

KML

PLANNING COMMITTEE

(14th Meeting)

9th December 2021**PART A (Non-Exempt)**

All members were present, with the exception of Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence and Deputy R.E. Huelin of St. Peter, from whom apologies had been received.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair
 Deputy G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade, Vice Chair
 Connétable M. Troy of St. Clement
 Deputy J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour
 Deputy L.B.E. Ash of St. Clement
 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier
 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence
 Deputy S.G. Luce of St. Martin

In attendance -

G. Duffell, Principal Planner
 C. Jones, Senior Planner
 L. Davies, Planner
 K. Ambrasa, Planner
 R. Hampson, Planner
 T. Ingle, Principal Historic Environment Officer
 K.M. Larbalestier, Specialist Secretariat Officer, States Greffe

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| Minutes. | A1. The Minutes of the meeting held on 2nd December 2021, having been previously circulated, were taken as read and were confirmed. |
| Tabor Cottage,
La Petite
Route des
Mielles, St.
Brelade:
proposed
demolition and
redevelopment.

P/2021/0338 | <p>A2. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A4 of 2nd December 2021, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought approval for the demolition of the existing dwelling known as Tabor Cottage, La Petite Route des Mielles, St. Brelade and its replacement with a new dwelling. It was also proposed to widen the vehicular access, alter the boundary walls to the south and east and erect a new boundary fence to the east. The Committee had visited the application site on 30th November 2021.</p> <p>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, the application was re-presented.</p> <p>The Committee confirmed its decision to grant permission for the reasons set out in the Department's report.</p> |
| Field No. 235,
La Ruelle, St. | A3. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A6 of 2nd December 2021, considered a report in connexion with a retrospective application which sought |

Lawrence:
retention of
agricultural
track/installat-
ion of
shepherd hut
(RETRO-
SPECTIVE).

P/2021/1239

permission for an agricultural track on Field No. 235, La Ruelle, St. Lawrence and the installation of a shepherd's hut for use as holiday accommodation. The Committee had visited the application site on 16th November 2021.

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, the application was re-presented.

The Committee confirmed its decision to grant permission for the reasons set out in the Department's report.

Hotel
Alhambra,
Roseville
Street, St.
Helier:
proposed staff
accommodat-
ion units.

P/2021/0733

A4. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A8 of 2nd December 2021, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the creation of 2 self-contained staff accommodation units at the rear of the Hotel Alhambra, Roseville Street, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the application site on 30th November 2021.

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, the application was re-presented.

The Committee confirmed its decision to grant permission for the reasons set out in the Department's report.

Chez Nous, La
Rue du Bel au
Vent, St.
Lawrence:
proposed first
floor
accommodat-
ion/single
storey
extension
(RFR).

P/2020/1817

A5. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A13 of 2nd December 2021, considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which sought permission for the removal of the existing roof at the property known as Chez Nous, La Rue du Bel au Vent, St. Lawrence and the creation of first floor habitable accommodation. It was also proposed to construct a single storey extension to the ground floor east elevation. The Committee had visited the application site on 16th November 2021.

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, the application was re-presented.

The Committee confirmed its decision to grant permission for the reasons set out in the Department's report.

La Solitude, La
Rue de la
Scelleterie, St.
Lawrence:
proposed
replacement
garage roof/
installation of
granite and
timber
cladding/
closure of
vehicular
access (RFR).

P/2021/0098

A6. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A14 of 2nd December 2021, considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which sought permission for a replacement garage roof at the property known as La Solitude, La Rue de la Scelleterie, St. Lawrence. It was also proposed to clad the garage with granite and timber and construct a new roadside wall to close off vehicular access to Rue de la Scelleterie. The Committee had visited the application site on 16th November 2021.

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, the application was re-presented.

The Committee confirmed its decision to grant permission for the reasons set out in the Department's report.

application site and agricultural land as a small holding and was aware that interest had been expressed by individuals in the past. Mr. Fisher was not aware that a marketing exercise had been undertaken in order to identify demand for such a use. Whilst he accepted that the application did not include proposals for the agricultural fields, he anticipated that the change of use of buildings on the site to provide tourism accommodation would make it more difficult to work the fields. He had been reliably informed that the benefactor had been adamant that the fields should remain in agricultural use. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

The Committee heard from Ms. [REDACTED] Maudsley, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] She believed that the applicant should consider leasing the accommodation for residential purposes, as opposed to tourism, especially in the light of demand for housing in the Island. She was of the opinion that the proposed tourism accommodation would intensify the use of the site and lead to increased traffic. In concluding, Ms. Maudsley stated that she was appalled that the National Trust had chosen to pursue a change of use to tourism accommodation as opposed to using the site to provide much needed housing.

