

Planning Committee

(13th Meeting)

8th June 2023**Part A (Non-Exempt)**

All members were present, with the exception of Deputies A.F. Curtis of St. Clement and Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North, from whom apologies had been received.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair
 Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin, Vice Chair
 Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen
 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Clement
 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence
 Connétable M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement
 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South
 Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (not present for items No. A2 – A8)

In attendance –

G. Duffell, Planning Applications Manager (not present for items No. A2 and A3)
 C. Jones, Senior Planner
 L. Davies, Planner
 G. Vasselin, Planner
 S. De Gouveia, Trainee Planner
 J. Gibbins, Trainee Planner
 L. Plumley Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items No. A1 – A8)
 K.M. LARBALÉSTIER, Principal Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items No. A9 – A19)

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

Minutes. A1. The Minutes of the meetings held on 2nd and 18th May 2023, were taken as read and were confirmed.

Hotel de Normandie, St. Clement's Road, St. Saviour: proposed extension. A2. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A12 of 18th May 2023, received a report in connexion with an application which proposed the construction of a third floor extension to the east elevation of Hotel de Normandie, St. Clement's Road, St. Saviour. Various minor external alterations and alterations to the vehicular access onto La Grève d'Azette were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 16th May 2023.

P/2022/1387 Connétables D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence, M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement and Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin, did not participate in the consideration of this item.

The Committee recalled that it had been minded to approve the above application, contrary to the Department's recommendation. For the purpose of formally confirming its decision and setting out the reasons for approval, as detailed within the officer report, the application was re-presented.

The Committee confirmed approval of the application for the reasons set out in the report and on the basis of the conditions set out therein.

Field
No.1514, La
Rue de
Dielament,
Trinity:
proposed
agricultural
shed.

A3. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A15 of 18th May 2023, received a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the construction of an agricultural shed to the south of Field No. 1514, La Rue de Dielament, Trinity, in association with [REDACTED]. The Committee had visited the site on 16th May 2023.

Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence did not participate in the consideration of this item.

P/2022/1449

The Committee recalled that it had been minded to approve the above application, contrary to the Department's recommendation. For the purpose of formally confirming its decision and setting out the reasons for approval, as detailed within the officer report, the application was re-presented. The Committee confirmed that a Planning Obligation Agreement suggested by the Infrastructure and Environment Department to secure improvements to the cycle network was not considered necessary in this instance.

The Committee confirmed approval of the application for the reasons set out in the report and on the basis of the conditions set out therein.

Flat, Cambrian
Villa, La Route
de La Haule,
St. Peter:
proposed
change of use.

A4. The Committee received a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for a change of use from residential to tourism accommodation (short term self-catering holiday lets) in respect of the Flat, Cambrian Villa, La Route de La Haule, St. Peter. The Committee had visited the site on 6th June 2023.

P/2023/0092

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Built-Up Area and Shoreline Zone and that Policies SP2, 3, 4, 6, PL3, GD1, 9, EV1, H3 and TT2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant to the application.

The Flat was a 3 bedroom duplex apartment with 2 parking spaces and a terrace, set within Cambrian Villa, a residential building along the shoreline at Beaumont, which comprised a total of 5 residential units and had direct access to the beach adjacent to a cycle path. It was confirmed that none of the residential units within Cambrian Villa were currently used for tourism accommodation purposes. The Committee was advised that the property provided an attractive residential accommodation within a sustainable and accessible location and, in light of the documented housing shortfall in the Island, the proposed loss of residential accommodation was considered contrary to the strategic objectives of maintaining and improving housing supply. Whilst it was recognised that Policy EV1 encouraged proposals for new visitor accommodation within the Built-Up Area, particularly in designated Tourist Destination Areas ('TDAs'), the application site was not located within a TDA and the need to retain and increase the residential housing supply was considered to carry greater weight in this instance. Consequently, it was recommended that the application be refused on the grounds that it was contrary to the provisions of Policy H3.

9 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from Ms. [REDACTED], representing one of the owners, who outlined the rationale for the proposed change of use. The property, having originally been built as a 'bachelor pad', had an unconventional layout, which did not lend itself to use as a family home. Unlike the other units within Cambrian Villa, which were let on a long term basis, the Flat had had 5 tenants in the last 9 years and was proving increasingly difficult to let for a number of reasons, including high heating costs and a lack of outside space. The most recent tenant had asked to exit the lease early, citing affordability concerns and the property had been left in a state of disrepair. Tourism accommodation was considered a more suitable use for the unit,

which would result in less wear and tear, and the intention was to create a unique space in an attractive location, showcasing what the Island had to offer, including Jersey produce and artwork by local artists. Ms. [REDACTED] noted that Jersey Business and Freedom Holidays supported the application and had provided helpful feedback. The existing drawbacks to the use of the unit as residential accommodation were not considered to impact the proposed tourism use and the provision of parking would be an additional draw to holidaymakers visiting the Island. Ms. [REDACTED] advised that an application for temporary change of use would be acceptable to the applicant and requested that the Committee consider this option.

Mr. [REDACTED], Head of Hospitality and Tourism at Jersey Business, addressed the Committee, noting that a lack of tourism accommodation could threaten Jersey's travel connectivity in the longer term. He challenged the assertion that the application site was not located within a TDA, on account of its proximity to St. Aubin and commented on the decrease in visitor accommodation which had been noted within the area. The application, if approved, would go some way towards redressing the balance. It was imperative, he added, to retain and improve the options available for visitors and he urged the Committee to support the application.

