

Planning Committee

(15th Meeting)

13th March 2025

Part A (Non-Exempt)

All members were present, with the exception of Connétables P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity (Chair), M.O'D. Troy of St. Clement, R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen and D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence, from whom apologies had been received.

Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement (Acting Chair)
 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour
 Connétable M. Labey of Grouville
 Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North
 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South
 Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity

In attendance –

C. Carter, Planning Applications Manager
 C. Jones, Senior Planning Officer
 S. De Gouveia, Planner
 T. Venter, Planner
 J. Gibbins, Planner
 G. Vasselin, Planner
 L. Davies, Planner
 B. James, Planner
 L. Plumley, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A1 – 5)
 H. Roche, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A6 – 9)

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

Minutes.

Field Nos. 470 and 415A, La Grande Route de St. Martin, La Rue des Friquettes, St. Saviour: proposed construction of 38 affordable homes.

P/2024/1368

A1. The Minutes of the meeting held on 20th February 2025, were taken as read and were confirmed.

A2. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the construction of 38 affordable homes, comprising 3 x 2 bedroom, 33 x 3 bedroom and 2 x 4 bedroom dwellings with amenity space, vehicle parking and storage on Field Nos. 470 and 415A, La Grande Route de St. Martin, La Rue des Friquettes, St. Saviour. Various hard and soft landscaping, to include communal and public open space, 2 new vehicular access routes on to La Rue des Friquettes and pedestrian access on to La Grande Route de St. Martin were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 11th March 2025.

Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour did not participate in the determination of this application.

A site plan, drawings, and a 3-dimensional model were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in Sustainable Transport Zone 5, the Green Zone and was on the Eastern Cycle Route Network. The site had been allocated for the provision of affordable housing in the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP7, GD1, GD2, GD3 GD6, GD10, NE1, NE2, NE3, HE1, HE5, H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, CI8, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT3, TT4, WER1, WER6, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) as follows: Development Briefs: Affordable Housing Sites (2023), Density Standards Guidance (2023), Residential Space and Parking Standards (2023) and Planning Obligation Agreements (POA) (2017).

The Committee was advised that the proposal sought permission to deliver an affordable housing scheme comprising 38 homes, in accordance with the policy requirements of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and relevant SPG. The site was irregular in shape and comprised 2 separate land parcels (Site A and Site B), constrained by a sewer-run and an unclaimed area of land between the 2 sites which could not be built upon. The proposals formed a single development, with Site A accommodating 27 units (2 x 2 bedroom houses, 23 x 3 bedroom houses, and 2 x 4 bedroom houses) and Site B accommodating 11 units (one x 2 bedroom house and 10 x 3 bedroom houses). The mix and density of housing was considered appropriate and was supported by the Strategic Housing Unit. The delivery partner would be Andium Homes.

The entering into of a Planning Obligation Agreement (POA) was proposed to secure the following –

- a contribution towards drainage (£13,800) and transport improvements (£231,077) towards bus shelters on Princes Tower Road and La Grande Route de St. Martin, the delivery of junction improvement works to the junction of Princes Tower Road and La Rue des Friquettes, and a contribution towards the Eastern Cycle Route Corridor;
- a proposed affordable housing tenure split of 55 per cent for first time buyers and 45 per cent for social rented accommodation;
- a landscape and ecology management plan; and
- a management plan, maintenance plan and resident's forum.

The proposed level of car parking accorded with the Residential Parking Standards (2023) SPG and there had been no objection from the Infrastructure and Environment Transport section, subject to the entering into of a suitable POA. Whilst concerns were noted from the Parish Roads Committee regarding the proposed vehicle access routes into the site, the rationale for both access routes had been evidenced and the visibility splay requirements were met. The proposed arrangements represented the only viable access routes into the site at the current time and would enable the delivery of the scheme as an affordable housing site, as intended by the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. A Percentage For Art contribution was also proposed, which would consist of 4 carved Portland stone panels set into gate piers at the entrances to the development.

The application was accordingly recommended for approval, subject to certain conditions detailed within the Department report and the entering into of a suitable POA, pursuant to Article 25 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 (as amended), as detailed within the Department report. In the event that agreement could not be reached within 6 months of the date of approval, the application would be returned to the Committee for further consideration.

All representations received in connexion with the application had been included within the Committee's agenda pack.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Principal Transport Planner, Infrastructure and Environment Department, regarding the proposed access arrangements. [REDACTED] advised that vehicle access via La Grande Route de St.