The Committee heard from Mr. [REDACTED] Le Miere, who was disappointed that Morel Farm had not been leased to a tenant farmer for over a decade. He stated that he was aware of expressions of interest in leasing the farm and understood that no response had been received from the National Trust. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Good quality crops had been grown on the family farm and in the fields associated with Morel Farm. He too supported the lease of Morel Farm to an agriculturalist and was opposed to the proposed tourism use.

The Committee heard from Deputy Morel, who advised that as well as representing constituents he was also responsible for Arts, Culture and Heritage and the Rural Economy in his capacity as Assistant Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture. He highlighted the value of Morel Farm and its uniqueness and suggested that the National Trust should have considered agricultural and residential uses for the farmhouse ahead of a tourism use. The Deputy was not ruling out a tourism use but believed that the farmhouse could be leased to a family who could run the self-catering accommodation. He questioned the appropriateness of using the whole farmstead for tourism purposes.

The Committee heard from Mr. [REDACTED] Le Couteur, who referred the Committee to his written representation. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Mr. Le Couteur stated that agriculture in the Island was facing an existential crisis and that this was not in any way related to a shortage of historic farmsteads. Mr. Le Couteur advised that if, at any point in the future there was a resurgence in agriculture, the proposals would not preclude Morel Farm from operating as a viable farm. Mr. Le Couteur did not doubt that there had been interest from smallholders in leasing Morel Farm but he pointed out that such a use had to be sustainable and financially viable to secure a future. In response to a question from a member, it was noted that Morel Farm comprised 20 verges of agricultural land.

The Committee heard from Mr. [REDACTED] Alluto, Chief Executive Officer of the National Trust for Jersey, who advised that Morel Farm had been gifted to the National Trust for Jersey by the late Mr. [REDACTED] Morel. However, the associated farmland had been

14th Meeting
09.12.21

retained by Mr. Morel, indicating that he had not intended for the Trust to operate the site as a farm. When the fields had passed to Mr. Morel's daughter on his death, she had gifted the land to the Trust and the organisation had leased the fields for agricultural purposes at a very reasonable rental. Mr. Alluto confirmed that he had spoken to Miss Morel on a regular basis and at no time had she placed any restrictions on the use of Morel Farm and had been well aware of the need to generate money to care for the property. She had, in fact, encouraged the Trust to increase the rental. Major investment in the buildings was required and Government funding would facilitate the necessary work and the proposed new use would secure a viable future for Morel Farm. Mr. Alluto stated that previous speakers appeared to malign the visitor economy in favour of agriculture and he argued that both sectors were of vital importance. Transport links and spending in the local economy suffered when tourism declined and the Island had already lost a number of tourism beds in favour of residential accommodation – a rebalance was needed. The proposed new use would allow visitors and Islanders alike to enjoy Morel Farm and the surrounding countryside. In concluding, Mr. Alluto recalled that there had been no objections to applications submitted in 2012 and 2017, but there had been a sudden flurry of objections in response to the current application. The proposed works would not preclude a return to agriculture in the future if this was considered sustainable. The National Trust was passionate about the work it undertook and had a proven track record of restoring and caring for historic buildings. In response to a question from a member regarding the charge that the National Trust had not marketed the property for agricultural purposes, Mr. Alluto advised that when the previous tenant had left some 10 years ago the property had been in a very poor state and the Trust did not have the funds to carry out the works necessary to re-lease it. A series of caretaker tenants had occupied Morel Farm thereafter. Furthermore, there was no requirement for the Trust to seek an agricultural tenant as no such restrictions had been placed on the bequest and Morel Farm was an unqualified residential property with no employment land requirements. The associated fields continued to be leased to Jersey Hemp and Mrs. ■ Le Sueur-Rennard.

Having considered the application, the Committee decided to grant permission, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the officer report.

Morel Farm,
La Rue de la
Fontaine St.
Martin, St.
Lawrence:
proposed
change of use
to tourism
accommodat-
ion.

P/2021/1355

A8. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the change of use of the chapel building at Morel Farm, La Rue de la Fontaine St. Martin, St. Lawrence to self-catering accommodation. The Committee had visited the application site on 7th December 2021.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Green Zone and Morel Farm was a Listed Building. Policies SP1 and 4, GD1, NE1, NE2 and NE7, HE1, ERE4, EVE1, H11 and LWM2 of the 2011 Island Plan were of particular relevance.

