Committee recalled that, contrary to the Department's recommendation, a previous application for the redevelopment of the site had been refused on the grounds of overdevelopment, contrary to Policies SP3, SP4, SP5, GD6 and NE3. The scheme had also been considered prejudicial to highway safety, contrary to Policies SP7 and GD6. The Committee had agreed to defer consideration of the current application pending the resolution of the technical difficulties which had prevented members from viewing the 3 dimensional virtual model.

The Committee noted that, in broad terms, the Bridging Island Plan Policies supported the principle of redeveloping the site for residential use. Policy support was not unconditional, and consideration had also been given to detailed operational policies and SPG in relation to the scale of development that would be acceptable on the site. The planning history of the site also had to be taken into account and, in particular, recent decisions. Having assessed the application, the Department was of the view that the application under consideration addressed the previous reasons for refusal. The number of units had been reduced to 2 and the vehicle access improved with a better turning area and appropriate visibility splays. Consequently, the Department was recommending approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the Department report.

A total of 22 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] who believed that the scheme would encroach on public land behind the sea wall, as discussed at the Committee meeting in December 2023. [REDACTED] was assured that this was not the case and that any development on the site should be a minimum of 5 metres from the sea wall in accordance with the Drainage (Jersey) Law 2005 and Policy WER3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. [REDACTED] noted that no reference, or updates, had been made to the drainage report which had been submitted in November 2023, and highlighted a condition in the report which referenced works which would be required to prevent seawater flooding through the development and onto the public highway. The case

officer confirmed that the drainage report had been considered by the Committee and had been made publicly available on the Government website. On a separate note, ██████████ advised he had struggled to hear the presentation of the application by the case officer.

The Committee heard from ██████████, a resident of the area, who was concerned about the proposal to re-position the bus stop and feared that this would give rise to highway safety issues. He added that the Transport division of the Infrastructure and Environment Department had not consulted residents in the area, who were concerned about the impact of the relocation of the bus stop.

The Committee heard from ██████████ the applicant's agent and ██████████ advised that the proposition to relocate the bus stop, to land which would be ceded to the public as part of the scheme, was not part of this proposal and had been added as a condition. ██████████ advised that Policy TT3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan stated that a development of 5 or more dwellings should provide appropriate infrastructure to support public transport and bus use; however, the application proposed 2 dwellings. Connétable P. B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair advised that the Committee would consider the bus shelter condition separately.

██████████ reminded the Committee that the existing dwelling had been unoccupied for over 7 years, and the proposed development would be constructed on previously developed land. Additional turning space for vehicles had been provided and the setting of the Conway Tower improved. There would be no unreasonable impact on neighbours and a high quality design approach had been adopted, in keeping with the surrounding area and in accordance with Policies GD6 and SP3. In response to the Committee's concerns, the proposed cladding had been altered and a new pavement would be provided along the boundary, in accordance with Policy TT2. A central access point afforded a 14 metre wide visual corridor to the foreshore, in accordance with Policy GD9, and the scale and mass of the proposed dwellings was considered appropriate. There were no implications for a protected tree on the application site.

██████████ noted that the proposed development would be situated 5 metres back from the sea wall and that the high water mark did not reach beyond the bottom of the sea wall. He added that he had consulted the appropriate authority with regard to the foreshore and a formal licence could be instated if required.

The Committee concluded that the architectural approach adopted was uninspiring in this important coastal location and did not meet the tests set out in Policy GD6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Consequently, the Committee, with the exception of Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour and Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South, refused the application for the reasons set out above.

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

Field No. 525,
La Rue des
Buttes, St.
John: proposed
variation of

A4. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which proposed the variation of a condition attached to the permit associated with planning application reference P/2019/1183 for a residential development on Field No. 525, La Rue des Buttes, St. John. The application also involved the change of use of part of Field No. 525 in order to create a playing field, vegetable garden, wildlife pond,

condition of permit. various ancillary structures and 3G playing surface for St. John's School. The Committee had visited the site on 20th February 2024.

RC/2023/0912 Deputy [REDACTED], St. Lawrence and Trinity, 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, Water Pollution Safeguard Area and was an affordable housing site, safeguarded for educational use. Policies SP2, SP3, SP7, PL5, CI1, H5, GD1, GD6, NE3 and WER5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant to the application.

The Committee recalled the relevant planning history of the site, which included 2 previous planning applications (P/2022/0284 and RP/2023/0789 referred) for the change of use of the proposed playing field to a 3G pitch with associated fencing. Application P/2022/0284 had been submitted by Jersey Property Holdings, who had committed to lease the land and undertake the work on the 3G pitch on behalf of the Children, Young People, Education and Skills Department (CYPES) following the transfer of the land to the Parish of St. John. The lease had been agreed for the duration of the application.

The Committee was advised that condition No.16 of the permit precluded the occupation of the dwellings until such time as the playing field had been completed and made available for the use of St. John's School. The application proposed the revision of the condition in order to facilitate immediate occupation of the completed dwellings by first time buyers. It was proposed that the playing field and associated infrastructure would be constructed within 7 months of the decision date of the permit. The Committee was informed that the application had initially sought to remove the condition completely, meaning that there would no longer be any planning requirement to ensure the commitment by any party for the playing field / 3G pitch to be constructed.

