

Planning Committee

(16th Meeting)

10th April 2025

**Part A (Non-Exempt)**

All members were present, with the exception of Connétables M. Labey of Grouville and D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence and Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity, from whom apologies had been received.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity (Chair)  
Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement (Vice Chair)  
Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour  
Connétable M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement  
Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen  
Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North  
Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South

In attendance –

C. Carter, Planning Applications Manager  
C. Jones, Senior Planner  
B. James, Planner  
G. Vasselin, Planner  
L. Davies, Planner  
S. De Gouveia, Planner  
T. Venter, Planner  
T. Ingle, Principal Historic Environment Officer, Historic Environment Team  
L. Plumley, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A1 - A5)  
C. Tucker, Assistant Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A1-A5)  
H. Roche, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A6 – A11)

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

Minutes.	A1. The Minutes of the meeting of 13th March 2025, having been previously circulated, were taken as read and were confirmed.
High-tor, Le Chemin de Herupe, St. John: proposed construction of extension (RFR).	A2. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A8 of 13th March 2025, considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which sought permission for a single-storey, flat-roof extension to the south elevation of the property known as High-tor, Le Chemin de Herupe, St. John. The Committee had visited the site on 11th March 2025.  The Committee recalled that it had been minded to grant permission, contrary to the Department's recommendation. Consequently, the application had been re-presented for formal decision confirmation and to set out the specific reasons for approval.
P/2024/0981	The Committee confirmed approval of the application for the reasons set out in the Department report and subject to the inclusion of standard conditions relating to the

commencement of development and the requirement for the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans/documents. Members recalled that the application had been assessed against Policies GD1 and HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and requested that the reasons for approval be amended to reflect this.

St. Matthew's Church, La Route de St. Aubin, St. Lawrence: proposed demolition of buildings and construction of community hall.

P/2024/1255

A3. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the replacement of the church hall, vicarage and outbuildings at St. Matthew's Church, La Route de St. Aubin, St. Lawrence, with a new 2-storey church community hall, 2 x one bedroom residential units, a café, offices, and other community spaces, together with car parking facilities and landscaping. The Committee had visited the site on 8th April 2025.

A site plan, drawings and a 3-dimensional model were displayed. The Committee noted that St. Matthew's Church was a Grade One Listed Building adjacent to Coronation Park, a Grade One Listed Place and protected open space, and a field to the west which was also designated as protected open space and located within the Green Zone. Additionally, the application site was situated within the Built-Up Area (BUA) boundary and part of the site was at low risk of inland flooding. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP7, PL3, GD1, GD2, GD3, GD5, GD6, GD9, GD10, NE1, NE2, NE3, HE1, H1, H2, H4, ME1, ME2, C15, C17, TT1, TT2, TT3, TT4, WER1, WER2, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Residential Space Standards (2023), Residential Parking Standards (2023), Density Standards (2025), Landscape and Seascape Character Guidance (2023) and Site Waste Management Plans (2013).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, which included an application for the demolition of existing buildings, the construction of a 2-storey church community hall, 2 x 3 bedroom residential units, a café, offices and community spaces, together with landscaping and parking facilities (planning application reference No. P/2023/0117 refers), which had been withdrawn.

The Committee was advised that St. Matthew's Church would be retained and that the proposed development included the following –

- a 2-storey church community hall with a ground floor entrance area, foyer/flexible space, meeting room, kitchen, café, creche with an enclosed outside area, main hall with a maximum occupancy of 216 people, flexible area to supplement the main hall, rehearsal room, 2 lifts, toilet facilities, 4 stores (including 2 external stores), communications and plant rooms;
- the first floor of the church community hall would comprise a void over the main entrance and main hall space, mezzanine floor, landing/milling space, administrative office, meeting room, 3 group rooms, toilets, showers, staff facilities and a balcony;
- 2 replacement residential apartments measuring 56 and 68 square metres respectively, each of which would feature a balcony;
- a sunken roof plant enclosure with lift overrun and areas of planting;
- a shared space to the front of the church community hall, small reflecting pool, vehicular turning area, car parking for 30 vehicles (5 accessible spaces and 4 with electric charging facilities), 20 sheltered bicycle parking spaces, 4 motorcycle parking spaces and overflow parking for 80 additional cars on the field to the south of the site which would be used 5 to 6 times a year;
- the Percentage For Art contribution in the form of 2 large glazed and illuminated crucifixes to the north and south elevations of the church community hall; and,
- landscaping, green areas, a connection to Coronation Park and a gateway to the field to the west.