Martin would greatly prejudice highway safety and could not be supported. There was no objection to the proposals, subject to the junction between La Rue des Friquettes (which was administered by the Parish), and Princes Tower Road being improved to reduce road safety risk. The design for the junction would need to be agreed with the Highway Authority in advance of works commencing. Pedestrian and cycle improvements in the vicinity of the site would also be required.

Connétable Lewis addressed the Committee, in his capacity as Connétable of St. Saviour, to outline concerns raised by the Parish Roads Committee regarding the proposed vehicle access arrangements. The proximity to St. Michael's school and increased levels of traffic on La Rue des Friquettes would present risks to road users, including horse riders. The proposals were not supported on the basis that a vehicular access route onto La Grande Route de St. Martin would be preferable. A pedestrian crossing point on La Rue des Friquettes was requested in order to improve road safety. Concerns were also expressed regarding drainage and surface water management and the potential for localised flooding to occur. Noting that 2 connections to foul sewers were proposed on La Rue des Friquettes, a contribution towards the cost of road resurfacing was requested. Connétable Lewis expressed the view that the proposed bus shelter on Princes Tower Road would be underutilised and suggested that the POA contribution could be applied differently. From a personal perspective, he expressed concern regarding the cumulative impact of the proposed development, particularly given the potential for redevelopment of the neighbouring Les Cinq Chenes Estate. In concluding, he stated that the Parish Roads Committee could not support the proposals in their current form.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED], who was pleased to note the Department's recommendation for approval. He highlighted the collaborative approach adopted by the applicant and noted that all relevant matters of concern had been comprehensively considered and addressed. A full assessment had been undertaken in respect of drainage and surface water management and no water would be discharged onto the public highway. The access arrangements had been carefully considered and represented the only viable option, as outlined in the Department report. La Rue des Friquettes was subject to a 20 mile per hour speed limit and the required visibility splays could be achieved. The proposals accorded with the requirements of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and relevant SPG. He urged the Committee to support the scheme, noting that it would deliver much-needed affordable housing on a site specifically designated for this purpose.

The Committee heard from the applicant's transport consultant, [REDACTED], who confirmed that vehicular access via La Grande Route de St. Martin was not safely achievable due to highway constraints. Vehicular access via the neighbouring Les Cinq Chenes Estate could not be accommodated at present but the proposed design would allow for the implementation of the same, should plans to redevelop Les Cinq Chenes Estate be progressed by Andium Homes. The proposed vehicular access routes complied with all relevant requirements and could serve as vehicular passing places on La Rue des Friquettes if necessary. Children primarily travelled to St. Michael's School by car, with only one per cent of pupils walking to the school, and no collisions had been reported on La Rue des Friquettes in the last 5 years. The impact of the proposed development would be negligible in terms of traffic and public transport connectivity would be improved. Road safety improvements were also proposed, and provision had been made to integrate pedestrian and cycle routes through Les Cinq Chenes Estate in the future. In concluding, [REDACTED] stated that there were no grounds for refusing the application on the basis of the proposed access arrangements.

[REDACTED] of Andium Homes Limited, the affordable housing provider for

the proposed development, addressed the Committee and outlined the careful consideration which had informed the development of the scheme. The proposals responded to the constraints of the site and would deliver 38 units of much-needed affordable housing, whilst meeting all relevant policy requirements. The design was supported by the statutory consultees and significant road safety improvements were proposed, including a sizeable contribution towards bus and cycle route enhancements, which would improve local amenities. The type of housing proposed was in high demand and would help to address the needs of families on the Housing and Assisted Purchase Gateway schemes. The delivery of affordable housing on a site designated for this purpose by the States Assembly would be transformative and he urged the Committee to support the proposals.

In response to questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that –

- flexibility had been designed into various units to allow for future loft conversions if required, subject to planning permission;
- a contribution by the applicant towards the resurfacing of La Rue de Friquettes would be a matter for a private highway agreement;
- the applicant was open to alternative options in relation to the allocation of the financial contribution *via* the POA, including a potential pedestrian crossing on La Rue des Friquettes;
- the distribution of the proposed tenure split across the site was yet to be determined;
- proposals in respect of the redevelopment of Les Cinq Chenes Estate were being developed and would include consideration of the proposed development's vehicle access arrangements; and
- whilst the proposed 4 bedroom units were noted to include only one bathroom, this accorded with policy requirements and represented a necessary compromise to maintain the affordability of the scheme.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously decided to grant permission, subject to the imposition of the conditions set out in the Department report and the applicant entering into a suitable POA. The Committee specified that any significant changes to the proposed housing tenure split should be brought to the Committee for consideration.