The Committee noted that comments in support of the application had been submitted by the previous Minister for Children and Education, the current Assistant Minister for Children and Education and the Connétable of St. John. It was noted that the variation of condition No.16 as proposed was considered reasonable and would satisfy the requirements of the relevant policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. On this basis the application was recommended for approval.

35 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] who paid tribute to the work undertaken by his predecessor in connexion with the application. The Connétable advised that the third set of plans for the provision of the 3G pitch which had been approved in November 2023, would deliver a much improved facility for St. John's School. 4 tenders had been received for the work, which would commence in April 2024. The Committee was advised that the commencement of development had been delayed pending the transfer of drainage rights to the Parish of St. John. The Connétable noted his support for the variation of condition No.16.

[REDACTED] of GI Mourant Developers addressed the Committee and outlined the sequence of events which culminated in the ceding of the land to the Parish of St. John and indicated his support for the variation of condition No.16.

The Committee, having assessed the application against the relevant policies of the

2022 Bridging Island Plan, decided to grant permission.

No. 1 Castle
View,
Westmount
Road, St.
Helier:
proposed
change of use
(RETROSPEC
TIVE).

P/2023/1014

A5. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a retrospective application which sought permission for the change of use of a residential dwelling to a 'Class J - residential institution' at the property known as No. 1 Castle View, Westmount Road, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 20th February 2024.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area of the Green Backdrop Zone and was on the Eastern Cycle Route Network. The application site formed part of the new hospital site. Policies SP2, SP3, SP7, PL1, GD1, GD8, H1, H3, H4, H7 and C12 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee was advised that the application sought retrospective permission for the change of use of the site to a residential home for young people and their support teams, which would require no alterations to the property. The application was situated in the Built-Up Area where housing for those with additional needs was supported by Policy C12 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The proposed change of use was in line with current care practice, which sought to move from an institutional-based care model to a modern community-based structure.

The Committee was informed that there were 4 car parking spaces associated with the application site and the property benefitted from private amenity space for occupants. The application site was considered appropriate for the proposed use and the application was therefore recommended for approval in accordance with Policies C12, H7 and GD1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

9 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] who lived in the vicinity of the application site. [REDACTED] advised the Committee that, whilst she advocated a society which supported children, she considered that the rights of neighbours had been ignored. [REDACTED] highlighted irregularities in the planning application and advised that the property had been used as a residential institution since June 2023, in breach of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002. Turning to car parking issues, [REDACTED] noted that whilst the property had space to park 4 vehicles, there would be between 2 to 6 staff vehicles parked at any one time. She acknowledged that the problem had been addressed, with staff parking being provided at the Overdale Hospital site but added that this was a temporary solution with the forthcoming closure of Overdale. [REDACTED] informed the Committee that she had consulted with the previous Minister for Infrastructure and Assistant Minister for Children and Education, but communications had ceased with the adoption of P.1/2024 - Vote of No Confidence in the Chief Minister in January 2024. [REDACTED] described certain problems which had arisen as a result of the current use of the property, and which prejudiced the amenities of surrounding neighbours, contrary to Policy SP7 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022. She advised that the peaceful sense of place once enjoyed by residents had deteriorated and urged the Committee to refuse permission.

The Committee was addressed by [REDACTED] and Skills Department (CYPES) and [REDACTED] who acknowledged that the application was retrospective as CYPES officers had been unaware that planning permission was required in order to facilitate the change of use. [REDACTED] noted that issues which had arisen had

been monitored by Parish Deputies and that the parking difficulties had been addressed, albeit temporarily. He advised the Committee that the residential institution was controlled by the Regulation of Care (Jersey) Law 2014, and that the Government of Jersey and the Minister for Education were the corporate parents of the resident. The residential home was inspected monthly by regulatory officers and was found to be compliant with the legislation. [REDACTED] stated that CYPES officers had been working hard with the States of Jersey Police in order to overcome behavioural problems and reminded the Committee of the circumstances which led to children being placed in the care of the Department. He confirmed the permanent occupancy arrangements which existed at present and advised that other professionals visited the site from time to time. In response to a question from the Committee, [REDACTED] confirmed that continued occupancy would be based on an assessment of ongoing needs and statutory obligations.

[REDACTED] advised that the application site had been one of a number of properties which had been compulsory purchased by the previous Government of Jersey as part of the new hospital development plans. The provision of amenity and car parking spaces aligned with standards and was considered to be acceptable for the use. [REDACTED] suggested that conditions, such as a transport plan and working with neighbours to address any issues could be attached to the permit.