In response to a question from the Committee, the case officer confirmed that the Department's recommendation would remain unchanged in respect of an application for temporary change of use.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin and Connétable M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement, endorsed the recommendation to refuse the application for the reasons set out in the report.

Brackendale,
La Rue du Val
de la Mare du
Sud, St. Peter:
proposed
change of use.

P/2022/1639

A5. The Committee received a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for a change of use from tourism accommodation (Class F (d) self-catering unit) to residential dwelling, in respect of Brackendale, La Rue du Val de la Mare du Sud, St. Peter. The Committee had visited the site on 6th June 2023.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Coastal National Park ('CNP') and Protected Coastal Area ('PCA'), outside of the Built-Up Area, in Airport noise zone 3, in a water pollution safeguard area with a low risk of inland flooding. Policies SP1 – 6, PL5, GD1, EV1, H1, 3, 4, 9, TT2, WER2, 5, and 10 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan ('BIP') were relevant to the application.

Brackendale consisted of a 2 bedroom self-catering tourist unit which formed part of a wider site comprising 3 properties and had been constructed above an existing garage serving one of the other properties ('The Grange'), following the grant of P/2015/0104 and RP/2015/1484. Approval had been granted subject to a number of conditions, which included a restriction on the use of the property, as self catering accommodation for holiday purposes only, and specified that this did not include use as a permanent residential unit. The Committee noted that a previous application (P/2021/0629) for change of use to residential dwelling had been refused under the previous Island Plan by the Department, under delegated powers, for reasons which were set out in the report. The application had been resubmitted for consideration under the BIP.

The Committee was advised that the proposal would generate a new residential dwelling in an unsustainable location, within the CNP and PCA, and would not demonstrate any environmental gain, contrary to Policies SP1, 2, 6, PL5 and H9. In addition, insufficient consideration had been submitted to demonstrate that adequate consideration had been given in respect of the development being sited within a flood risk area, contrary to Policies SP1, WER2 and WER5. The application was accordingly recommended for refusal on these grounds.

15 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the owner, Mr. [REDACTED], who outlined his longstanding ownership and occupation of the property. Due to various health issues, he and his wife were no longer able to manage the self-catering tourist unit and efforts had been made to sell The Grange and Brackendale together, however, prospective buyers had been put off by the restriction on the use of the property and the uneconomic rental income which was generated. He and his wife wished to downsize and move into Brackendale in order to remain close to his elderly parents. The alternative, he advised, was for the unit to remain empty, which did not seem sensible given Jersey's current housing crisis. He noted that the property was served by mains drains and water and he was not aware of any issues relating to flooding in La Rue du Val de la Mare du Sud.

The applicant's agent, Ms. [REDACTED], of KE Planning, addressed the Committee, noting that the BIP required a holistic assessment and each case should be considered on its merits. She understood that an application for sub-division of The Grange would likely be recommended for approval under the policies of the BIP, noting that it supported making better use of existing buildings and building sustainable communities. She noted that under Policy H9 – 'Housing outside the built-up area', proposals for new residential development outside the built-up area could be supported in certain circumstances and referenced the exception specified in paragraph 4 therein. Allowing Mr. [REDACTED] to remain close to his family would support the BIP's aim to create sustainable communities. The Committee noted financial information which had been submitted in respect of the rental return from the unit; Ms. [REDACTED] advised that the tourism accommodation use had become uneconomic and had only persisted thanks to the owners not taking a salary. She noted that the proposal created the opportunity to create a home with no change to the physical environment and would decrease both intensity of use and demand on local infrastructure. These factors were material considerations in her view, to be balanced against the requirements of Policy H9. She noted that no environmental harm would result from the proposal and advised that the applicant was open to a condition with regard to planting if necessary. The concern about flood risk had come as a surprise, she added, due to the application site being in an area of low risk and in affecting only the access driveway and not the property itself. She urged the Committee to support the application.

In response to a question from the Committee, it was confirmed that the matter of the potential sub-division of The Grange was not relevant to this application and exception 3 of Policy H9 did not apply, the property being of recent, sympathetic construction.

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

Field No.
1111, La Rue
des Hougues,
St. Ouen:
proposed
change of use
(RETROSPEC
TIVE).

A6. The Committee received a report in connexion with an application which sought retrospective consent for a change of use from Class D – Agriculture to dog care business, alongside the construction of various associated structures including sheds and fences, in respect of Field No. 1111, La Rue des Hougues, St. Ouen.

Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen did not participate in the determination of this application.

P/2022/1724

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was an agricultural field located in the Protected Coastal Area ('PCA') and in accordance with the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment, within the 'Interior Agricultural Plateau'. Policies SP1, 2, 3, PL5, GD1, 6, NE1, 3 and ERE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant to the

application.

The Committee was advised that the proposal, by virtue of its unsustainable location and subsequent reliance on motor vehicles to facilitate access to and from the site, failed to meet the strategic objectives and requirements of Policies SP1, 2, 3, and PL5. The design of the proposal and introduction of associated structures was not considered to protect or improve the landscape character of the PCA and was therefore contrary to Policies GD6 and NE3. The proposal would also facilitate the loss of agricultural land due to its design and location, contrary to Policy ERE1. Finally, the proposed use would result in unreasonable harm to neighbouring amenities including those of nearby residents, by way of noise pollution, contrary to Policy GD1. The application was accordingly recommended for refusal on these grounds.

36 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

In response to a question from the Committee, it was confirmed that a mismatch in the location and site plans had been reported and corrected documentation had been provided to the Committee.