The Committee was advised that the Highway Authority had objected to the proposals due to concerns about highway safety and the proposed car parking provision. In particular, the absence of a safe crossing facility on Victoria Avenue was considered to pose a transport safety risk and, if permission was granted, a contribution of one third of the cost of a signalised pedestrian crossing (£112,000, was recommended by way of a Planning Obligation Agreement (POA)) . It was noted that the proposed crossing would also provide safe access to Coronation Park and the applicant had indicated that a contribution of 10 per cent (approximately £30,000) could be considered. Additionally, contributions towards a westbound bus stop and walking and bicycle infrastructure (£3,000 and £43,000) had also been suggested. The Committee was advised that the proposals, as submitted, were considered acceptable from a transport perspective, subject to appropriate conditions. It was noted that further negotiations would be required to reach agreement regarding a suitable POA, and members were informed that the matter could be agreed by the Committee or delegated to the Department, as appropriate.

The Committee noted that the development was considered acceptable in principle and would deliver an enhanced community facility within the BUA. The site was highly sensitive from a heritage perspective and deserving of significant protection. Whilst the scale and mass of the development would impact views of the site from the south, the proposed demolition of the church hall would improve the setting and enhance the primacy of St. Matthew's Church. The application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions outlined in the Department report.

All representations which had been received in connexion with the application had been included within the Committee's agenda pack, including a significant number which had been received after the publication of the meeting agenda.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] Senior Transportation Planner, Infrastructure and Environment Department, who outlined the response of the Highways Authority to the proposed development. Whilst the community value of the proposal was noted, concerns remained regarding public safety and accessibility implications. The level of car parking was considered inadequate and the use of the adjoining field for informal additional car parking was considered unsuitable during winter months and unsustainable in the longer term. [REDACTED] stated that further information was required in respect of the management of traffic and parking on the site, given the intensification of use that would arise. A signalised pedestrian crossing on Victoria Avenue was considered essential for public safety. Whilst delays to traffic would be negligible, pedestrian safety was paramount. The proposed bicycle parking was considered to be poorly located and insufficient for the projected volume of visitors. In concluding, [REDACTED] advised that, for these reasons, the Highway Authority was unable to support the application and urged the Committee to consider whether the proposal could be delivered in a safer and more sustainable manner.

In response to questions from the Committee, [REDACTED] confirmed that the installation of a signalised pedestrian crossing on Victoria Avenue was a priority for the Highways Authority and that a significantly higher level of car parking was required on the site.

The Committee heard from the applicant's architect, [REDACTED] of Waddington Architects, who outlined how the proposed development reflected the history, character and identity of the area. The proposals sought to build on the generosity of Lady Florence Boot, a philanthropist, who had gifted Coronation Park

to the Island in 1937, for the benefit of the public. Lady Boot had also commissioned the rebuilding of St. Matthew's Church at this time, with glass interior fittings by the renowned artist René Lalique. [REDACTED] advised that, following pre-application advice, the scale of the proposed development had been reduced to ensure that it was sympathetic to the landscape and historic setting. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to endorse the Department recommendation and approve the proposals, which would deliver a purpose-built community facility in the spirit of Lady Boot's enduring generosity to the Island.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of MS Planning Limited, who highlighted support within Policy C14 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan for the development of community facilities within the BUA. The proposals accorded with the policy tests set out in Policy C14 and would deliver improved, more accessible, modern and flexible spaces for Islanders to meet, socialise and access support. The site was in a sustainable location and would better serve the needs of the community, with no harm to neighbouring amenities. The design had been amended to ensure that the proposed development was subservient and set back from the Grade One Listed Building and would restore and enhance public views of the same. In concluding, [REDACTED] urged the Committee to support the application on the basis of the community benefits and positive impact on the setting of the site.