Connétable D. W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence expressed concern in connexion with the impact on neighbours. [REDACTED] advised that work was being undertaken to minimise disruption and the use was being monitored by the Care Commission. He explained that, in time additional support from health professionals and the Jersey Youth Service would be provided as part on the ongoing care plan and improvements had been noted. Should the situation change, alternative residency arrangements would be made. The Connétable noted that, whilst she had no issue with the use of the property as a residential institution, [REDACTED] confirmed that there were no plans to use the site as a secure facility or for remand purposes, and that the policy of the Government of Jersey was to endeavour to keep children on the Island where possible.

The Committee concluded that the application did not align with Policies GD1, SP7, H7 and TT1 of the 2022 Bridging Island plan. There had been no site selection process or risk assessment in connexion with the location and there were transport and car parking issues. Consequently, the Committee, with the exception of Connétables P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence and Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South, refused permission for the reasons set out above.

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

Nos. 3 - 4
Centre Point,
La Route des
Genets, St.
Brelade:
proposed
change of use
and various
alterations.

A6. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the change of use of an existing coffee shop to facilitate its use by Domino's Pizzas at Nos. 3 - 4 Centre Point, La Route des Genets, St. Brelade. Various internal and external alterations were proposed, including the installation of a glazed door and screen replacement, air conditioning and chiller unit installation and an air intake grill to the north elevation, with removal of the extraction grills to the west. The Committee had visited the site on 20th February 2024.

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

P/2023/0314

site was situated in the Built-Up Area of the Les Quennevais Secondary Centre. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP6, PL2, GD1, GD6, ER4, TT1, TT2, TT4 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted that the application site comprised a 2 storey building with a residential unit on the first floor, situated in a commercial area and was directly adjacent to a retail outlet. Neighbouring properties included a public house to the south and a building to the north east with a retail use on the ground floor and office space above. The existing car park was open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and a private car park which was separated from the public car park by a barrier. Consequently, there was no requirement to provide on-site car parking.

The Committee was advised that the Department was of the view that the proposal satisfied the requirements of the relevant policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Following the receipt of submissions and consultation responses, the proposal was not considered to impact highway safety or the amenities of neighbours and was therefore recommended for approval, subject to certain conditions detailed within the Department report.

26 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] who advised that the applicant had worked closely with the Department to address issues which had been raised. He noted that the site was within a designated commercial centre, would create local employment opportunities and that the use was supported by policy. [REDACTED] added that the proposed hot food takeaway would operate from 11am to 11pm, Monday to Sunday, in keeping with the operational times of the adjacent public house. There would be no noise impact on neighbouring amenities and no fried foods would be prepared on the site. [REDACTED] advised that staff and delivery driver parking would be provided within the capacity of the 2 public carparks adjacent to and opposite the application site.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] Infrastructure and Environment Department, who outlined the potential issues with car parking and public safety in connexion with the application. He was of the view that delivery drivers were unlikely to use the public park given the distance to the premises and there was a risk that parking would take place at the access points either side of the unit where a fire escape was also located. The fire escape led directly on to the existing pedestrian crossing so parking in this location would pose a risk to public/highway safety. [REDACTED] advised the Committee that there would be no means of controlling car parking once planning permission had been granted. There was no provision for covered bicycle or motorcycle parking on the site. Trip generation data had been obtained from the St. Helier Domino's store and the data estimated by the applicant company for the St. Brelade facility was unsupported.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously refused permission, contrary to the Department's recommendation. Members cited the tests set out in Policies TT1 and TT4 as the reasons for refusal. Concerns were expressed regarding the potential traffic issues and the applicant was advised to consider a cohesive transport plan.

As the Committee's decision was contrary to the Department's recommendation, the application would be re-presented at the next scheduled meeting for formal decision confirmation and to set out in detail the reasons for the refusal.

Land to the rear of Royal Bank Court, College Hill, St. Helier: proposed residential development.

P/2023/0635

A7. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A4 of 18th November 2021, of the Committee as previously constituted, considered a report in connexion with an application which excavation works to facilitate the construction of a one bedroom and 4 x 2 bedroom apartments on a parcel of land situated to the rear of Royal Bank Court, College Hill, St. Helier. It was also proposed to construct a retaining granite wall with new vehicular access on to College Hill. The Committee had visited the site on 20th February 2024.

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

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Built-Up Area of the Green Backdrop Zone and was on the Eastern Cycle Route Corridor. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP7, PL1, GD1, GD2, GD3, GD5, GD6, GD8, GD10, NE1, NE2, H1, H2, H3, H4, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER1, WER6, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to the St. Helier Urban Character Appraisal (2021) and draft SPG relating to residential, car parking space and density standards and landscape and seascape character (all 2023).

The Committee noted that planning permission had been granted in 2021 for the construction of a 4 bedroom dwelling on the site, with a retaining granite wall and new access on to College Hill (P/2020/1072 referred).

The current scheme sought permission for the construction of an apartment block comprising 4 x 2 bedroom apartments and a one bedroom apartment. The development would broadly mirror the previous approved application, with an increase in height of approximately 1300 millimetres, whilst achieving a more sustainable use of the land. A basement was proposed to accommodate amenities such as car parking, waste and residential storage. The apartment block would contain a number of terraced areas and there would be 3 dormer windows on the second floor level, several roof lights to the east side and a green roof space. A new vehicular access was proposed together with 5 car parking spaces and 11 bicycle parking bays. Pedestrian access would be created adjacent to a layby for delivery vehicles. A communal garden area, as well as private outdoor amenity spaces for all units were also proposed.