The Committee heard from Ms. [REDACTED], who lived within the area and objected to the proposals. She concurred with the assessment outlined within the Department's report and struggled to understand why the application site, unlike surrounding fields, was not being used for agriculture as it had been historically. She noted that the dog care business operating from the site was advertising for new clients, which led her to believe there was an intention to grow the size of the business. The shed and facilities currently catered up to 30 dogs and 5 team members and she was concerned by the potential for these figures to increase. In addition, she expressed concern that further requests might be made in the future for additional land, sheds, car parking and paraphernalia associated with the business. She reminded members of the need to uphold Jersey's planning laws and regulations, protect the environment and the Island's need for self-sufficiency, and asked the Committee to refuse the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant, Ms. [REDACTED], owner of Koko's Canines, who explained that there was no intention to grow the size of the business and advertising was undertaken on a regular basis purely in order to replace existing clients. She also confirmed that no additional dogs had been taken on, in light of the current situation. Ms. [REDACTED] outlined her qualifications and experience in canine care, and noted that finding premises for the business had been a challenging process; numerous attempts to seek guidance on suitable locations had been made, with no substantive response. Similar businesses had received approval, which led her to question the basis for the Department's recommendation in this instance. A profound appreciation of the natural world and desire to ensure that the facilities supported local wildlife meant that she was keen to plant appropriate hedgerows. The importance of Policies NE3 and GD6 was recognised and the field was primarily kept as grass and supported local wildlife. The structures (including sheds and fences) on the site were similar to those used by other canine care businesses in the Island and a number of such structures were noted in the surrounding fields. Ms. [REDACTED] referenced Policy ERE1 and the exceptions therein, noting that there were a number of unused fields in the Island with the potential for better utilisation. Providing dedicated facilities to cater for the needs of the Island's dogs provided one such opportunity and the site was carefully managed and supervised to respect the law. Solar energy was used to power the CCTV cameras on site and the hours of operation were limited to between 10am and 2pm to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties. It was not accepted that noise pollution resulted from the activities undertaken at the site.

Mr. [REDACTED] addressed the Committee and outlined his family connections to the field, which had been owned by his late mother. Prior to the business being started,

discussions had taken place with an officer of the Infrastructure and Environment Department and the Rural and Marine Sector Lead, which had led him to understand that the site could be used for this purpose. The field was not unusual in not being cultivated; it was noted that certain neighbouring fields were not in use for various reasons including being prone to flooding, too stony or the owners choosing not to plant them. Mr. [REDACTED] stated that whilst there was a gentle rural background noise due to the site's location, the business did not incite dogs to bark and operated only for a limited number of hours and not on weekends or bank holidays, thus minimising the impact on neighbours. He asked neighbours to be understanding and urged the Committee to support the application.

In response to questions from the Committee, Mr. [REDACTED] confirmed that he owned a number of fields in the area totalling 27 vergées, including the application site. In addition, he rented fields to the north and south of the application from [REDACTED]. Ms. [REDACTED] confirmed that dogs were not dropped off or picked up at the application site by clients, as the team of 5 staff undertook pick ups and drop offs from around the Island using specially adapted vehicles. She noted that there were no toilet facilities on site; staff usually only spent around 45 minutes there at a time, making use of alternative facilities whilst out walking the dogs, an arrangement they were content with.

The Committee, whilst recognising the need for dog care facilities, particularly following the significant increase in dog ownership associated with the COVID 19 pandemic, noted the challenge in locating businesses of this nature. It was recognised that a location within the Built-Up Area ('BUA') would be both difficult to find and sub-optimal, and that an equine operation would be permitted to erect similar structures. It was noted, however, that materials such as plastic and hard core had been used on the application site and this was considered undesirable.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour, approved the application, having concluded that the proposals accorded with Policies SP1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 on the basis that they were not irreversible; it would be difficult to locate the business in the BUA; landscape harm was considered minimal due to the similarity with use for equine purposes; the hours of operation were reasonable in terms of disruption to neighbours; and the imposition of a number of conditions, to include a planting scheme, disuse and repair provision, limited hours and days of operation as outlined above, access by staff vehicles only and a restriction on the importation of aggregates to the site.

Having noted 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.

141, Le Clos
des Sables, St.
Brelade:
proposed
extension.

A7. The Committee received a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the construction of a single storey extension at 141, Le Clos des Sables, St. Brelade, to create a one bedroom dwelling, with associated alteration to vehicular access in order to accommodate additional parking.

P/2023/0122

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Built-Up Area ('BUA') and Strategic Proposal 4, Policies SP2, H1, 2, 3, PL2, GD1, 6, NE1, TT2, 4, WER6 and 7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant to the application. Attention was also drawn to draft Supplementary Planning Guidance in respect of residential space and parking standards.

The Committee noted that Le Clos des Sables, along with its neighbouring housing development Le Clos des Quennevais, was considered to be a sustainable location and whilst many properties therein had been extended, the majority of the plots had remained as their original size. The proposals under consideration sought to retain

the host dwelling and create an additional dwelling within the application site on the north west boundary. The Committee was advised that the proposal, by virtue of its scale, design, position and site coverage, would result in a cramped overdevelopment of the front corner of the application site and failed to achieve a high standard of design. Insufficient evidence had been provided to demonstrate that the proposed foul and surface water drainage arrangements would be satisfactorily accommodated within the existing network. In addition, insufficient information had been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would accommodate bicycle parking and storage provisions. Consequently, the application was recommended for refusal on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies GD6, WER6, WER7 and TT2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