The Committee heard from the [REDACTED], Vicar of St. Matthew's Church, who highlighted significant public support for the proposals, including from Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence. The 'Hope Centre' church community hall would provide a much-needed, warm and welcoming multi-use space. The current hall was outdated and could only accommodate one event at a time. The proposals would allow St. Matthew's Church to better serve the community with an inclusive and accessible facility. The Hope Centre would be a place of safety, support and belonging and would provide space for children's activities, school holiday clubs, meeting rooms and rooms for charities and care homes to use, providing opportunities for elderly people to gather for monthly hot lunches. Dedicated counselling, healing and pastoral services would facilitate additional community support, and the proposals would enhance the tourist experience, with a café on site. Sufficient car parking spaces were proposed, and capacity would continue to be managed appropriately when large events were held. [REDACTED] noted that the use of St. Matthew's Church car park by members of the public visiting Coronation Park was a regular occurrence which was managed by Church staff. In addition, following a request from the Infrastructure and Environment Department, Coronation Park groundskeeping staff had been permitted to use the car park at St. Matthew's Church to alleviate pressure on the nearby public car park. He was confident that parking issues could be managed and would not be problematic. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to support the proposals, noting the significant public benefits which would arise at no cost to taxpayers.

In response to questions from the Committee, the following points were confirmed

- 
- there would be a reduction of 10 car parking spaces (from 40 down to 30);
- consideration would be given to the management of the car parking arrangements during the construction phase, to including alternative provision at other privately owned sites;
- the application, as proposed, did not include a signalised pedestrian crossing on Victoria Avenue;
- the proposed development would be located solely on the part of the site that was in the BUA;
- the proposed café would be open 6 days a week and closed on Sundays; and,
- a feasibility scheme had confirmed that the proposed roof plant enclosure was appropriate and the ventilation structures would not be visible from the public

realm.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously endorsed the Department recommendation to grant permission, subject to the conditions detailed in the Department report. In doing so, the Committee stated that it was unreasonable to expect the applicant to contribute towards the cost of a signalised pedestrian crossing on Victoria Avenue via a POA. The Committee also requested that the conditions be amended to require the reuse of certain materials (namely granite) on the site.

Fair Acre, La  
Route Orange,  
St. Brelade:  
Various  
proposed  
alterations.

P/2024/1349

A4. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A6 of 20th October 2023, of the Committee as previously constituted, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for revisions to a previously approved application (planning application reference No. P/2021/1790 refers), to enable the conversion of a 2 bedroom unit of residential accommodation to provide 2 x 2 bedroom units, the raising and alteration of roof profiles, 2 additional second floor roof terraces and various internal and external alterations at the property known as Fair Acre, La Route Orange, St. Brelade. The Committee had visited the site on 8th April 2025.

A site plan, drawings and a 3-dimensional model were displayed. The Committee noted that the site was located in the Built-Up Area (BUA) of Les Quennevais, with a small area to the southwest forming part of the Protected Coastal Area. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL2, GD1, GD6, NE1, H1, H2, H3, H4, TT1, TT2, TT4, and WER7 of the Bridging Island Plan were relevant and attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Parking Space Standards (2023) and Residential Space Standards (2025).

The Committee was apprised of the relevant planning history of the site, noting that P/2021/1790 had been approved in May 2023, following an appeal (MD-ENV-2023-203 refers). Permission had been granted for the demolition of the former residential dwelling and associated structures on the site, and the construction of 13 x 2 bedroom residential units, with associated refuse store, electrical substation, roof-based solar panels, landscaping and car parking. A previous application proposing the construction of 15 x 2 bedroom residential units on the site had been refused by the Committee, as previously constituted, in May 2021 (planning application reference No. P/2020/1533 refers).

The Committee was advised that permission was now being sought for second floor extensions to the east and west elevations, along with various alterations, to create an additional unit of residential accommodation. No works were proposed to the area of the site that was located in the PCA. The proposed revisions, including the scale, design, height and location of the proposed second floor extensions, changes to fenestration, and the overall increase in height of the building by 0.58 metres were considered acceptable and in keeping with the design and character of the approved building. The proposed additional residential unit would provide a good standard of accommodation, met residential space and car parking standards. The proposed development would not have an unreasonable impact on neighbouring amenities, protected species or the public drainage system. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, subject to certain conditions outlined in the Department report.