The Department was of the view that the proposal satisfied the requirements of the relevant policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The development had been specifically considered in relation to its potential impact on the neighbouring properties and upon the character of the surrounding area. In light of the above, the application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the Department report and the applicants entering into a Planning Obligation Agreement (POA), pursuant to Article 25 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 (as amended), to facilitate the delivery of a financial contribution towards the Eastern Cycle Route Network.

24 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] who referenced the pressures which would be incurred on College Hill as a result of the development. He felt that the building would dominate the side of the hill, impacting on neighbouring properties but without the desired contribution to the housing stock. [REDACTED] referred to historical planning applications noting that it had taken 10 years to reach the point where the revised plans had been deemed to align with

policy. He added that College Lane was privately owned, and that construction works would not be permitted to encroach on the same.

██████████ ██████████ addressed the Committee and stated that concerns had been raised in connexion with previous approved plans for a single dwelling. In his view, the revised application for an apartment block gave rise to pedestrian safety concerns on the hill, especially during peak times. He further outlined traffic risks associated with construction vehicles parking on College Hill and requested that a condition be attached to the permit (if permission was granted) in connexion with the placement and size of soakaways at the foot of the proposed development.

The Committee heard from ██████████ who occupied a neighbouring property. ██████████ also referenced historic plans for 4 apartments on the site, which had been refused and the scheme subsequently amended to propose a single dwelling, which had been approved in 2020. ██████████ noted that the proposed apartment block would be approximately 1300 millimetres higher than the approved dwelling and expressed concern in connexion with the noise impact of 5 apartments on the site and the second floor dormer windows, which she believed would overlook the garden space of ██████████

██████████ addressed the Committee. ██████████ informed the Committee that residents had expressed concern in connexion with the ownership of the gateway from ██████████ and had recently been repaired at the expense of residents. An agreement to maintain the park area by the developer as part of the November 2020 application had not been met. She felt that the potential existed for damage to properties caused by the excavation and construction works and sought assurance that any damage incurred would be rectified. ██████████ expressed concerns with regard to pedestrian safety and noted that statistics on the number of people who used the hill daily would be beneficial. She advised that there was no support for the development amongst the residents of College Hill and urged the Committee to refuse permission for the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, ██████████ of MS Planning, who reminded the Committee that the site had an existing permit for a 4 bedroom dwelling and that excavation works had commenced. ██████████ advised that a single dwelling would not make best use of this site within the Built-Up Area. He drew attention to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance on density standards (2022) which required a minimum of 50 dwellings per hectare (DPH) in the Town of St. Helier and noted that the application would provide the equivalent of 56 DPH. ██████████ advised that vehicle and bicycle parking, storage and internal spaces complied with the required standards and the proposed scale and mass of the apartment block did not vary from the approved plans. He added that a financial contribution towards the Eastern Cycle Route Network had been agreed and that the development was in a sustainable location for one to 3 bedroom flats. ██████████ advised that the application complied with the relevant policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

In response to questions from the Committee, ██████████ confirmed that the basement had increased in size from 125 to 250 square metres in the revised plans and that whilst the roof garden overlooked properties to the east a distance of 25 metres would be maintained.

Having considered the application, the Committee concluded that the scale and mass and the increased height would have an overbearing impact on neighbouring

properties, contrary to Policies GD1 and H1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Consequently, the application was unanimously refused for the reasons set out above.

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

Unit 2,
Peacock Farm,
La Rue de la
Piece Mauger,
Trinity:
proposed
installation of
container
storage
units/constructi
on of granite
wall.

A8. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A11 of 23rd November 2017, of the Committee as previously constituted, considered a report in connexion with an application which proposed the installation of 15 shipping containers within the car park of Unit 2, Peacock Farm, La Rue de la Piece Mauger, Trinity. A new boundary wall and landscaping were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 20th February 2024.

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

P/2023/0474

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and the Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies SP2, SP3, SP6, PL5, GD1, ERE2, NE1, NE3, HE1, TT1, TT2 and TT4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, which included a number of previous planning applications (P/2015/1510, P/2016/1289, RC/2018/1284, P/2022/0397 and P/2022/0513 referred). The most recent application to install 43 shipping containers within the car park had been refused in November 2022 (MS/2022/0743 referred) on the basis that it failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies GD1, TT1 PL5 and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Furthermore, the applicant had previously installed a series of shipping containers within the car park area, without the necessary permission. Following a complaint in 2022, the applicant had been required to remove the containers. The Committee noted that the previous application for 43 shipping containers was refused on the grounds that development of this kind was considered to be unsightly, and harmful to landscape character.

The Committee was advised that the current application sought permission for a bank of 15 shipping containers within the car park to provide additional storage facilities, together with a new boundary wall and landscaping. The application site was an established self-storage facility to the north west area of Peacock Farm, containing 2 large industrial sheds (former agricultural premises), fitted out with self-storage units across 2 floors, with an associated car park to the north.