The Committee noted that as the application had been made by a States of Jersey employee, the application had been referred to the Committee for determination, in accordance with agreed procedures.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant, Ms. [REDACTED], who noted that a page of correspondence between herself and the Department did not appear to have been provided to the Committee and she duly provided a summary of the same. The proposed dwelling would provide independent accommodation for close family members, one of whom was in poor health and required support. The unit had been designed to allow for wheelchair access with input from occupational health services for the interior specification. Vehicle access and provision was considered satisfactory, with space for up to 4 cars and additional on street parking was available nearby. Waste management had also been considered as the proposal involved the demolition of a small existing garage and its replacement with a dwelling which would be subservient to the host dwelling. Ms. [REDACTED] felt she had been unfavourably steered by officers to apply for permission for a separate unit of accommodation and indicated that an alternative option, such as an extension that was integrated with the host dwelling, would also be suitable and this option would have been pursued, had she been advised differently. Given the declining health of the family member concerned, speed was of the essence. She noted that the application site included 2 sheds which could be used for bicycle storage and in relation to concerns about drainage, advised that a rain handler system would be installed.

In response to questions from the Committee, Ms. [REDACTED] confirmed that the host dwelling was her family home and would remain so; as the proposed dwelling would be occupied by family members, storage was not a material concern and space within the host dwelling could be used for this purpose if necessary. Notwithstanding this, the Committee was advised that the storage provision was not considered to be sufficient, based on the information that had been provided.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously endorsed the Department recommendation and refused permission for the reasons set out in the report. In doing so, members suggested that consideration be given to a revised application in respect of an extension forming part of the host dwelling.

16, Les
Quennevais
Park, St.
Brelade:
proposed
external
alterations.

A8. The Committee received a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the replacement of existing vertical hanging tiles to the front and rear façade (west and east elevations) of 16, Les Quennevais Park, St. Brelade, with 'Hardie' plank cladding and the addition of 2 rooflights to an existing flat roof at the rear of the property.

The Committee noted that due to the applicant being related to a member of staff in the Department, the application had been referred to the Committee for determination, in accordance with agreed procedures.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Built-Up Area and a Water Pollution Safeguard Area and that Policies GD1 and BE6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant to the application.

The Committee noted that a similar style of cladding was evident in and around the general vicinity of Le Clos des Sables and that the rooflights would not impact neighbours or be visible by the public. The proposal would not negatively affect neighbours or the character of the area, was in keeping with neighbouring properties, and was believed to satisfy the requirements of Policies GD1 and BE6. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application and no persons present wished to speak for or against the application.

The Committee unanimously approved the application

Le Feugerel
House, La Rue
du Feugerel,
St. John:
proposed
change of use
to self-
catering.

A9. The Committee received a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been determined by the Department under delegated powers and which proposed the change of use of a storage area above a detached double garage at the property known as Le Feugerel House, La Rue du Feugerel, St. John to self-catering accommodation. The Committee had visited the site on 6th June 2023.

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

P/2022/1371

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and that Policies SP1 – SP4, SP6, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE3, EV1, TT1, 2, 4, WER2, 5 and 8 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the application site was outside the Built-Up Area. Whilst it was recognised that Policy EV1 of the Bridging Island Plan supported the creation of tourist accommodation, the scheme did not involve the conversion of a traditional farm building; nor would it provide a viable use for a Listed Building. Consequently, the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies SP2, PL5, NE3 and EV1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee received the applicant, Mrs. [REDACTED] and her agent, Ms. [REDACTED]. In response to a question from a member, Ms. [REDACTED] confirmed that Building Bye-Law permission had been granted, subject to the imposition of a condition in relation to the provision of additional ventilation. Ms. [REDACTED] referenced the Department report, which noted that the scheme proposed no physical changes to the building. Therefore, she contended that it followed that there would be no harm to the rural character of the area. There were no concerns regarding impact on neighbouring amenities and whilst one car parking space had been provided this could be removed as active travel choices would be promoted. The proposal would repurpose an underused part of the building and would cater for nature activity based tourism, for which there was a growing demand (this view was supported by Visit Jersey). The location of the application site allowed easy access to the north coast walking and cycle routes. Ms. [REDACTED] focussed on Policy EV1, which she believed supported Visit Jersey's Destination Plan and which did not specifically refer to the conversion of traditional farm buildings. Mrs. [REDACTED] also drew attention to the Bridging Island Plan policies which had been carefully formulated to achieve the sustainable

development of the Island with a balance between social, environmental and economic considerations. She highlighted the need to adopt a holistic response to the assessment of policies. In concluding, Ms. [REDACTED] stated that the scheme was justified, appropriate, necessary and was supported by policy.

Mrs. [REDACTED] advised that it had originally been intended to use the space as a games room but the development had not been completed until 2020 (permission had been granted in 2010), by which time her children had left home. She had subsequently offered the accommodation for use by a Ukrainian family but this had not been permitted due to the fact that its use as habitable accommodation was not authorised. During its site visit, the Committee had been disappointed to note that a kitchen had already been installed in the building. Ms. [REDACTED] confirmed that whilst this did not form part of the original approval, it was in line with the recent Building Bye Laws permit.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin, endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out above.

Garden
Cottage,
Langley Park,
St. Saviour:
proposed
demolition and
redevelopment.

A10. The Committee received a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been determined by the Department under delegated powers and which proposed the demolition of the property known as Garden Cottage, Langley Park, St. Saviour and its replacement with a new 3 bedroom dwelling. The Committee had visited the site on 6th June 2023.