The Committee was advised that Morel Farm comprised a main house with a group of associated outbuildings (a bakehouse, chapel and stables) and outside areas. The site was surrounded by agricultural land and had been gifted to the National Trust for Jersey in 1939. The application proposed the change of use of the chapel (currently used as an agricultural workshop) to facilitate the creation of a one bedroom self-catering unit.

The Committee noted that permission had been granted in 2012, for the refurbishment of the main house. The conversion of the detached bake-house to provide a new tourism unit had also been approved. The permit had been renewed in 2017, and works to the main house had commenced shortly thereafter. The application under consideration proposed the restoration of the historic building

fabric of the chapel (where necessary), to include repairs to existing walls and windows and the bell tower. The existing roof (described as defective) was to be removed and rebuilt to the same profile, with a pair of conservation rooflights being installed. In the Department's view, the change of use to tourism accommodation was in accordance with the relevant Island Plan Policies. Therefore, it was recommended that permission be granted with no conditions attached.

14 letters of support and 35 letters of objection had been received in connexion with the application.

All representations in connexion with Morel Farm were recorded under Minute No. A7.

Having considered the application, the Committee decided to grant permission, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the officer report.

Clos de
Sergent
Nursery and
Field No.
702A, La Rue
des Cabarettes,
St. Martin:
proposed
installation of
boundary
fencing/JEC
sub-station.

A9. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A6 of 15th July 2021, considered a report in connexion with a revised application which sought approval for the installation of a green acoustic fence, the construction of an electricity sub-station and the installation of 15 air conditioning units at Clos de Sergent Nursery, La Rue des Cabarettes, St. Martin. The Committee had visited the application site on 7th December 2021.

Deputy S.G. Luce of St. Martin 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 Policies NR1 and NE7 of the 2011 Island Plan were of particular relevance.

P/2020/1771

The Committee noted that internal works had been carried out to a glasshouse (which had been constructed on the application site in 2007) to bring it back into use. With regard to the proposals, the Committee was informed that permission was being sought for the construction of an electricity sub-station to serve the glasshouse, which would be sited on the south-east corner of the site and would replace the existing oil tank and boilers. 15 new air conditioning units were also proposed to the eastern elevation to support growing operations inside the glasshouse. An operational statement detailed the activities but this had been redacted due to the fact that it contained commercially sensitive information.

A previous application for the construction of a larger electricity sub-station on the application site had been refused. Members had felt that too many questions remained unanswered and there had been concerns that work on the electricity sub-station had commenced without permission. The Committee had also been unconvinced that work undertaken inside the glasshouse did not need planning consent. The impact of the proposal on the countryside character had also been considered significant. On a more general note, the Committee had concluded that a much more holistic approach to applications of this nature was required and it was agreed that future applications should consider the whole site, as opposed to the piecemeal approach presented.

With regard to the current application, whilst there was a general presumption against all forms of development within the Green Zone, there were permissible exceptions, which included the development of ancillary buildings. The proposed sub-station would be broken down into smaller components, with part of it (the transformer) being installed inside the glasshouse structure (not requiring planning

permission). A much smaller structure measuring only 2.1 metres x 2.1 metres x 2.4 metres high was proposed to be re-sited to the south west of the glasshouse and would be screened by an existing hedgerow which formed the western boundary. It would replace a larger oil tank in this location, which would be removed together with the oil-fired boilers inside the glasshouse. The proposed sub-station would, therefore, have a reduced impact on the site and would be hidden from public view. The addition of an acoustic fence around the proposed air conditioning units would provide sufficient mitigation against noise disturbance. In conclusion, the application was considered to satisfy the requirements of Policies NR1, NE7, ERE2 and SP5 of the 2011 Island Plan. The scheme would be beneficial in the context of diversification and complied with Government objectives to achieve carbon neutrality. It was also unlikely that the scheme would cause any significant landscape harm to the Green Zone or the wider setting. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the Department report.

11 letters of representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from Mrs. ■ du Heume, who expressed concerns in relation to the democratic process which had been followed. She believed that the proposal constituted piecemeal development and she was most concerned about the potential loss of prime agricultural land. Ms. Du Heume did not believe that growing medicinal cannabis was 'lawful' on this field and believed that the proposal would be detrimental to other members of society. She also expressed concerns regarding noise and the impact of the proposed development on wildlife. Ms. Du Heume reminded the Committee that the cannabis industry relied on artificial light for growing and she raised concerns regarding the 'huge amount of energy' which would be required. In concluding, Ms. Du Heume stated that she had sent photographs of works which had been carried out on the site to the Minister for the Environment but had yet to receive a response.