It was acknowledged that the number of containers had been reduced and an element of screening had been introduced. The Department had decided that the proposal would result in an inappropriate development in a countryside location, which failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies PL5 and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Shipping containers, by their nature and design, were likely to create an unacceptable level of noise during use, thereby causing unreasonable harm to the amenities of nearby residents, contrary to Policy GD1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Consequently, the application was recommended for refusal.

11 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the Applicant's agent, [REDACTED] who advised that the concerns which had been highlighted in the previous application had been addressed with a significant reduction in the number of proposed containers and screening in order to mitigate the visual impact. [REDACTED] believed that the car parking to the west of the site was not in keeping with the rural character of the countryside in a similar manner to outdoor storage facilities. He addressed the assumption by the Department that more units would follow if the scheme was granted permission and noted that this indicated a negative starting position for the application.

[REDACTED] informed the Committee that the applicant would be prepared to accept a condition restricting use access to the containers to between the hours of 7.00 a.m. and 7.00 p.m., albeit that he felt this was unnecessary. He noted that the site housed a commercial operation which generated noise and that such issues could be addressed under the Statutory Nuisances (Jersey) Law 1999, rather than via the planning process. There was also a potential to reduce noise using door seals on the containers if required. [REDACTED] advised that the proposed screening would improve the existing landscape of the commercial site and that the applicant, as a responsible business owner, was aware of his responsibilities. He concluded that the market requirement for self-storage continued to be strong, and that the application complied with the relevant policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

The Committee was addressed by the applicant, [REDACTED] who noted that the proposed containers were a direct extension of the existing operation. He advised that all of the current storage units were occupied, with less than one person per day visiting the site to access the units, with no visits outside operational hours. In response to a question from the Committee, [REDACTED] advised that the dimensions of the storage containers would be 8 x 8 x 20 feet with the wall being 1.8 feet high. The containers were notably higher than the proposed wall, but as they would be positioned some distance away, they would be completely screened. He added that other storage solutions had been examined, but containers presented a more sustainable option than the construction of a building.

The Committee considered the application and expressed concerns in connexion with the impact of noise on neighbouring amenities and usage of the site out of operational hours, contrary to Policies SP1, SP2, PL5, NE3, GD1 and EI1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Consequently, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out above.

Les Champs
Gres, La Rue
du Grouet, St.
Brelade:
proposed
replacement of
telecomm-
unications
equipment.

A9. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which proposed the replacement of telecommunications equipment, to include a pole, an antenna, 2 cabinets and associated equipment to the east of the property known as Les Champs Gres, La Rue du Grouet, St. Brelade. The Committee had visited the site on 20th February 2024.

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

S/2023/0982

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Coastal National Park and the Protected Coastal Area. Policies GD1, GD6, ME3, PL5, NE3 and UI4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted that the proposed works did not involve the relocation of any existing satellite masts. The proposed changes were not considered to be harmful to

the character of the area, as the location of the mast reduced the impact. Furthermore, the Environmental Health Department ('EH') had confirmed that no harm to health or amenities would arise from the proposals. 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.

The Committee noted that 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 the health-related concerns. The Committee noted that EH had advised that current evidence suggested that refusal of applications for mobile masts on health grounds was unreasonable. Furthermore, such proposals had to be assessed against the policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and were supported by Policy U14. 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.

7 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee received the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Waddington Architects, who offered to answer any queries that arose in connexion with the application.

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

Car Park, St.
Aubin's, Le
Boulevard, St.
Brelade:
proposed
replacement of
telecommunica
tions
equipment.

S/2023/0984

A10. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which proposed the replacement of telecommunications equipment, to include 3 antennae, 6 cabinets and associated equipment to the north east elevation of a car park at Le Boulevard, St. Brelade. The Committee had visited the site on 20th February 2024.

Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity 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 Protected Coastal Area and a Coastal Flooding High Risk Area. Policies GD1, GD6, ME3, PL5, NE3, U14 and WER2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted that the proposed works did not involve the relocation of any existing satellite masts. The proposed changes were not considered to be harmful to the character of the area, nor were they considered relevant in the context of flooding. Furthermore, the Environmental Health Department ('EH') had confirmed that no harm to health or amenities would arise from the proposals. 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.

The Committee noted that 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 the health-related concerns. The Committee noted that EH had advised that current evidence suggested that refusal of applications for mobile masts 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.

11 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from a representative of the applicant company who advised that whilst the existing equipment had been installed at a lower level, below the roof line of the structure, the proposed new equipment would sit above the roof line in a relocated position.

Having considered the application, the Committee decided to grant permission, subject to the imposition of the conditions set out in the Department report and on the basis of an additional condition which would require certain equipment to be painted brown to reduce the visual impact.

Le Chalet
Rose,
Bagatelle
Road, St.
Saviour:
proposed
demolition and
redevelopment.