16 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], on behalf of [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident. He referred to a letter dated 20th January 2025, from the applicant's agent,

noting that 2 “more affordable units” were proposed to replace the approved single penthouse flat. [REDACTED] did not believe that the proposals would deliver affordable housing and noted that they represented a significant increase in floorspace. The size differentials were outlined and [REDACTED] stated that the creation of large balconies would result in disturbance to neighbouring properties. He urged the Committee to reject the proposals.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbour to the west of the site, who opposed the application. The extensive planning history of the site was referenced and [REDACTED] pointed out that 2 large extensions were proposed, with a significant increase in floorspace. The proposed balconies would feature privacy screens but there was no guarantee that these would be maintained, and he expressed concerns regarding the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy. The size of the proposed balconies was excessive and the proposed increase in mass was unacceptable. The proposals were commercially driven and did not consider the impact on neighbouring amenities. In concluding, [REDACTED] stated that local residents objected to the proposals and urged the Committee not to grant permission.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident. Whilst he did not object to the proposed development in principle, [REDACTED] questioned the car parking provision, which he felt was insufficient. Only 2 visitor car parking spaces were proposed, and he was concerned that this would result in visitors to the site using neighbouring streets for parking.

The Committee heard from the applicant’s agent, [REDACTED] of MS Planning Limited, who confirmed that the proposals would result in a minor increase in floorspace of 63 square metres, equivalent to a 3.6 per cent increase. He explained that the 2 proposed units of accommodation would be more affordable than the approved single penthouse flat. [REDACTED] noted that the independent Planning Inspector who had been appointed to consider the appeal had commented that the number of apartments proposed was well within the capacity of the site and could be accommodated by the existing local infrastructure. The addition of one unit of residential accommodation in a sustainable location was considered acceptable and the standards relating to housing, amenity space and car parking provision would all be met. He noted that privacy screens would be installed and maintained to address concerns regarding overlooking. The proposed revisions were of a minor nature and [REDACTED] urged the Committee to approve the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant’s agent, [REDACTED] of Dandara Limited, who confirmed that the proposed development met residential space standards. The mature trees on the site and the installation of 1.8-metre-high privacy screens, which would be maintained in perpetuity, would address concerns about overlooking. He confirmed that there would be no impact on the previously approved landscaping scheme or the trees in the surrounding area and that 2 outside stores would be provided. He also confirmed that the number of proposed car parking spaces would remain unchanged at 28.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously endorsed the Department recommendation and granted permission, subject to the conditions set out in the Department report.

La Mielle du  
Parcq, La  
Grande Route  
des Sablons,  
Grouville:  
proposed

A5. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition of a residential dwelling and associated structures known as La Mielle du Parcq, La Grande Route des Sablons, Grouville, and the construction of 4 residential dwellings with stores, garages and associated car parking. Landscaping and alterations to the access route were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 8th April 2025.

demolition and  
construction of  
residential  
dwellings.

P/2024/1174

A site plan, drawings and a 3-dimensional model were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated within the Built-Up Area (BUA) boundary and that policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL5, GD1, GD5, GD6, GD9, H1, H2, NE1, NE3, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER1, WER6, WER7 and U13 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Residential Space Standards (2023), Residential Parking Standards (2023), Density Standards (2025), and Site Waste Management Plans (2013).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, including an application for the construction of a single storey home office to the southwest of the site, which had been withdrawn (planning application reference No. P/2023/1061 refers).

The Committee was advised that the heritage value of the property had been assessed, and it had been concluded that it was not of sufficient architectural merit to warrant inclusion on the Register of Buildings of Architectural and Historical Importance. The Committee noted that the scheme proposed the construction of one x 3 bedroom and 3 x 4 bedroom units. The access lane, which formed part of the application site, and which also served 5 other properties, would be resurfaced, with 3 vehicular passing places being provided.

The Committee was advised that the proposals would result in increased housing density and the delivery of additional residential dwellings on a site in the BUA, in accordance with the strategic objectives of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The case for demolition had been made and the scheme was considered to be well designed. The proposed materials, spatial layout, relationship with neighbouring properties and landscaping were considered acceptable. The proposed development would contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area and deliver improvements to the access lane, with no significant concerns noted in relation to traffic impacts. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, subject to certain conditions detailed in the Department report.

29 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], on behalf of neighbouring residents. He stated that consultation had been insufficient and expressed concerns regarding the relationship between the proposed development and neighbouring properties. 2 of the proposed units were located close to the boundary of the site, with the potential for noise disturbance and overlooking. Balconies were proposed, which would exacerbate these issues, and whilst these would have privacy screens, there was no guarantee that they would be maintained over time. The design was considered inappropriate and visually harmful, and the car parking arrangements were inadequate. Turning to the access arrangements, [REDACTED] expressed concerns regarding safety and the ability for vehicles to manoeuvre, with particular reference to refuse vehicles. He believed that the proposals would result in the overdevelopment of the site, and he urged the Committee to refuse permission.