The Committee heard from Ms. ■ Agar, who advised that the need for the sub-station had not been fully explained and she stated that the Committee should require a holistic plan for the whole site.

The Committee heard from Mrs. ■ White, who advised that despite the previous refusal, work had continued on site with materials being delivered and alterations being made. There was no clear indication as to the exact nature of the works and she too believed that the growing of medicinal cannabis on the application site was unlawful and contrary to the intended use of the field/glasshouse and the conditions which had been attached to the existing permit for the glasshouse. She urged the Committee to authorise enforcement action and stated that approval of the application would reduce confidence in the planning process.

The Committee heard from Mr. ■ Gibb of St. Martin's Conservation Trust, who highlighted perceived conflicts in terms of works carried out on the application site in accordance with the General Development Order – permitted development rights - and the Protection of Agricultural Land (Jersey) Law 1964. If the Committee granted permission it must also reasonably consider the impact on agricultural land.

The Committee heard from Mr. ■ Nicholson, representing the applicant company. Mr. Nicholson reminded the Committee that the application sought permission for the installation of a green acoustic fence, the construction of an electricity sub-station and the installation of 15 air conditioning units. The scheme met the Green Zone and other relevant policy tests and proposed a small scale incidental use which would not cause serious harm.

In response to a question from a member, it was confirmed that no enforcement issues had been identified on the application site.

Having considered the application, the Committee endorsed the officer recommendation to grant permission, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the Department report. In doing so, the Chair advised that he had visited the application site with the Minister for the Environment and had received assurances around certain works carried out on site, to include the use of an existing concrete slab which had been laid when the glasshouse had been erected. The Department had also confirmed that work inside the glasshouses had been carried out in accordance with permitted development rights. Whilst supportive of the application, Deputy K.F. Morel concluded that a holistic plan for the site would be most beneficial.

Former Les
Quennevais
School,
Quennevais
Park, St.
Brelade:
proposed
change of use
to medical
facility.

A10. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought approval for the change of use of the Former Les Quennevais School, Quennevais Park, St. Brelade to a medical facility which would accommodate facilities which were to be relocated from Overdale (the site selected for the new hospital, for which a planning application had been submitted). The application also proposed the construction of a canopy to the main entrance of the building, the removal of a portacabin to the south west of the site and the formation of off-road parking and 2 access roads for residential dwellings at Clos des Sables. The Committee had visited the application site on 7th December 2021.

P/2021/1139

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair and Deputies G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade, Vice Chair, M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier and L.B.E. Ash of St. Clement did not participate in the determination of this application. Deputy J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour acted as Chair for the duration of this item. In doing so, he confirmed had no previous involvement in discussions regarding the provision of a new hospital in his capacity as a former Assistant Minister for Health.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area. Policies SP1, 2, 4, 6 and 7, GD1, NE1, NE2, NE4, BE6, SCO1, SCO2, TT4, 5, 8 and 9, NR3, LWM2 and 3 and WM1 of the 2011 Island Plan were of particular relevance.

The Committee noted that, pending the outcome of the planning application for the new hospital at Overdale, it was necessary to relocate a range of services and it was proposed to utilise the former Les Quennevais School. The applicant had confirmed that it was intended that the repurposed school building would be operational by late 2022. The new facility would be open to patients between 9.00 am and 5.00 pm and would be closed at weekends and on bank holidays.

A total of 141 car parking spaces would be provided for patients and staff, including 14 wheelchair accessible parking spaces, 2 drop off spaces and 11 motorbike spaces. An additional 30 staff car parking spaces would be provided at Les Quennevais Sports Centre (some 350 metres to the east of the site). These spaces would be available to staff between 8.00 am and 6.00 pm, Monday to Friday. An existing car parking area to the north-east of the building had also been designated for staff parking. A one-way system would operate within the car parks and a turning point for buses would be provided in the southern car parking area off Clos des Sables. In terms of the bus service provision, it was noted that the route 12A bus, which usually travelled along Route Orange, would be diverted into Clos des Sables. This service operated on an hourly basis. Other bus routes used Route Orange (routes 12 and 22) and the route 15 bus ran from St Helier to Jersey Airport on a regular basis, with the

nearest bus stop being 450 metres away on Route des Quennevais. It was anticipated that some members of the public would use a patient transfer service, which was organised centrally with volunteers covering all hospital sites. Between 7 and 10 passengers per day were currently brought to and from the existing Overdale Hospital site in this way. To allow better traffic flows and access to the site, free parking would be permitted on Route Orange and off road car parking would be provided for 8 properties affected by this aspect of the proposal. 60 bicycle spaces could be accommodated on site, with a staged approach being taken to implementation in order to assess demand.