Les Homets,
La Grande
Route des
Sablons,
Grouville:
proposed
demolition and
construction of
2 new
dwellings.

A2. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A5 of 14th March 2024, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition of an existing dwelling and the construction of one x 4 bedroom and one x 5 bedroom dwellings at the property known as Les Homets, La Grande Route des Sablons, Grouville. The formation of a vehicular access and associated landscape works were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 11th March 2025.

Connétables M. Labey of Grouville and K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour did not participate in the determination of this application.

P/2024/1015

A site plan, drawings, and a 3-dimensional model were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area, the Shoreline Zone and was adjacent to a Grade 3 Listed Building, Conway Tower No. 3 (Hurel). Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP7, PL3, GD1, GD3, GD5, GD6, GD9, NE1, NE2, NE3, HE1, H1, H2, H3, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT3, TT4, WER1, WER3, WER6, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) as follows: Disposal of Foul Sewage (2012), Density Standards Guidance (2023), 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 a previous application for the demolition of the existing dwelling and its replacement with a smaller 2 storey extension and the construction of 3 dwellings on the remainder of the site. This application had been refused by the Committee, as previously constituted, in May 2022 (planning application reference No. P/2021/0870 refers). A subsequent application for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the construction of one x 4 bedroom and one x 5 bedroom 2 storey dwellings had been refused by the Committee in March 2024 (planning application reference No. P/2023/0530 refers) due to concerns over the proposed design.

The Committee was advised that permission was sought for the demolition of an existing 2 storey property and its replacement with 2 new dwellings. It was noted that an evergreen oak was sited within the north-eastern area of the garden, which had been Listed with a full Tree Preservation Order (Order No. T/2020/0001 refers). The proposed replacement dwellings would align with the surrounding area and be similar in scale. The impact on the setting of the nearby Conway Tower No. 3 (La Hurel) would remain unchanged and the scheme would improve the broader landscape context.

It was noted that the development sought to protect and enhance biodiversity and the provision of habitats, including the preservation of the Listed tree. The proposed dwellings exceeded the internal residential space standards and provided sufficient private amenity space, with adequate outlook, daylight and sunlight penetration and privacy. The proposal would not result in an unreasonable impact on residential amenities of neighbouring amenities. Adequate off-street car parking and bicycle storage was proposed and a public footpath and space for a bus shelter would also be provided by the applicant and secured by way of condition. Although the proposed footpath would not link with any other footpaths, it formed part of an incremental strategy to secure pedestrian accessways and develop safe road infrastructure.

Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, having taken into account the relevant Policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and all material considerations. Approval would be subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the Department report.

8 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Infrastructure and Environment Department, who advised that there was a risk of the Listed tree being affected by the development and that a condition was proposed which would require its replacement in the event of its demise.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Infrastructure and Environment Department, who advised that the proposed public footpath would improve public safety and visibility. Additionally, securing a space for a bus shelter would safeguard the future provision of such a facility. He confirmed that the Department would seek to take ownership of the public footpath in due course.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, regarding an alleged foreshore encroachment. He stated that the application site included reclaimed foreshore land owned by the public of Jersey, which was a material consideration. Approval of the proposals would result in the loss of public land and he referenced a number of cases where this had occurred. [REDACTED] also expressed concerns regarding the potential for localised flooding to occur as a result of

overtopping of the sea wall, which the application had failed to take into account. He urged the Committee to reject the application on the basis of the factors outlined above.

██████████, a neighbouring resident, addressed the Committee to outline his concerns regarding the inclusion of a space for a bus stop within the proposals. Whilst he had no objections to the redevelopment of the site in principle, he noted that there had been no consultation with local residents regarding the potential relocation of the existing bus stop. He explained that the current location was ideal and that relocating the bus stop to the application site would worsen road safety in the area. The potential relocation of the bus stop was not supported by local residents, though the public footpath was considered acceptable.

The Committee heard from the applicant's architect, ██████████ of TSA Studio, who explained that the proposed development sought to make a positive contribution to the sense of place and distinctiveness of the setting. The proposals considered the Listed tree and had been endorsed by the Historic Environment Team. In addition, the visual impact of the scheme had been reduced to address the previous reasons for refusal, and he urged the Committee to grant permission.