A11. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A11 of 23rd February 2023, of the Committee as previously constituted, considered a report in connexion with an application which proposed the demolition of a garage at the property known as Le Chalet Rose, Bagatelle Road, St. Saviour and its replacement with a new 2 storey, 2 bedroom dwelling with associated car parking and amenity space. It was also proposed to alter the vehicular access onto Bagatelle Road. The Committee had visited the site on 20th February 2024.

RP/2023/0969

Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour 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 within the Built-Up Area (Local Centre: Five Oaks) and was on the Eastern Cycle Route network. Policies SP1 – SP5, PL1, GD1, GD6, H1 – H4, TT1, TT2, TT4, ME1, WE1, WE6 and WE7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. The Committee's attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance ('SPG'): draft Parking Space Standards (2023) and draft Residential Space Standards (2023).

The Committee recalled that, in accordance with the Department's recommendation, a previous application for the redevelopment of the site had been refused on the grounds of overdevelopment and unreasonable harm to neighbouring properties, contrary to Policies SP3, SP4, SP5, PL1, GD1, GD6, H1 and H2. The scheme had also been considered prejudicial to highway safety, contrary to Policies TT1 and TT4, and insufficient information had been submitted to demonstrate waste minimisation, contrary to Policy WER1.

The Committee noted that, in broad terms, the Bridging Island Plan Policies supported the principle of redeveloping the site for residential use. Policy support was not unconditional, and consideration had also been given to detailed operational policies and SPG in relation to the scale of the development that would be acceptable on the site. The planning history of the site had also been taken into account and, in particular, recent decisions. Having assessed the application under consideration, the Department was of the view that the proposed works addressed the previous reasons for refusal. The number of units had been reduced to one and the vehicle access improved with a sufficient turning area. Furthermore, the Department considered the unreasonable harm to neighbouring properties to have been alleviated by virtue of the fact that the proposed dwelling would project no further than the building line of the existing property. The view from the proposed dormer would be obscured by

the height of an existing pitched roof garage and would overlook the car parking area and Bagatelle Road. Consequently, approval was recommended, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the Department report.

7 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] Architectural Services, who noted the planning history of the site and advised that the applicant had worked closely with the Department and the highway authority to arrive at a mutually acceptable solution. The recommendation from the Department to reduce the mass and scale of the proposed dwelling had been implemented, and the building reorientated. [REDACTED] advised of other revisions to the scheme, all of which resulted in aesthetic improvements.

In response to a question from a member, [REDACTED] confirmed that the existing property benefitted from 3 bedrooms, a separate studio and a garage.

After due consideration, the Committee decided to grant permission, subject to the imposition of the conditions set out in the Department report. In doing so, some members expressed the view that the site had probably reached its full potential in terms of the amount of development which could reasonably be accommodated.

Ida's, Victoria Avenue, St. Lawrence: proposed flue installation. (RETRO-SPECTIVE). (RFR).

A12. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of a retrospective application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which proposed the installation of a flue to the rear of the property known as Ida's, Victoria Avenue, St. Lawrence. The Committee had visited the site on 20th February 2024.

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

P/2023/0710

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site housed a Grade 4 Listed Building and was situated in the Built-Up Area, the Inland Flooding Low Risk area and was on a Primary Route Network. Policies GD1, GD6, HE1 and WER2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. The Committee's attention was also drawn to the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment.

The Committee was advised that the application sought retrospective permission for the installation of a flue to the rear of the property. An offer had also been made to install a 'spinning cowl' to increase the upward draw of generated smoke.

The Committee noted that the application had been refused on the grounds that the flue was considered to be harmful to the special interest of the Listed Building, contrary to Policy HE1. The Historic Environment Team ('HET') objected to the proposal on the basis that the composition and position of the flue contributed to a visual impact that was incongruous with the simplicity of the existing building. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] who advised that planning permission had been granted for the construction of a modern extension to the property 8 years previously, with no reference to HET. [REDACTED] informed the Committee that during the construction of the extension, the owner had decided to install a wood-burning stove and the necessary Building Bye Laws consent had

been received. However, the applicant had been unaware of the requirement to seek planning consent for the flue, and this had only been brought to their attention following a recent complaint from a neighbour in connexion with the emitted smoke. [REDACTED] advised that the owner had offered to paint the flue black to reduce the visual impact and to install a spinning cowl to mitigate the smoke emissions. The efforts of the owner to preserve the Listed Building were also acknowledged.

[REDACTED] reiterated that he had been unaware of the requirement to apply for planning permission for the flue. The Committee was advised that the flue had been in place for 7 years. [REDACTED] highlighted the value of the wood-burning stove as a focal point and as a facilitator of family-orientated activities.

The Committee discussed the application and expressed concern in connexion with the visual impact of the flue on the Listed Building but acknowledged that the flue had been positioned on the part of the modern extension furthest away from the original building. The Committee noted that only one objection had been raised in connexion with the application.

The Committee was minded to support the application, contrary to the Department recommendation, on the basis that the scheme was considered to comply with Policies GD1 and HEI of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. In doing so, certain members accepted the applicant's offer to paint the flue black.