P/2022/1100

Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South and Connétables K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour and D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence did not participate in the determination of this application.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area and that Policies SP1 – SP4, H1 – H4, PL3, GD1, ME1, TT1, 2, 4, WER2 and 7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee was advised that the application site was severely constrained in terms of ground levels, proximity to neighbouring properties, car parking and access. The scheme did not sufficiently address any of these issues and was not considered to be appropriate in this context. Concerns existed regarding the impact of the development on the character of the area and, in particular, on the green backdrop of existing gardens, contrary to Policies SP3 and PL3 of the Bridging Island Plan. Furthermore, the submission lacked the level of detail required to satisfy the relevant Policies of the Bridging Island Plan 2022. Consequently, the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies SP3, PL3, GD1, GD5, GD6, TT1, TT2, TT4, SP1, WER1, WER2, WER7, ME1, SP5 and NE1. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

The Vice Chair highlighted certain discrepancies in the submitted drawings and the case officer confirmed that the drawings did not appear to correspond.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, Ms. [REDACTED], who accepted that there were discrepancies in the submitted drawings and offered to provide clarification outside of the meeting. In the meantime, Ms. [REDACTED] explained that the existing cottage was poorly constructed and was attached to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. The proposed new dwelling would be positioned further away from the rear of the apartments (the distance to the neighbouring dwelling was 17 metres) and a separate access would be provided, which would facilitate better access to the garden area. Improved energy efficiency, zero utility bills, the re-use of grey water and a composting macerating system were proposed so there was no requirement to connect to the foul sewer network. There would be some excavation to the rear of the site, with waste materials being used as infill at the front of the site. 2 parking spaces would be provided; one of which would have an electrical charging point.

There was also a bus stop nearby.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously refused permission for the reasons set out above.

No. 45 Halkett
Place, St.
Helier:
proposed
change of use
of third floor.

A11. The Committee received a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been determined by the Department under delegated powers and which proposed the change of use of the third floor of No. 45 Halkett Place, St. Helier from residential to office accommodation. The replacement of 3 windows and the repair of another were also proposed together with minor interior alterations. The Committee had visited the site on 6th June 2023.

P/2022/1333

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

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area and was on the Eastern Cycle Route. No. 45 Halkett Place was also a Listed Building. Policies SP1 – SP3, SP6, PL1, GD1, GD6, HE1, 2, H3, WE2 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee was advised that the Bridging Island Plan made provision for the supply of 4,300 homes and proposals which resulted in the net loss of a housing unit could not be supported as this was contrary to Policy H3. Insufficient information had been submitted to demonstrate how foul sewerage would be disposed of, contrary to Policy WER6 and the Infrastructure and Environment Department (Drainage Section) required drainage modelling to ensure that sufficient capacity existed. Consequently, the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies WER6 and H3 of the Bridging Island Plan. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

The Committee heard from Ms. [REDACTED], representing the application and the agent, Ms. [REDACTED] of PF+A. Ms. [REDACTED] advised that there were currently 2 commercial tenants in the building, both of whom wished to expand. Ms. [REDACTED] read pre-prepared statements from both tenants in support of the application and the Committee noted concerns regarding safety issues arising from the shared access arrangements between the commercial and residential tenants, noise and security related issues (it was noted that the building was not secured outside of office hours to allow access to the residential unit).

Ms. [REDACTED] advised that, despite the recommendation for refusal, positive pre-application advice had been received. She highlighted the difficulties associated with the inclusion of a residential unit in the building, to include the absence of a private access for the same, the lack of car parking, private amenity space, refuse and bicycle storage. The plans responded to the recommendations set out in a heritage impact assessment which had been prepared by MS Planning and the Infrastructure and Environment Department (Drainage Section) had confirmed that all issues had been satisfactorily addressed. Finally, Ms. [REDACTED] highlighted the fact that the scheme would facilitate the growth of existing local businesses.

Having considered the application, the Committee decided to grant permission, contrary to the Department recommendation on the basis that the residential accommodation within the building did not meet the required residential standards and was contrary to Policy GD1. It was noted that the application would be re-presented at the next scheduled meeting for formal decision confirmation.

Berlinia, La
Rue de la
Monnaie,
Trinity:

A12. The Committee received a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of a retrospective application which had been determined by the Department under delegated powers and which sought permission for fencing at the south-eastern and north-eastern boundaries of the property known as Berlinia, La

replacement
fence
(RETRO-
SPECTIVE).

P/2022/1344

Rue de la Monnaie, Trinity. The Committee had visited the site on 6th June 2023.

Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity and Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity did not participate in the determination of this application. Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin acted as Chair for the duration of this item.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area and that Policies GD1, GD6, NE1 and TT1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted that permission was sought for a timber fence which varied in height according to the topography of the site. The application had been refused on the grounds that the design of the fence failed to conserve, protect and contribute positively to the distinctiveness of the surrounding built environment, landscape and wider setting, contrary to Policy GD6 of the Bridging Island Plan. On a related matter, it was noted that alterations to the vehicular access were considered to constitute permitted development. 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, Mr. [REDACTED], who explained that the previous fence had been replaced due to its dilapidated state and the applicant had not appreciated that planning permission was required. The applicant was willing to reduce the height of the fence and/or paint it if the Committee felt that this would assist.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously refused permission for the reasons set out above and encouraged the applicant to work with the Department in order to arrive at a mutually acceptable solution.

Lyndale, La
Rue de Grand
Jardin, Trinity:
proposed glass
house.

P/2022/1269

A13. The Committee received a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been determined by the Department under delegated powers and which sought permission for the construction of a pitched roof glasshouse to the north of the property known as Lyndale, La Rue de Grand Jardin, Trinity. The Committee had visited the site on 6th June 2023.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity and Deputy A. Howell of Trinity did not participate in the determination of this application. Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin, Vice Chair acted as Chair for the duration of this item.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and that Policies GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, HE1, ERE1 and ERE5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Lyndale, a Grade 4 Listed Building was part of a wider site which included several residential and commercial units, together with agricultural fields, to include Field No. 1256, which was relevant in the context of the application.