The applicant's legal representative, ██████████, addressed the Committee regarding the matter of the foreshore. He noted that the applicant had obtained legal advice in this connexion and reminded members that matters pertaining to the title of land did not constitute material planning considerations. Notwithstanding this, he confirmed that in his view, the proposals did not represent an encroachment upon the foreshore.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously decided to grant permission, subject to the imposition of the conditions set out in the Department report. In doing so, the Committee acknowledged the concerns that had been expressed regarding the location of the bus stop and requested that the conditions be amended to remove references to the construction of and transfer of the area of land required for the same. The Committee also requested that an informative be added to the permit regarding matters pertaining to the title of land.

No. 23
Duhamel
Place, St.
Helier: various
proposed
works.

RP/2024/0808

A4. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for various amendments to a previously approved scheme (planning application reference No. P/2019/1512 refers) at the property known as No. 23 Duhamel Place, St. Helier. The proposed amendments included the replacement of a rooflight, 3 windows to the east elevation and 2 dormer windows to the east and west elevations (with timber windows rather than UPVC as previously requested); the replacement of a flat roof with a mono-pitch roof; and the installation of a balustrade and staircase to the west elevation, together with various internal alterations. The construction of a pergola, 2 dormer windows and the renovation of railings were no longer proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 11th March 2025.

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

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was a Grade 4 Listed Building situated in the Built-Up Area and Primary Centre and on the Eastern Cycle Route Network. Policies SP3, SP4, PL1, GD1, GD6, HE1, HE2 and H1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to the Protection of Historic Windows and Doors (2025).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, including an application for the demolition of an existing and construction of a new extension, together with various alterations to fenestration, (planning application reference No. P/2019/1512 refers) which had been approved by the Department under delegated powers in January 2020. Permission had subsequently been sought for various revisions to P/2019/1512 (planning application reference No. P/2022/0810 refers), which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers in November 2022.

The Committee was advised that the proposed changes were considered to be acceptable in the location and would not unreasonably harm neighbouring amenities or the setting of the Listed Building. The application was therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies SP3, SP4, PL1, GD1, GD6, HE1, HE2 and H1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and was recommended for approval, subject to certain conditions detailed within the Department report.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

No persons present wished to speak for or against the application.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously endorsed the recommendation to grant permission, subject to the conditions outlined in the Department report.

Les Landes
Lodge, Le
Mont des
Landes, St.
Martin: various
proposed
external
alterations.

A5. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the conversion of an existing outbuilding to a pool house, including various external alterations, at the property known as Les Landes Lodge, Le Mont des Landes, St. Martin. The alteration of the roof pitch, roof covering and installation of roof lights was proposed, together with the construction of an external raised deck and steps and various alterations to fenestration. The Committee had visited the site on 11th March 2025.

P/2024/1182

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

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Protected Coastal Area, the Eastern Cycle Route Corridor and that Les Landes Lodge was a Grade 3 Listed Building. Policies PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, H9, HE1 and HE2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant to the application.

The Committee was advised that the proposed development would enhance the condition and appearance of the existing structure without causing unreasonable harm to neighbouring properties or the surrounding environment. The proposal also aligned with the 2022 Bridging Island Plan policies concerning Listed Buildings, the Protected Coastal Area and neighbouring amenities. Accordingly, the application was recommended for approval, subject to certain conditions detailed within the Department report.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

No persons present wished to speak for or against the application.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously endorsed the recommendation to grant permission, subject to the conditions outlined in the

Department report.

The Mount, Le Mont Rossignol, St. Ouen: proposed demolition of extension and construction of new extensions and 3 new dwellings (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 demolition of an existing extension and the construction of new extensions to convert a 5 bedroom dwelling into one x 2 bedroom, one x 3 bedroom and one x 5 bedroom dwellings at the property known as The Mount, Le Mont Rossignol, St. Ouen. Associated parking, stores, amenity spaces and alterations to the vehicular access onto Le Mont Rossignol were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 11th March 2025.

Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour did not participate in the determination of this application.

P/2024/0613

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Coastal National Park, the Protected Coastal Area and was a Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE2, NE3, H1, H2, H3, H4, H9, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER5, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant to the application. Attention was also drawn to the relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Parking and Residential Space Standards (2023) and the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Assessment.