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

Rozel Bay
Tearoom, La
Brecque du
Nord, Trinity:
proposed
change of use
to habitable
space.
(RFR).

P/2023/0627

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 proposed the change of use of the premises known as Rozel Bay Tearoom, La Brecque du Nord, Trinity to facilitate the creation of additional habitable space for the existing dwelling located above the tearoom. The Committee had visited the site on 20th February 2024.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Protected Coastal Area. Policies SP1, SP3, SP4, SP6, GD1, GD6, ER4, H1, H9, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. The Committee's attention was also drawn to the following Supplementary Planning Guidance ('SPG'): Planning Policy Note No. 3 – parking guidelines (1988).

The Committee was advised that the application sought permission for the change of use of the tearoom to provide additional habitable space for the existing residential unit above, which would involve the internal remodelling of the property. The proposed scheme would convert the ground floor into a dining area with a kitchen, and the servery area on the first floor would be converted into a study. There would be no external alterations to the building.

The application had been refused on the grounds that insufficient evidence had been provided to demonstrate that the loss of the employment site would not be harmful to the Island's economic base and its attractiveness as a tourist destination, contrary to Policies ER4, H9 and SP6. Furthermore, the Department noted that there was a lack of evidence that the premises had been effectively marketed for a reasonable

period, contrary to Policy ER4. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

2 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] who advised that the owner of the property had not received a rental income from the tenant who had operated the tearoom for a period of 2 years to date, following the closure of the business during the COVID-19 pandemic. The tenant advised that the tearoom business was no longer financially viable. The property had subsequently been marketed for a period of 18 months and advertised as a mixed-use development. [REDACTED] advised the Committee that he had conducted 4 open viewings at the property and had overseen several individual viewings. A lack of footfall and the size and unsuitability of the building were cited as reasons for the negligible interest of potential buyers willing to sustain a catering operation. The Committee was advised that the property was in a very poor state of repair and [REDACTED]

The Committee heard from the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] the applicant's agent, addressed the Committee and outlined concerns regarding the Department's decision and the policy basis of the same, especially given the size of the tearoom. [REDACTED] advised the Committee that he was aware of 2 other applications for the conversion of an employment site to residential accommodation, both of which had been approved under the auspices of the Bridging Island Plan with no requirement for a marketing strategy. [REDACTED] noted that only 21 square metres of the property was used as the tearoom. The Committee's attention was also drawn to the fact that Rozel Bay was not a designated tourist destination area, which [REDACTED] argued invalidated the decision of the Department to refuse the application on the grounds that it would harm the attractiveness of the Island for tourists. [REDACTED] further advised that the change of use would result in environmental improvements in line with the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. It was suggested that it was unreasonable to expect a small business to continue to operate if it was no longer economically viable and reference was made to Policy SP6, which supported diversification. The Committee was advised that the scheme aimed to maximise the external amenity space available to the property through the 62 square metre terrace, and that the current layout of the property would not satisfy public health or fire safety regulations to facilitate the tearoom operation. [REDACTED] concluded by stating that the proposed development would provide a family dwelling in a highly desirable area with no impact on neighbouring properties.

The Committee discussed the proposals and noted some discrepancies between the information contained within the Department report and the oral representations received. The timing of the closure of the tearoom was questioned and [REDACTED] confirmed that the kitchen (which was shared with the existing residential accommodation) had re-opened after the pandemic for the sale of cakes only. The Committee was advised that the property had been marketed with a free hold sale price and that a lease price had not been provided due to the applicant's desire to sell. The view was expressed that the manner in which the property had been marketed did not prove redundancy of the employment land use and the assessment of the free hold value was queried, with the suggestion that this represented a speculative uplift in value. Reference was made to a number of other commercial properties which were being marketed for sale and their respective values were noted. The Committee's attention was drawn to Supplementary Planning Guidance in connexion with the protection of employment land and members concluded that

the case for redundancy had not been made.

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

The Riddings,
La Grande
Route des
Sablons,
Grouville:
proposed
construction of
garden
office/pool
house. (RFR).

A14. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which proposed the construction of a garden office to the west of the property known as The Riddings, La Grande Routes des Sablons, Grouville, and a pool house to the east of the property. The Committee had visited the site on 20th February 2024.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Build-Up Area and was on the Eastern Cycle Route network. Policies GD1, GD6 and NE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

P/2023/0771

The Committee was advised that the application sought permission for the construction of a garden office to the west of the site and a pool house to the east, in addition to external alterations to the property.

The application had been refused on the grounds of overdevelopment and on the basis that the scheme failed to contribute positively to the distinctiveness of the property and surrounding built environment, contrary to Policy GD6. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of MAC Architectural Services, who advised that the applicants had initially been advised that the property was Grade 3 Listed and this had been a factor when renovation works were carried out. They had subsequently discovered that the property was not, in fact, Listed. [REDACTED] recounted the planning history of the site and the works which had been approved by the Department, to include the construction of a swimming pool and modest extension. He advised the Committee that the planning applications for the ongoing works and the scheme under consideration had been submitted with the Grade 3 Listing in mind. Had the applicants known that the property was not Listed they might have considered submitting an application for a smaller office space in accordance with Permitted Development Rights. [REDACTED] disagreed with the view of the Department regarding the 'disproportionate size' of the proposed development, noting that the scheme comprised single storey ancillary units located away from the main house measuring 90 square metres in total (the pool house would also provide guest accommodation). The Committee was advised that large areas of open space would be retained and the units would be located off the site boundary to reduce the impact on neighbouring properties.