The application sought consent for the construction of a pitched-roof glass house to the north of the site, more specifically to the north of Field, No. 1256. The glass house would measure approximately 104.56 square metres, when measured internally, with a maximum height of approximately 3020 millimetres. Alongside the glass house 2 ramps and reinforced landscaping were proposed. The application had been refused on the grounds of its impact on the landscape character of the Green Zone, contrary to Policies GD6, NE3 and ERE5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. 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, Mr. [REDACTED] and his agents, Messrs. [REDACTED] of Godel Architects. It was noted that until 1987 there had

been a larger glass house on the site which had been damaged in the Great Storm (the Committee had been provided with photographs of the same). Much of the below ground infrastructure associated with the former glass house remained. Mr. Godel noted a suggestion from the Historic Environment Team (which was not supported by the Planning Department) that the proposed glasshouse could be located in an alternative position. Mr. [REDACTED] pointed out that this would require new below ground infrastructure and excavation, which would be uneconomical and detrimental to the landscape character. The applicant was a bonafide agriculturalist who wished to sell vegetables from the application site. In recent years he had planted an orchard and grown vegetables in raised beds on fields surrounding the application site. He now wished to expand the vegetable production within a glass house and such proposals were supported within the Rural Economy Plan as a potential means of addressing food security issues. The applicant had also offered to plant new trees and hedgerows to provide additional screening. A glass house was considered to be more appropriate than a polytunnel as it would require less maintenance, would be more durable and would provide a better climate for growing. A business plan had been submitted as part of the application process, together with a heritage impact assessment. The application was supported by the Jersey Farmers' Union and the Rural Economy Team and it had been confirmed that the land in question was not subject to any agricultural restrictions. Mr. [REDACTED] concluded by stating that the applicant was willing to accept a condition restricting the use of the land to agriculture.

Mr. [REDACTED] pointed out that there were a number of redundant glasshouses in the Island which had been damaged in the Great Storm and that the applicant was one of the few owners who had removed the damaged structure at his own expense.

The Connétable of St. Lawrence asked whether the applicant required permission to create the raised beds and the case officer advised that he believed that consent should have been sought. Mr. [REDACTED] disagreed with this view, stating that the growing of crops in raised beds constituted an agricultural use.

The applicant confirmed that he did not intend to heat the proposed glasshouse and had access to water.

With the exception of the Connétable of St. Lawrence, the Committee decided to grant permission on the basis that the scheme would facilitate diversification of the rural economy, and in accordance with Policy SP6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Having recognised that its decision was contrary to the Department recommendation, the Committee noted that the application would be represented at the next scheduled meeting for formal decision confirmation and the approval of any conditions which were to be attached to the permit.

Lyndale, La
Rue de Grand
Jardin, Trinity:
proposed
change of use.

A14. The Committee received a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been determined by the Department under delegated powers and which sought permission for the change of use of ancillary office accommodation to residential at the property known as Lyndale, La Rue de Grand Jardin, Trinity. The Committee had visited the site on 6th June 2023.

P/2022/1270

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity and Deputy A. Howell of Trinity did not participate in the determination of this application. Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin, Vice Chair acted as Chair for the duration of this item.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and that Policies SP1 – SP4, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, HE1, H1, H9, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER4, WER6, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Lyndale, a Grade 4 Listed Building was part of a wider site which included several residential and commercial units, together with agricultural fields.

The Committee noted that the application had been refused on the grounds that it failed to meet the strategic objectives and requirements of Policies SP2, PL5 and H9. Furthermore, the introduction of a residential unit was considered inappropriate in this context, contrary to Policies GD6 and NE3; and, the scheme proposed a residential unit in a location with limited amenities, contrary to Policy H1. 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, Mr. [REDACTED] and his agents, Messrs. [REDACTED] of Godel Architects. The Committee noted that the office accommodation had been used in association with an engineering company owned by the applicant. Due to a reduction in demand for the services provided and competition from other companies, the office space was no longer required. The applicant wished to create residential accommodation for staff employed in retail and agricultural enterprises on the site. In the longer term the applicant's family would benefit from the provision of quality residential accommodation.

Mr. [REDACTED] advised that the office accommodation was now redundant and that the premises had been advertised in accordance with policy requirements for a period of 3 months. There were a number of staff working on the site in both the retail and agricultural enterprises and the applicant wished to provide staff accommodation within the existing redundant structure. The proposed development would have minimal impact on the external appearance of the building and the scheme met the space standards. There had been no objections from statutory consultees and the scheme aligned with the aims of the Bridging Island Plan and the detailed policies, which encouraged the reuse of existing buildings. All reasons for refusal had been addressed in the written submission. The proposed development would be beneficial to neighbours, would reduce trip generation, noise and emissions and provide a new residential unit. Mr. [REDACTED] noted a reference to the proposed development 'urbanising the character' of the area and he stated that he failed to see how this would occur as the scheme involved the reuse of an existing building.

Deputy Luce noted that the application description did not specifically refer to the creation of staff accommodation (which required assessment against different policy criteria) and the applicant confirmed that permission was not being sought for staff accommodation, contrary to Mr. [REDACTED] comments. Mr. [REDACTED] advised that it was likely that the proposed residential unit would be occupied by a family member. In response to a question from Deputy Luce, it was confirmed that only the office accommodation element of the building had been advertised for lease and some discussion followed on the interpretation of the policy. Members raised concerns about the proximity of the proposed dwelling to working areas on the site and the potential safety implications arising from the same. Mr. [REDACTED] advised that there was one other residential building on the site, together with Lyndale Sports shop (which was open to the public) and there had been no accidents in the past.