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the basis that the proposals would cause a significant increase in occupancy. The proposed extensions would be visually dominant and disproportionate to the existing building and would be exacerbated by the irregular fenestration. The proposed alterations to the existing vehicular access would result in the loss of mature trees which failed to protect the landscape character of the area. Concerns were also expressed in connexion with inadequate capacity within the public sewage system to dispose of the discharge of sewage from the development. Consequently, the application was recommended for refusal on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies SP3, SP4, PL5, GD1, GD6, H9, WER7 and NE3 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 MS Planning Limited, who addressed the reasons for refusal. [REDACTED] advised that the application site had recently joined the foul sewerage network and, whilst this had occurred since the application had been refused, the Department had been informed. Alterations to the vehicular access were necessary to ensure highway safety and would involve the removal of a small number of self-seeded non-specimen trees, with the majority of the mature specimen trees being retained. The Committee was advised that revised plans for the access alterations had been submitted but had not been acknowledged by the Department. [REDACTED] noted that the proposals aligned with Bridging Island Plan 2022 Policies PL5, which supported the 'best use' of large sites, and H9, which stated that '*new homes would be supported in limited circumstances including the conversion, extension and/or subdivision of existing buildings*'. This was reinforced by the SPG relating to Housing Outside the Built-Up Area (2023). [REDACTED] advised that the proposed 3 new dwellings would not increase the potential occupancy of the site when compared with the capacity of the existing single 5 bedroom dwelling, which was currently under-utilised.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter, Chief Minister, Government of Jersey, in his capacity as Deputy of St. Ouen and a neighbour of the application site. [REDACTED] indicated his support for the

application and drew attention to the provision of affordable accommodation, which was a political priority, together with an aging population, lower birth rates and the exodus of young people from the Island. He added that Bridging Island Plan Policies had been redrafted to allow for the provision of new dwellings with the conversion and extension of properties in the countryside. [REDACTED] stated that the proposed extension and conversion would provide homes for the applicant's 2 children and their families, thereby reducing pressure on other first-time buyer providers. Furthermore, he felt that the scheme would improve the vista and landscaping of the area and urged the Committee to be pragmatic in its decision making.

Having considered the application, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report. In doing so, the Committee accepted that the drainage issue had been resolved but emphasised that, as this was a review, the reason for refusal was unable to be removed. The Committee urged the applicant to work with the Department on a revised scheme for the site.

14 - 16 Fig
Tree House,
Parade Road,
St Helier:
proposed
construction of
extension
(RFR).

P/2022/0705

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 construction of a vertical, one storey extension to create a second floor to the north-east elevation, at the property known as Nos. 14 - 16 Fig Tree House, Parade Road, St Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 11th March 2025.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was a Grade 3/4 Listed Building used as a care home, situated in a Primary Centre in the Built-Up Area, Green Backdrop Zone and was on the Eastern Cycle Route Network. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP7, PL1, GD1, GD3, GD6, GD8, GD10, NE1, HE1, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT3, TT4, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, which included an application for the construction of a first floor extension to the north-east elevation (planning application reference No. P/2016/0195 refers) and an application for the construction of a first floor balcony to the south-west elevation (planning application reference No. P/2016/0267 refers). Both applications had been approved by the Department under delegated powers in April 2016. A further application for various internal alterations to create 4 residents' rooms had also been approved by the Department under delegated powers in September 2021 (planning application reference No. P/2021/1090 refers).

The Committee was advised that the application site comprised one Grade 4 Listed Building and 2 Grade 3 Listed Buildings. The application sought permission to construct a vertical second floor extension, for the provision of 6 additional rooms. The Historic Environment Team (HET) had objected to the proposal on the basis that the development failed to protect the settings of the Listed Buildings on the site and those within the immediate area. The application had been refused on the grounds that the additional storey on the rear and sides of the building would be overly dominant, resulting in a detrimental impact upon the historic character of the Listed Buildings. Furthermore, the scheme represented a bulky addition which failed to be subordinate to the main building and would cause harm to the character of the surrounding area. The proposed development would also result in a significant increase in scale which would impact on the amenities of residents within the care home and those in adjoining properties. Consequently, it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application on the basis that it was contrary to Policies SP3, SP4, GD1, GD6, PL1 and HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], owner of an adjacent property, who advised that previous work undertaken on the application site had been disruptive to neighbours and residents of the care home. He stated that the proposed extension would impact on sunlight and daylight to the rear of his property and would be detrimental to his health and enjoyment of the garden and amenity areas.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of J Design Limited, who addressed the reasons for refusal of the application. He referred to the overshadowing analysis which had evidenced the effect of the proposed extension on neighbouring properties, and which had indicated little to no impact. [REDACTED] also felt that the Department assessment of the application had not considered the height of the surrounding buildings. He referred to the impact on the business of the closure of Glenferrie Care Home, creating the requirement for the extension and extra resident's rooms at Fig Tree House.