In response to a question from the Committee, it was confirmed that refuse vehicles currently reversed to a point approximately halfway down the access lane and that bins were wheeled out to this point for collection.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, who concurred with [REDACTED] concerns and highlighted issues regarding the proposed access and car parking arrangements. The proposed vehicle passing spaces on the

access lane would likely be used as car parking spaces due to the lack of visitor parking in the development. The access arrangements would result in car headlights shining into the neighbouring property, which, along with increased intensity of use and associated noise impacts, would result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenities. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to refuse the application on this basis.

The applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of MS Planning Limited, addressed the Committee and highlighted the consideration that had been given to neighbouring amenities in the development of the proposals. The car parking and access arrangements were considered acceptable and met the requirements of the Parish refuse contractor, who had confirmed their feasibility. Whilst the concerns of neighbouring residents were acknowledged, all relevant matters had been considered and addressed and the proposals revised to reflect this. The scheme would deliver additional family homes in a sustainable location and the proposed demolition was justified. In concluding, [REDACTED] urged the Committee to approve the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of FEX, who outlined the collaborative approach that had been adopted to inform the design of the scheme. The proposed density was in line with that of neighbouring sites and hard landscaping had been minimised to prioritise private amenity space and provide sea views. The dwellings would benefit from amenity space to the front and rear, with an attractive site frontage that would result in biodiversity improvements. Existing planting would be retained and improved. The design responded to the form and mass of neighbouring properties and would integrate into the surroundings. In addition, overlooking and overshadowing had been considered. Materials would be reused on site and modern methods of construction would be employed, to reduce vehicle movements and the impact of the development. The proposed access arrangements represented an improvement to the current situation and were acceptable. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to support the proposals, which would deliver 4 new well designed, modern family homes.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North, refused permission, contrary to the Department's recommendation. Concerns were expressed regarding the justification for demolition, overdevelopment of the site, impact on neighbouring amenities and the proposed design.

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

The Pleiades,  
La Grande  
Route de la  
Cote, St.  
Clement:  
proposed  
demolition and  
replacement of  
conservatory /  
construction of  
second floor  
level and porch  
(RFR).

A6. 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. The application sought permission for the replacement of an existing conservatory to the north-east elevation of the property known as The Pleiades, La Grande Route de la Cote, St. Clement. The construction of an additional second floor level and porch to the south-east elevation and the modification of the vehicular access onto La Grande Route De La Cote were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 8th April 2025.

Connétable M.O'D. Troy of St. Clement and Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement 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 Local Centre of Grève D'Azette in the Built-Up Area and



P/2024/1078

was on the Eastern Cycle Route Network. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL3, GD1, GD6, NE1, H1, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to the relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in relation to Residential Space and Parking Standards (2023).

The application had been refused on the grounds that the mass and height of the development would be visually dominant and incongruous in the street scene and would have an unreasonable overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties. The proposed development failed to provide 2 car parking spaces of the required size, electric charging points or the ability to manoeuvre and exit the site safely. Furthermore, the removal of the existing front wall would significantly alter the visual appearance of the street scene and the character of the area. The information provided to evaluate the ecological impacts and any mitigation measures to avoid harm to the protected species was considered insufficient. Consequently, it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application on the basis that it was contrary to Policies SP1, SP3, SP4, SP5, GD1, GD6, H1, NE1, TT2 and TT4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

4 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Curtek Architectural, who expressed surprise at the use of the term 'incongruous' in the reasons for refusal, on the basis that a much larger building was situated approximately 150 metres from the application site. He added that the 2022 Bridging Island Plan recognised the need for taller buildings on smaller footprints given the finite amount of space available. [REDACTED] noted that vehicle parking was already provided on the site and that the proposed garage could accommodate a regular sized vehicle. In relation to the proposed entrance and egress, whilst the existing arrangements could be maintained if the Committee considered the revised arrangements to be problematic, the demolition of the low roadside wall was not considered detrimental to the street scene. [REDACTED] informed the Committee that the neighbouring property was in the same ownership as the application site so the impact of overlooking would not be problematic. [REDACTED] confirmed that a response to the notice of refusal had been submitted *via* the Government website, and he expressed concern that this had not been received by the Department. The response had addressed the Infrastructure and Environment Department, Transport Division and the Land Resource Management reasons for refusal.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair, advised that as the Committee was being requested to review an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers, the application had to be assessed on the basis of the information previously submitted and no new information could be considered.