Having considered the application, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report. The Committee was particularly concerned with the size of the pool house and the potential for this being used as a separate unit without dedicated car parking or amenity space.

No. 2 Walton
Villas, La
Route de St.
Aubin, St.
Helier:

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 proposed the construction of an extension to the property known as No. 2 Walton Villas, La Route de St. Aubin, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 20th February 2024.

proposed
extension/
construction of
garage/
terrace. (RFR).

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area. Policies GD1, GD6 and NE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. The Committee's attention was also drawn to the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment.

P/2023/0892

The Committee was advised that the application sought permission for the construction of an extension to the south west elevation of the property, which would facilitate the construction of a garage and storeroom on the lower ground floor. It was also proposed to construct a terraced area on top of the extension, which would be at ground floor level relative to the north east elevation of the property. Minor alterations, including the installation of 2 privacy screens to the east and west of the terrace, were also proposed.

The application had been refused on the grounds that the proposed extension would cause unreasonable harm to the amenities of the 2 neighbouring properties resulting in an overbearing impact and loss of daylight and privacy, contrary to Policy GD1. Additionally, the design, scale and mass of the extension was considered harmful to the appearance of the existing property and surrounding built environment, contrary to Policy GD6. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED], who advised that the scheme sought to provide additional amenity space and the proposals mirrored approved development in the vicinity. It was noted that the neighbours on either side of the property had provided letters of support for the application on the basis that the scheme would not be prejudicial to privacy.

The applicant, [REDACTED], addressed the Committee and advised that the proposed extension would provide additional habitable space for his family. It was noted that an extension to a neighbouring property meant that the site currently received no natural light after midday, and the proposed terrace would provide an amenity space which would benefit from evening sunlight.

The Committee, with the exception of Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour, was minded to support the application, contrary to the Department recommendation, on the basis that the scheme was considered to comply with Policies GD1, GD6 and H1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The Committee noted the importance of site visits in the determination of applications.

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

Haute Croix
House, La Rue
du Bechet es
Cats, Trinity:
proposed
ground floor
extension.
(RFR).

A16. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which proposed the construction of a single storey extension to the east elevation of the garage of the property known as Haute Croix House, La Rue du Bechet es Cats, Trinity. The Committee had visited the site on 20th February 2024.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity and Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity did not participate in the determination of this application.

P/2023/0747

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in a Water Pollution Safeguard Area and the Green Zone. Policies SP2, SP5, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE3, H9, TT4 and WER5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. The Committee's attention was also drawn to the following Supplementary Planning Guidance ('SPG'): draft Residential Parking Standards (2023), draft Housing Outside the Built-Up Area guidance (2023) and Landscape and Seascape Character Guidance (2023).

The Committee was advised that the application sought permission for the construction of a one storey extension to the east elevation of the existing garage, and that garage and external doors would be inset on the proposed southern and northern elevations respectively.

The application had been refused on the grounds that the incremental enlargement of dwellings within the Green Zone was not supported by the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, and that the proposed development, when considered in connexion with previous extensions, would represent a disproportionate increase in floor space. The proposed scale and siting of the extension along the street frontage were also considered to be visually dominant in the context of the original property and surrounding countryside setting, contrary to Policies PL5, GD6 and H9. 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] Architecture, who recounted the planning history of the site, to include the Department's refusal of a previous application for a 2 storey extension above the garage, which had generated objections from neighbours. [REDACTED] advised the Committee that the applicant had consulted both the Department and neighbours in relation to the current proposals. It was noted that the scale of the proposed extension had been reduced to a single storey. The scheme also sought to address overlooking to a neighbouring property and no objections had been received in connexion with the application. The Committee was advised that the architectural style of the scheme was consistent with that of the original building, and that reference to a 96 per cent increase in floor area in the Department's report was incorrect. [REDACTED] calculated the increase in floor area at 11 per cent for non-habitable space to be used for the storage of cars, which would result in visual improvements.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity addressed the Committee and expressed support for the application, advising that the proposals would provide additional parking space for the applicant.

The Committee was minded to support the application, contrary to the Department recommendation, on the basis that the scheme was considered to comply with Policies H9, GD6 and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The view was expressed that the proposed works represented the maximum development the site could bear.

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

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

A17. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. 8 of the present meeting, decided to make recommendations to the Minister for the Environment in connexion with the provision of storage facilities, in accordance with Article 9A of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 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 that it was required to present a report to the States at the end of the first quarter of 2024. The Planning Applications Manager was directed to prepare the report for approval by the Committee.