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

High-tor, Le
Chemin de
Herupe, St
John: proposed
construction of
extension
(RFR).

A8. 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 permission for the construction of 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.

P/2024/0981

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

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and a Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies SP2, SP4, PL5, GD6, HE1 and H9 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Parking and Residential Space Standards (2023).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, which included a similar application (planning application reference No. P/2024/0534 refers). The application had been refused by the Department under delegated powers in July 2024, on the grounds that it failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP4, GD6, HE1 and H9 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. An application for the construction of a carport and triple garage to the north of the site had been approved by the Department under delegated powers in October 2015 (planning application reference No. P/2015/1437 refers). A revision to this permission had been approved by the Department under delegated powers in January 2017 (planning application reference No. RP/2016/1705 refers).

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the size, siting and design of the proposed extension was considered to be disproportionate to the scale and character of the host dwelling. Furthermore, the scheme would have a harmful impact on the character and setting of the neighbouring Grade 4 Listed Building known as Herupe Cottage. Consequently, the proposals failed to meet the requirements of Policies SP4, GD6, HE1 and H9 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

11 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of X10D Design Limited, who advised that the applicant had made adjustments to the proposals following the refusal of planning application reference No. P/2024/0534. The windows had been changed to the style of the first floor windows of the host building and timber cladding would be used in order to blend with the character of the main dwelling.

The Committee heard from Connétable [REDACTED] of St. John, Minister for Infrastructure, Government of Jersey, in his capacity as Connétable of St. John. The Connétable referred to the existing 2017 permission for the construction of a carport and triple garage (as referenced above) and noted that the 2017 scheme was a far larger development than the current application. He added that the proposed extension would result in a modest addition to make the best use of the dwelling which was not a Listed Building. The Connétable noted that the Historical Environment Team had not objected to the application and that 2022 Bridging Island Plan Policies allowed for flexibility in connexion with such extensions.

The Committee was addressed by the applicant, [REDACTED], who advised that the extension was required to provide increased amenity space within the modest dwelling.

Having considered the application, the Committee decided to grant permission, contrary to the Department's recommendation, on the basis that the scheme was considered to align with Policies H1, H9 and GD6. In doing so the Committee requested a condition requiring samples of the proposed cladding materials to be submitted for approval by the Department.

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.

Clarendon
Grove
Apartments,
Upper
Clarendon
Road, St.
Helier:
proposed
installation of
fence and gate
(RFR).

P/2024/1064

A9. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers, and which proposed the installation of a timber fence and gate to the south and west of the property known as Clarendon Grove Apartments, Upper Clarendon Road, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 11th March 2025.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area, Primary Centre of St. Helier, Green Backdrop Zone, Urban Area and on the Eastern Cycle Route Network. Policies SP2, SP4, PL1, GD1, GD6, GD8 and TT2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant to the application. Attention was drawn to the relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in relation to the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (2023).

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the proposed fence and gate would be out of context and character with the surrounding roadside features. Furthermore, the proposed fence would create an obstruction or hazard to users of the pelican crossing which formed part of the existing network for pedestrians. Consequently, the application failed to meet the requirements of Policies GD1, GD6 and TT2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, and the application was recommended for refusal.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] Nova-Cad Limited, who stated that the proposed fence would not be out of context or character within the street scene as high fences had been installed on neighbouring properties. He added that concerns regarding the impact upon the pelican crossing was not known and that the reasons for refusal could have been addressed had the decision to refuse the application been relayed earlier. [REDACTED] noted that the fence would provide security and privacy to the occupants.

In response to question from the Committee, [REDACTED] advised that the fence could be fixed mechanically to the perimeter wall of the application site and that the fencing would not be in danger of collapse during adverse weather conditions, as the installation would be certified by structural engineers.

Having considered the application, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report. In doing so, the Committee suggested that the applicant explored alternative screening solutions, such as hedge planting.