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

No. 27  
Roseville  
Street, St.  
Helier:  
proposed  
conversion and  
associated  
construction

A7. 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. The application sought permission for the conversion of a one bedroom flat and 6 bedsits to provide a new one bedroom flat and 2 x 2 bedroom flats, with associated external storage and bicycle parking, at the property known as No. 27 Roseville Street, St. Helier. The construction of 2 dormer windows to the east elevation and 2 dormer windows to the west elevation was also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 8th April 2025.

(RFR).

P/2024/0683

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 a Grade 3 Listed Building situated on the boundary of the Built-Up Area and on the Eastern Cycle Route Network. Policies SP2, SP3, SP4, SP7, PL1, GD1, GD6, HE1, HE2, H1, H2, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to the relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in relation to Residential Space and Parking Standards (2023), St. Helier Design Guidance (2023), Density Standards (2023), Disposal of Foul Sewage (2012), Protection of Historic Windows and Doors (2018) and Managing Change in Historic Buildings and Places (2024).

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the development was not in accordance with the SPG relating to Residential Space Standards (2023), resulting in poor living conditions. The proposed development would result in a loss of outlook and light, having an unreasonable impact on neighbouring residential amenities. Furthermore, the application failed to demonstrate that the supporting services proposed within the courtyard would not compromise accessibility, safety of road users or the car parking arrangements of neighbouring properties. Due to insufficient information, the potential impact on the Grade 3 Listed Building could not be fully assessed. Consequently, it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application on the basis that it was contrary to Policies SP3, SP4, SP7, GD1, GD6, H1, HE1, HE2, TT1 and TT2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Page Architects Limited, who advised that the applicant had received positive pre-application advice from the Department. He noted that the majority of the original features of the Grade 3 Listed Building had been stripped away during the 1980's with only the staircase and an archway remaining intact. These original features would be retained. [REDACTED] addressed concerns regarding the top floor 'attic' room, which did not comply with the residential space standards in its existing form and advised that the proposals would improve the quality of the space and enhance light and ventilation. The proposed one and 2 bedroom units complied with spatial requirements and approval of the scheme would result in the removal of 6 sub-standard bedsit units.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Connétables K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour and M.O'D. Troy of St. Clement, decided to grant permission, contrary to the Department's recommendation.

As the Committee's decision was contrary to the Department's recommendation, it was noted that the application would be re-presented for formal decision confirmation and the approval of the conditions which were to be attached to the permit, including a condition requiring the removal or relocation of the external stores.

Egypte Farm,  
La Rue  
D'Egypte,  
Trinity:  
proposed  
reconstruction

A8. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A4 of 27th July 2017, of the Committee as previously constituted, considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers. The application sought permission for the reconstruction of an existing farmhouse and outbuilding to form one x 3 bedroom dwelling and a garage and store, with associated landscaping works, at the property

of dwelling  
and  
outbuilding  
(RFR).

P/2024/0660

known as Egypte Farm, La Rue D'Egypte, Trinity. The stabilisation of other buildings on the site was also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 8th April 2025.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair, did not participate in the determination of this application. Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement, 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 Coastal National Park and the Protected Coastal Area. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL5, H1, H9, ERE3, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER6, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to the relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in relation to Residential Space and Parking Standards (2023) and the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (2023).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site including an application to reconstruct the derelict ruins of 2 units (planning application reference No. PP/2006/0475 refers) which had been refused by the Committee in June 2006. An application which sought permission for the reconstruction of the derelict dwellings and outbuildings to create independent guest accommodation had been refused by the Committee in June 2014 (planning application reference No. P/2014/0066 refers). Planning application reference No. P/2015/0978 had sought permission for the reconstruction of an existing derelict farmhouse and outbuilding to form one x 3 bedroom dwelling and a garage and store. This application had been approved by the Committee in July 2017, and subsequently refused by the Minister for the Environment in October 2021, following a third party appeal.