Having considered the application, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out above and requested that an additional reason for refusal relating to safety be added to the decision notice. Mr. [REDACTED] suggested that the Committee might wish to remove Policy H9 as a reason for refusal on the basis that the change of use of the building had been permitted to facilitate the existing use. Following some discussion, the Committee concluded that it would not wish to remove reference to this policy in the reasons for refusal.

Les Deux
Ruelles, Le
Feuguere, St.
Lawrence:
proposed

A15. The Committee received a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been determined by the Department under delegated powers and which sought permission for the construction of a dormer to the east elevation of the property known as Les Deux Ruelles, Le Feuguere, St. Lawrence. It was also proposed to replace the roof materials with

dormer/re-roofing/re-cladding.

P/2022/1206

traditional slate and replace the existing cladding with insulated render. The Committee had visited the site on 6th June 2023.

Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence and 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 Green Zone and that Policies GD1, GD6 and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment and it was noted that the application site was within the Interior Agricultural Plateau.

The Committee noted that the application proposed the introduction of a large, suburban style dormer window. The existing roof design was unusual and the addition of the proposed cat-slide dormer window was considered to accentuate this, resulting in a negative visual impact on the overall appearance of the property. Consequently, it had been concluded that the development would appear incongruous and would be harmful to the character of the area. The application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies GD1, GD6 and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The Committee was advised that there were no concerns with regard to the re-covering of the roof with traditional slate and the replacement of the cladding with insulated render. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant, who advised of the improvement works which had been carried out to date and the desire to improve the appearance of the rear of the property. It was noted that the dormer would provide improved habitable space and that the insulated render would address damp and mould problems which, together with the new roof covering, would improve thermal performance. It was noted that permission had been granted for a larger dormer extension at a neighbouring property which was much closer to the roadside and would be visually prominent. Consequently, consistency of approach was requested together with any advice on an appropriate approach.

Having considered the application, the Committee was convinced by the arguments made by the applicant and concluded that the proposed works would result in an overall aesthetic improvement, with the added benefit of enhancing the health and wellbeing of the occupants without detriment to the character of the area. Consequently, permission was granted, contrary to the Department recommendation. It was noted that the application would be represented at the next scheduled meeting for formal decision confirmation and the approval of any conditions which were to be attached to the permit.

Park Garage,
Hastings Road,
St. Helier:
proposed
demolition and
redevelopment.

P/2022/1504

A16. The Committee received a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been determined by the Department under delegated powers and which sought permission for the demolition and redevelopment of Park Garage, Hastings Road, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 6th June 2023.

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

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area and was on the Eastern Cycle Route Corridor. Policies SP2, SP3, SP4, PL1, GD1, GD5, GD6, GD10, HE1, EI1, H1, H2, H4, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER1, WER6, and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee was advised that a previous application had been withdrawn on the

basis of advice received from the Department in connexion with the impact of the development on neighbouring amenities.

The Committee noted that the revised application proposed a 3 storey flat roof apartment building comprising 6 flats. The new units would comfortably comply with internal residential space standards and each would have a designated balcony space and an external store. The new building would be larger in scale than its immediate residential neighbours, although there were larger scale developments nearby (notably, the former Metropole Hotel development). The Committee was advised that the proposed development would fill the site to its boundaries resulting in a cramped development, which would impose on its surrounding neighbours. Consequently, concerns existed with regard to the impact of the development on neighbouring amenities and, in particular, properties on Cleveland Road. A series of windows and balconies in close proximity to the boundary would overlook the private gardens of those properties. The concerns of neighbours on Hastings Road were also noted but the relationship between these properties and the proposed development was not considered unreasonable in this context. In conclusion, the Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies SP3, SP4, GD1, and GD6 and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

7 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

In response to a question from a member regarding the potential for contamination on the site from the previous use, the Committee was advised that it was understood that petrol tanks on the site had been decommissioned in 2012. The submitted information suggested that remedial action had been undertaken. However, it was noted that the Environmental Protection Section of the Department required further works, as set out in its consultation response.

The Committee heard from Mr. [REDACTED] of MS Planning, representing neighbouring residents, who were extremely concerned about the impact of the proposed development and had submitted written representations. Mr. [REDACTED] noted that the proposed development would fill the site to its boundaries and the conclusions in the Department report were clear with regard to the impact of the same. Concerns related to the scale of the development, its proximity to neighbouring dwellings with direct overlooking (all windows faced south), the overbearing impact and loss of light and privacy. Whilst the need for new housing was understood, the proposed development would cause unreasonable harm. Mr. [REDACTED] drew attention to an existing wall, which was shown on the drawings as being retained with the caveat that it would be 'adapted to suit the new development in accordance with structural engineering advice'. It was noted that although there was a lot of greenery on this wall, this had not been included in the ecological assessment and, in this context, reference was made to Policies NE1 and NE2. The proposed development represented a distinct change in character when compared with the south side of the road and Mr. [REDACTED] reminded the Committee of the Urban Character Appraisal which sought, among other things, matching development. Comparisons with the former Metropole Hotel development were not considered to be relevant as this site had previously accommodated a large hotel. In terms of remediation works in respect of contaminated land, there was no evidence of the works which had been undertaken in the submission and Supplementary Planning Guidance required the inclusion of a phase one risk assessment. Outstanding drainage issues were also noted, as per the response from the relevant statutory authority. Finally, Mr. [REDACTED] stated that it did not appear that a marketing process had been undertaken to prove redundancy of the previous employment land use. He suggested that these matters should also be added as reasons for refusal.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, Mr. [REDACTED] of Dyson and Buesnel, who advised that the existing wall would be retained in its entirety and