The site was located within the Built-up Area and the proposals to re-use an existing building (with no external alterations) for a medical facility for a temporary period aligned with the Government's strategy of providing a new hospital facility on the Overdale site. The application had been carefully assessed against the relevant Island Plan policy context and accorded with policy requirements. Consequently, it was recommended that permission be granted, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the officer report.

16 letters of representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from Ms. ■ Howell, who stated that permission should not be granted for the change of use of the former Les Quennevais School site until such time as the planning application for the use of the Overdale site for the proposed new hospital had been determined. Ms. Howell believed that the proposal was premature and did not constitute a good use of public money. She was opposed to the demolition of purpose built facilities at Overdale and did not believe that this was in accordance with Island Plan Policies. She also questioned the long term plans for many of the relocated services, which she alleged would not be accommodated within the proposed new hospital. She listed a number of concerns relating to the proposed new hospital facility and the provision of services. She asked how the former Les Quennevais School site, which had not been considered fit for educational purposes, could be repurposed as a medical facility. She also felt that a more central location was required for relocated facilities.

The Chair asked those addressing the Committee to focus on the application under consideration.

The Committee heard from Ms. ■ Vanmeggelen, who noted that the application did not include a Green Travel Plan, but merely a requirement for the submission of such a plan once the facility was operational. Ms. Vanmeggelen believed that traffic volumes had been underestimated.

The Committee heard from Ms. ■ Venturini, who referred to a recent Government announcement that the former school site would ultimately be used for the provision of a residential development. She questioned the appropriateness of expending large amounts of money on a building which would ultimately be demolished and asked how this aligned with Island planning.

The Committee heard from Mr. ■ Baker, who stated that the application did not include Environmental Impact or Health Impact Assessments or a Green Travel Plan and he concluded that the Committee could not make a proper determination in the absence of this information. He too questioned the wisdom of progressing the application when the application for the new hospital on the Overdale site had yet to be determined. He believed that the Committee should consider the strong possibility of the application for a new hospital on the Overdale site being refused, as had been the case with a previous application for a new hospital on the existing

hospital site. Mr. Baker considered the application to be contrary to Policy SP6 and concurred with concerns regarding the use of public money for the relocation of facilities to the application site when there was so much uncertainty around the use of the Overdale site for the new hospital.

In response to a question from Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence regarding the amount of weight the Committee should give to the absence of a decision on the Overdale site application, members were advised that the application under consideration should be considered on its own merits.

The Committee heard from Ms. ■ Naylor, Chief Nurse, Health and Community Services. Ms. Naylor advised that, in order to facilitate the construction of a new hospital, essential services at Overdale had to be relocated to the application site. The site selection process had been rigorous and there was space to accommodate services.

The Committee heard from Mr. ■ Prince, Planning Agent, who advised that there was a strong case in favour of the proposed change of use on the basis that it would support the new hospital project and was in accordance with Policy SCO1. If permission was granted disparate facilities at Overdale, some of which were provided from poor quality accommodation, could be relocated to the application site, which would result in a significant improvement in the provision of health care. The application site was situated in a sustainable location in the Built-Up Area and the intended use was supported by the Spatial Strategy. The application would not result in the generation of significant volumes of waste arising from demolition. The applicant had worked with stakeholders in the context of access and car parking and it was noted that the proposed new use would generate only 132 additional trips when compared with the former school use. These trips would occur throughout the day, as opposed to peak school times. The application site was well served by public transport and the surrounding road network. Residents at Clos des Sables would be provided with dedicated off street car parking and a bus service would be re-routed to serve the facility. It was likely that some staff members would use the bus service to travel to work. Adequate car parking, to include disabled spaces and a drop off facility, would be provided and spaces at Les Quennevais Sports Centre would be set aside for staff members. The potential also existed to use part of the former library car park in the evenings. Mitigation measures had been put in place to address noise from roof mounted plant and ecological measures introduced in accordance with wildlife legislation. A landscaping strategy would retain and supplement landscaping. In conclusion, the application formed a vital component of the wider Our Hospital Project and would provide temporary modern fit for purpose health care facilities which accorded with Island Plan Policies.