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the site was situated outside of the Built-Up Area, where residential development could only be supported in certain circumstances. The site was also situated within the Coastal National Park where new development should protect or improve the character and special qualities of the area. In this particular case, the construction of a new dwelling would have an intrusive impact on the character of the area. Furthermore, the application constituted a new dwelling within the Coastal National Park and Protected Coastal Area as the previous residential use was considered to have been abandoned. Consequently, it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application on the basis that it was contrary to Policies SP1, SP2, SP4, PL5, NE3 and H9 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee was addressed by [REDACTED] representing the owners of the application site. It was noted that the 'abandonment' of the residential use was refuted. [REDACTED] outlined the history of the site since the original buildings had been destroyed by the occupying forces at the end of World War II, including an insufficient compensation offer from the States of Jersey to rebuild the properties. Despite relocating to South Africa, the family had maintained ties with the Island and the application site and visited regularly. The site continued to be leased for agricultural purposes and parish rates were paid in respect of the derelict properties.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Antony Gibb Historic Building Consultants and Building Surveyors, who reiterated that the application site had been destroyed during the Occupation, rather than abandoned. He outlined the extensive planning history of the site (most relevant detailed above) and confirmed that the first planning application had been submitted in 1949, with

subsequent applications up to 1989 being unsuccessful. [REDACTED] referred to the most recent planning application (planning application reference No. P/2015/0978), and the decision of the former Minister for the Environment not to endorse the recommendation of an Independent Planning Inspector. He believed that the application was entirely compliant with the Planning and Building Law (Jersey) 2002, and the relevant policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to approve the application and address past injustices.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour, endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report. In doing so the Committee expressed some sympathy for the applicants' position, particularly given the previous positive recommendation of the Independent Planning Inspector. However, it was recognised that the Minister for the Environment was not bound by the recommendations of the Independent Planning Inspector.

Seymour  
House, La  
Grande Route  
des Sablons,  
Grouville:  
proposed  
conversion of  
outbuilding  
(RFR).

A9. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A19 of 14th March 2024, considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers. The application sought permission for the conversion of an existing outbuilding to provide a 2 bedroom unit of accommodation together with the installation of solar panels, at the property known as Seymour House, La Grande Route des Sablons, Grouville. The Committee had visited the site on 8th April 2025.

P/2024/1228

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was a Grade 4 Listed Building located in the Built-Up Area on the Eastern Cycle Route Corridor. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP7, GD1, GD5, GD6, GD9, NE1, NE3, HE1, H1, H2, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER6, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to the relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in relation to Parking Standards (2023) and draft Residential Space Standards (2023).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, including a similar application for the conversion of an existing outbuilding to a 2 bedroom residential unit, which had been refused by the Committee in March 2024 (planning application reference No. P/2022/0924 refers).

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that, despite the clearly communicated reasons for the refusal of planning application reference No. P/2022/0924, together with the provision of pre-application advice, the proposals had not sought to address the most significant elements of concern. The design of the proposed dwelling was not considered to contribute positively to the distinctiveness of the area or protect the special interest of the adjacent Grade 4 Listed Building. The Transport Division of the Infrastructure and Environment Department had objected to the scheme on the basis of the intensification of use of the vehicular access based on visibility and the impact on the nearby bus stop. Furthermore, the absence of a Heritage Impact Statement, an Ecological Survey and a drainage modelling impact assessment was noted. As such, the application failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP3, SP4, SP7, GD1, GD6, NE1, HE1, H2, TT1, TT4 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Principal Historic Environment Officer, Historic Environment Team (HET). [REDACTED] advised that the outbuilding was not Listed but the proposed development was considered to negatively impact the setting

of the Grade 4 Listed Seymour House and the setting of the Grade one Listed La Rocque Harbour, contrary to Policy HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. She added that the HET had worked with the applicant to find an acceptable solution to certain requirements, such as achieving a sea view by using existing ventilation openings as windows. As the suggested compromises had not been achieved, the HET maintained its objection to the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of JSL Architecture, who addressed 3 points on behalf of the applicant, as follows -

- the proposed doorway to the east elevation was considered to be acceptable and its relocation would interrupt the proposed floor plans;
- the bathrooms and cloakrooms should benefit from direct ventilation, and the removal of the proposed windows to the south elevation would result in the use of mechanical ventilation in these rooms; and
- the proposed first floor windows had been raised above the gutter line to provide additional headroom and improved views.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Connétable R. A. K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen and Deputy S. M. Ahier of St. Helier North, endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report.

Quarterdeck,  
Le Mont de  
Gouray, St  
Martin:  
proposed  
extensions/  
various works  
(RFR).