references to adaptations related to works which might be required on the applicant's side. In terms of the scheme filling the site, it was noted that the upper floors would be set back from the boundaries and the revised scheme reduced the size of the building. With regard to overlooking, it was noted that the south elevation had been redesigned as part of the revised scheme and balconies had been removed to the west, with only one balcony on the south with a privacy screen to address overlooking. Windows served bathrooms, bedrooms and kitchens on each floor and every effort had been made to minimise overlooking. With reference to Mr. [REDACTED] comments regarding the foliage on the boundary, it was noted that this had not been included in the ecological assessment as it would be retained. There would also be no impact on the setting of Listed Buildings opposite the application site. With regard to contamination, it was noted that the petrol tanks had been located on an adjacent site and there was no evidence of contamination on that site. With reference to drainage, it was noted that the relevant public authority had advised that it had no record of existing drainage arrangements for the site and had suggested that the applicant survey the whole of Hastings Road, which was considered to be an unreasonable request. In concluding, Mr. Buesnel recognised the policy tensions which were at play, to include the need to use land efficiently with higher densities being achieved in the Built-Up Area.

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

Les Talus, Le
Mont Les
Vaux, St.
Brelade:
proposed
extension.
P/2022/0362

A17. The Committee received a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been determined by the Department under delegated powers and which sought permission for the construction of a ground floor extension to the east elevation of the property known as Les Talus, Le Mont Les Vaux, St. Brelade. The Committee had visited the site on 6th June 2023.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and the Grade 2 Listed Sevenoaks Bridge was situated to the south (no objections had been received from the Historic Environment Team). Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE2, HE1, H1, H3, H4, H9, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER1, WER6, and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted that permission was sought for a 2 storey extension to the south-east elevation of the above property to provide a new one bedroom unit of accommodation for a person requiring a high level of care (supporting information had been received in this connexion). The Committee's attention was drawn to the fact that permission had been granted in 2007 for an extension for this purpose and a condition of the permit prevented this accommodation from being leased independently. The Department had concluded that the application failed to demonstrate that the care could not be provided within the existing dwelling. It was, however, recognised that the proposed extension would not facilitate a significant increase in occupancy and could be reintegrated into the existing building. In summary, the Department was of the view that the proposed development would result in the overdevelopment of the site, with the extension failing to remain subordinate to the host dwelling. The scheme would result in a large increase in footprint, particularly when cumulative alterations on the site were taken into account, undermining the character of the countryside and the local context. Furthermore, insufficient information had been submitted to demonstrate the impact on surface water flood risk and drainage infrastructure capacity. In summary, the proposal failed to comply with Policies SP3, PL5, GD6, H9, WER6 and WER7 and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant, Mr. [REDACTED] who confirmed that

permission had been granted for the extension of the principal dwelling in 2007, to facilitate the provision of accommodation for a family member, who required care and support. It was noted that other family members now also required medical care and support. A one bed basement flat with a separate entrance also existed on the site and this was leased. The proposed extension would provide accommodation for the applicant and his wife, with the principal dwelling being occupied by another family member who would assist with the provision of care.

Mr. [REDACTED] advised that he had dealt with 3 different officers during the life of the application and he believed that the officer who had recommended the refusal of the application under delegated powers appeared to have no local knowledge and had failed to reply to correspondence in which advice had been sought as to whether any additional information was required. The decision to refuse the application had come as a surprise due to the lack of feedback from the Department. Mr. [REDACTED] stated that the measurements for the extension, as set out in the Department report, were incorrect, as were references to the application site being situated in an Inland Flood Zone. He noted that the application had been assessed as meeting 2 of the 3 criteria set out in Policy H9 (2), which he stated was disappointing as he had offered to provide further information on the remaining element. The report also failed to mention the benefits of the scheme; namely the release of a 3 bedroom house (outside the application site) which was currently occupied by a family member who would occupy the principal dwelling if permission for the extension was granted. This particular family member would also assist with caring for other family members, reducing pressure on health services. The footprint of the proposed extension equated to one percent of the site area, with the footprint of the existing buildings equating to 5 percent. There had been no objections to the application and the house was not visible from the road.

In concluding, Mr. [REDACTED] made an impassioned appeal to the Committee to grant permission in order to allow the family to provide the necessary care and support required by family members.

Having considered the application, the Committee decided to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report. In doing so, the Committee expressed sympathy for the applicant's circumstances.

Filming during site visits.

A18. The Committee noted that as part of the redesign of the States Assembly website, the States Greffe was looking for opportunities to film members undertaking duties outside of the Chamber, which would be featured on the home page. In this connexion, the Committee agreed that some of the site visits scheduled for 27th June 2023, could be filmed for this purpose with the consent of property owners and in liaison with the Planning Applications Manager.

Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002: recommendations in accordance with Article 9A(5).

A19. The Committee considered whether it would wish to make any recommendations to the Minister for the Environment arising from its assessment of the application of planning policy, in accordance with Article 9A of the Planning and Building Law (Jersey) 2002.

In the above context Members highlighted the challenges associated with identifying appropriate locations for dog care facilities in the context of the Bridging Island Plan policies and requested that further consideration be given to this issue (Minute No. A6 of the meeting refers).