The Committee heard from Mr. ■ Garforth, Architect, representing the applicant. Mr. Garforth advised that all departments at Overdale had been consulted and were supportive of the relocation proposals. The former Les Quennevais School site would provide larger and much improved facilities and the safety of the outdoor play area would be improved. Mr. Garforth advised that an Environmental Impact Assessment was not required but key issues had been elaborated on in the submission. The draft Bridging Island Plan contained a provision for the use of the former school site for community infrastructure. Draft Policy C12 referred to the relocation of services at Overdale. Finally, a comprehensive document which assessed trip generation and set out comparisons with the former use had been included with the submitted documents.

In response to a question from a member, the Committee noted that, if permission was granted, services would be operational at Les Quennevais by the end of 2022.

14th Meeting
09.12.21

Many of the services at Overdale were housed in buildings which required attention, irrespective of the outcome of the application for the new hospital.

The Committee heard from Mr. ■ Ratsinger, representing the applicant. Mr. Ratsinger advised that the Green Travel Plan was a live document which would evolve over time. An outline plan had been submitted and this would be refined when feedback on travel plans was received at the time of occupation. In response to a question from a member regarding what steps were being taken to ensure the safety of residents, Mr. Ratsinger advised that road safety measures which would ensure the well-being of residents and users would be formulated. Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence advised that his preference would be for the road safety measures to be agreed at the outset and Mr. Ratsinger confirmed that the designs would be audited by Government and risks and mitigation measures identified. Connétable M. Troy of St. Clement envisaged issues with indiscriminate parking and questioned what measures would be deployed to address this. Ms. ■ West, Our Hospital Project, advised that a porter would be on site at all times to ensure that no overspill parking occurred on the surrounding streets. She was, however, confident that the provision of on site parking was sufficient to meet the needs of staff and patients. There would be ongoing consultation with the Parish of St. Brelade to ensure that any issues were addressed without delay. Road safety measures had been tested, to include the re-routing of a bus. Ms. West confirmed that the porter on duty would have other site safety duties aside from ensuring that no unauthorised parking occurred. This concerned the Connétable of St. Clement, who advised that it was unlikely that one staff members with a range of duties would be able to oversee all incidences of indiscriminate car parking. Ms. West pointed out that most facilities at the former school site would be located on the ground floor so the layout was quite contained. No portering facilities existed at Overdale for the purposes of patient assistance so it was not envisaged that there would be huge demand for this service. However, the Connétable remained concerned about the potential for a road traffic accident and stated that he intended to write to the Our Hospital Project Team in this regard. Ms. West sought to reassure him by advising that this was a workforce issue which she was confident could be addressed.

The Committee heard from Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade, who advised that the Parish Roads Committee had been consulted on the proposals and the Project Team made aware of problems which had occurred in the past with overspill parking from Waitrose. The Parish of St. Brelade employed a parking control officer who patrolled the area at certain times and parking infractions were dealt with. The Connétable advised that consideration would need to be given to signage and road markings and this would be done in consultation with the Project Team. Deputy Morel advised the Connétable that he was concerned about the safety of residents and asked whether there was a need for speed mitigation measures. The Connétable advised that the Parish was open to suggestions but noted that residents were not generally supportive of the introduction of speed bumps due to the noise generated by vehicles driving over them.

In response to comments made, the case officer confirmed that the application site was in a highly sustainable location (for Deputy Morel's benefit it was confirmed that the term sustainable location related to ease of access to the site). The application did not generate the requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment and there was no requirement for Health Impact Assessments in Jersey. A travel plan had been submitted and a condition was proposed which required the submission of a more comprehensive plan (it was confirmed that this was not an unusual arrangement). There had been no objections from the highway authority and the future use of the site should not preclude the proposed change of use. In terms of comments regarding the school not being fit for purpose as an education facility,

it was confirmed that the issue had been one of capacity.

The Committee discussed the application and Deputy Morel proposed a deferral pending the receipt of further information in relation to road safety, especially in the light of the fact that many of those accessing the site would be unfamiliar with road layouts. However, it was noted that no such concerns had been expressed by the highway authority and the Connétable of St. Brelade confirmed that the Parish was content with the arrangements on the basis of the installation of appropriate signage. However, if the Committee felt that further mitigation measures were needed these would be considered by the Roads Committee.