P/2024/0973

A10. 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, for development at the property known as Quarterdeck, Le Mont de Gouray, St Martin. The application sought permission for the construction of a ground floor extension to form a garage to the east elevation, a first floor extension to the south elevation and a second floor extension to the north elevation. It was also proposed to construct first and second floor terraces to the south elevation, together with various internal and external alterations. The Committee had visited the site on 8th April 2025.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area, the Local Centre of Gorey Village, the Green Backdrop Zone and was on the Eastern Cycle Route Corridor. Policies SP2, SP3, SP4, PL3, GD1, GD6, GD8, NE1, H1, H2, TT1, TT2, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, including an application for the construction of a ground floor extension to form a garage to the east elevation, a first floor extension to the south elevation and a second floor extension to the north elevation of the application site. The construction of a first floor terrace and a second floor terrace to the south elevation with various internal and external alterations had also been proposed. The application had been refused by the Department under delegated powers in March 2024 (planning application reference No. P/2023/1414 refers).

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the scale, form, and design of the proposed development represented an inappropriate form of development which would cause harm to the character of the area, and the Green Backdrop Zone. Furthermore, the proposed development would have an unreasonable impact upon the residential amenities of the neighbouring property. As such, it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application on the basis that it failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP2, SP3, SP4, PL3, GD1, GD6 and GD8 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

2 representations had been received in support of the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED], who advised that the application site currently lacked balance and coherence and there was no garage attached to the property. [REDACTED] believed that the proposals would enhance, modernise and reduce the environmental impact of the dwelling in its current state. He added that the property would soon be dwarfed by a neighbouring development. The proposed development would be no higher than the approved neighbouring development and would result in a 38 percent increase in floor space, compared to a 150 per cent increase in floor space on the adjacent site. [REDACTED] advised that he would continue to improve the cōtil to the rear of the application site and he noted the 2 representations of support which had been submitted.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of MS Planning Limited, who reiterated the comparisons between the proposed development on the application and the neighbouring approved scheme. He advised that the 2022 Bridging Island Plan encouraged sustainability with the retention and expansion of existing homes, and that the property was in serious need of modernisation. [REDACTED] noted that other flat rooved developments existed in the vicinity, so he did not consider the proposals harmful to the character of the area. He added that previous SPG which stipulated a 3,000 square foot floor space limit had been rescinded so could not be factored as a reason for refusal. [REDACTED] addressed the impact of overlooking and stated that, as the site was situated in the Built-Up Area, an element of overlooking was to be expected and already existed. He added that the applicant intended to create a 'green wall' to the rear of the site, in order to mitigate the loss of green space in the Green Backdrop Zone.

In response to a question from the Committee, the applicant's architect, [REDACTED] of Elliot Design Partnership, advised that certain amendments had been made to the scheme in order to address the reasons for the refusal in relation to planning application reference No. P/2023/1414. Pre-application advice had been sought from the Department and the living room space had been reduced; careful landscaping of the rear garden wall would ensure the site blended into the Green Backdrop Zone. [REDACTED] added that the application site would no longer benefit from panoramic views due to the height of the properties opposite and the neighbouring developments.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Deputies A.F. Curtis of St. Clement and T.A. Coles of St. Helier South, decided to grant permission, contrary to the Department's recommendation.

As the Committee's decision was contrary to the Department's recommendation, it was noted that the application would be re-presented for formal decision confirmation and the approval of the conditions which were to be attached to the permit, including a condition requiring the external finishings to be submitted to the Department for approval.

Planning and  
Building Law  
(Jersey) 2002:  
2024 Annual  
Report in  
accordance  
with Article  
9A.

A11. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A18 of 24th March 2024, received the draft 2024 Annual Report which it was required to present to the States Assembly, in accordance with Article 9A of the Planning and Building Law (Jersey) 2002.

The Committee recalled that it had made various recommendations to the Minister for the Environment arising from its assessment of the application of planning policy and details of the same were included within the report. It was noted that recommendations had been made in relation to the following –

- the use of shipping containers for permanent storage solutions on sites within the Green Zone;
- insufficient car parking provision for new developments;
- clarity on the requirement for, and content of, business plans submitted with planning applications;
- clearer requirements for Percentage For Art contributions; and
- the requirement for better evidence to justify that land was no longer needed, or appropriate for, agriculture in relation to the consideration of applications for solar farms.

Having considered the content of the draft 2024 Annual Report, the Committee accordingly approved the same, and requested that the necessary arrangements be made for it to be presented to the States Assembly.