Ultimately, the Committee proceeded to determination and members endorsed the recommendation for approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the Department report. Whilst some members concurred with comments made regarding the determination of the application prior to a decision on the Overdale site, it was noted that the Department's advice was that the application had to be assessed on its own merits. Whilst supporting the application, the Connétable of St. Clement and Deputy Morel remained concerned with safety, the potential for indiscriminate car parking and the ability to properly manage the same. However, Deputy Morel was 'heartened' by the involvement of the Parish of St. Brelade and hoped that this would ensure that the impact on residents was managed.

Seagull House,
La Neuve
Route, St.
Brelade:
proposed
change of use
of ground floor
to café.

A11. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought approval for the change of use of the ground floor of Seagull House, La Neuve Route, St. Brelade from a shop to a café. The Committee had visited the application site on 7th December 2021.

Connétable M. Troy of St. Clement did not participate in the determination of this application.

P/2021/0314

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area and was in a Tourist Destination Area. Policies ER3, ER5, EVE2, HE1, GD1, GD7, BE7, BE6 and BE9 of the 2011 Island Plan were of particular relevance.

The Committee noted that an antique shop had formerly operated from the site, with a sail loft attached to the rear. It was proposed to create a café on the ground floor with an alfresco seating area to the front. Internal and external changes were proposed to facilitate the change of use.

The Committee was advised that the existing shop and sail loft to the rear had been underutilised in recent years. The new use would generate a level of activity which was not considered to be unreasonable, given the fact that St. Aubin was a Tourist Destination Area. A flue, which had originally been located above a door to the rear of the site, had been relocated in the submitted drawings so that it would vent through the roof adjacent to a 2-storey section of the building. Large, glazed doors would be installed on the street frontage, the roof would be insulated, roof lights fitted, windows replaced where necessary and new doors installed. An existing timber door in the rear of the Listed section of the building would be renovated. A flat located on the upper floor of the building would be renovated and timber sliding sash framed windows would be fitted. 2 bollards would be introduced adjacent to the side door of the café to safeguard pedestrians and patrons using the alfresco area from vehicles using a vehicular access to the north. The area in front of the building would be surfaced in granite, which would continue down the northern side of the building, resulting in a visual improvement which would complement the historic character

On a related matter, Mr. Jones stated that he had advised the Department that chimneys had been removed from the building and other work carried out without permission and he was concerned that no action had been taken in this respect.

The Committee heard from Messrs [redacted] Godel and [redacted]. Job of Godel Architects. Mr. Job advised that the Department had been consulted on the removal of the chimneys, which had been deemed unsafe. Other works which had been undertaken involved making broken windows safe. An independent noise assessment had been carried out and measurements taken from the nearest noise sensitive property and it had been concluded that noise levels would be acceptable and would not give rise to complaints or adverse impact. Odour and acoustic abatement measures and conditions were proposed. Legal restrictions meant that no opening windows were permitted in the alleyway and replacement windows would be obscure glazed to maintain privacy. In terms of the hours of operation, these would align with other establishments in St. Aubin and were acceptable to Environmental Health. It was confirmed that the kitchen would close at 10 pm and staff would be off the premises and extractors switched off by 11 pm. Finally, it was unlikely that the building would be painted black and the owner was willing to work with the tenant on this.

The Committee heard from Mr. [redacted] Double, who intended to operate a high quality coffee house from the premises. Restrictions on the hours of operation would have an impact on economic viability and Mr. Double expressed a preference for a 9 pm closing time.

Having considered the application, the Committee decided to grant permission, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the Department report. The Committee discussed the hours of operation and all members, with the exception of Deputies J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour and M.R. Le Hagarat of St. Helier, who did not support restricting the hours of opening, concluded that the café should close at 9 pm. On a related matter, it was confirmed that the application did not seek permission for a takeaway facility.

Linden House,
Bagatelle
Road, St.
Saviour:
proposed
conversion of
ground
floor/raising of
roof (RFR).

A12. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which sought approval for the conversion of the ground floor at Linden House, Bagatelle Road, St. Saviour to create a one bedroom residential unit. It was also proposed to raise the roof of the building to create additional accommodation at first floor level. The Committee had visited the application site on 7th December 2021.

Connétable M. Troy of St. Clement did not participate in the determination of this application.

P/2021/0067

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, GD1, GD7 and H6 of the 2011 Island Plan were of particular relevance.

The Committee noted that Linden House was a significant detached property which had originally occupied a large triangular site with a generous garden. In 2012, planning permission had been granted for the development of 2 additional dwellings within the garden of the property. A single storey outbuilding (which was located approximately 1.6 metres from the house) was located to the north and this contained a separate dwelling unit (with amenity wrapping around the eastern end), storage and a workshop. The workshop was the home of an art/jewellery studio. There were neighbouring properties to all aspects, with the closest being to the east and north. The application proposed an additional storey of accommodation above the

14th Meeting
09.12.21

outbuilding and it was intended to relocate the art/jewellery studio to the new accommodation. A one bedroom residential unit would replace the existing storage and workshop at ground floor level.

The application had been refused on the grounds that the scale and mass of the proposed development, to include the parking and amenity space, would represent a cramped and unsatisfactory overdevelopment that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As a consequence, the application failed to achieve the high standard of design required and conflicted with Policies GD1 and GD7 of the 2011 Island Plan. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

The Committee heard from Messrs. ■ Nicholson of MS Planning and ■ Francisco of Waddington Architects. Mr. Francisco reminded the Committee that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area and the scheme would make better use of the building footprint. The roof would be raised by 1.2 metres, in accordance with a scheme approved in 2011 (which had been endorsed by the former Department Architect and the Historic Environment Team), and a traditional design approach had been adopted with matching materials. The application delivered a development which was fully compliant with Island Policies and met all of the standards. There would be no harm to amenities or loss of privacy.

Mr. Nicholson also noted the 2011 approval (application reference P2011/0407) which permitted the demolition of the existing garage and stores, the construction of a new garage and workshop and a new roof over the garage and existing flat to create office space on the first floor. He was puzzled by references to the development under consideration being cramped as it took the same form as the previously approved scheme. Whilst the 2011 application had been approved under the 2002 Island Plan, the policy tests were essentially the same except that there was now a greater emphasis on making the most of Built-Up Area sites, increasing density levels and making more efficient use of land without compromising character. The footprint would remain the same and there would be no implications for neighbours. All residential amenity standards had been met without compromising the principal dwelling.

The case officer advised that the 2011 approval was for an office and not a residential unit.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Deputies J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour and M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier, expressed support for the scheme on the basis that the scale and form of the proposed development was almost identical to the previously approved scheme. Consequently, permission was granted, contrary to the Department recommendation. The application would be re-presented for formal decision confirmation at the first meeting in 2022.

The Granite House, Ferndale Farm, La Rue de la Grande Vingtaine, St. Peter: proposed double garage and store (RFR).

A13. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which sought approval for the construction of a double garage and store to the south of the property known as The Granite House, Ferndale Farm, La Rue de la Grande Vingtaine, St. Peter. The Committee had visited the application site on 7th December 2021.

Connétable M. Troy of St. Clement and Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence did not participate in the determination of this application.

P/2021/1339

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and was also in Airport Noise Zone 3. The Granite House was a Grade 4 Listed Building and Policies NE7, GD1, GD7 and HE1 of the 2011 Island Plan were of particular relevance.

The Committee noted that the application sought consent for the construction of a double garage with associated storeroom to the south of the site. The Committee noted that the garage would measure approximately 46.4 square metres and would be 5,400 millimetres high. It would be timber clad with a natural slate roof with black guttering. Although only one garage door would be installed, the garage would have capacity for 2 cars and an attached storeroom would be used for miscellaneous items. The Committee was reminded that alterations to Listed Buildings and places should not adversely affect the architectural, historic interest or character of the Listed Building or place, in accordance with Policy HE1. Policy NE7 (Green Zone) required ancillary buildings to be modest and proportionate when compared with other buildings and, as a result of its size, the proposed development was considered to be harmful to the setting of several Listed Buildings (the Granite House, Ferndale and Ferndale Cottage), as well as the surrounding Green Zone landscape. Consequently, the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies NE7, HE1 and GD1. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant, Mrs. ■■■ Haworth, who advised that the size of the garage and store had been dictated by the need to accommodate certain equipment, such as surf boards and motocross bikes. Care had been taken not to locate the structure in a position which would not have an adverse impact on the property. There had been no objections from neighbours and the proposed development would not be visible from outside the site. Mrs. Haworth concluded that certain planning breaches which had arisen at Ferndale Farm might have had a negative effect on the determination of her application.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair and Deputy S.G. Luce of St. Martin, both of whom expressed concerns regarding the ridge height of the garage, decided to grant permission, contrary to the Department recommendation. The Committee concluded that the development would not result in landscape harm and would not have an adverse impact on the setting of the Listed Building. It was noted that the application would be re-presented at the first meeting in 2022 for formal decision confirmation.

On a related matter, Deputy S. Luce of St. Martin noted some inaccuracies in the submitted drawings and it was recognised that approval was based on the dimensions detailed on the drawings.