

Planning Committee

(18th Meeting)

19th June 2025

Part A (Non-Exempt)

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

Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement (Acting Chair)
Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen
Connétable M. Labey of Grouville
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
W. Johnston, Senior Planner
G. Vasselin, Planner
T. Hunter, Historic Environment Officer, Historic Environment Team (Item A8 only)
L. Plumley, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A1 – A5)
S. Nibbs, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A6 – A9)

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

Minutes.

A1. The Minutes of the meeting of 8th May 2025, having been previously circulated, were taken as read and were confirmed.

Le Tresor,
La Rue Ville
Es Gazeaux,
St. Lawrence:
proposed
demolition and
replacement of
garage.
(RFR)

A2. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A8 of 8th May 2025, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition and replacement of a triple garage at the property known as Le Tresor, La Rue Ville Es Gazeaux, St. Lawrence, with 3 single storey garages. The Committee had visited the site on 6th May 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 and the conditions which were to be attached to the permit.

P/2024/1298

The Committee confirmed approval of the application for the reasons set out in the Department report and on the basis of the conditions detailed therein, including a specific policy reference to Policy ERE5, confirming that the need for the building arose from the use related to the operations of a *bona fide* agriculturalist, as previously requested by the Committee.

Field No. 765,
La Rue de St.

A3. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the construction of a strategic drainage storage attenuation

Clément, St.
Peter:
proposed
drainage tank.

tank and ancillary infrastructure within Field No. 765, La Rue de St. Clément, St. Peter. Permission was also sought for modification of the vehicular access and access road, lighting columns, vent stacks and a kiosk. The Committee had visited the site on 17th June 2025.

P/2024/1285

Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen 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, adjacent to the Airport Operational Area and in Airport Noise Zone 3 and in a Water pollution Safeguard Area. Policies SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, SP7, PL5, UI1, NE1, NE2, NE3, GD1, GD6, HE1, HE5, WER1, WER2, WER5 and ERE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance relating to the Development of Contaminated Land (2017).

The Committee noted that permission was sought for the installation of a below ground concrete storage tank with an internal diameter of 25 metres to provide approximately 7,500 cubic metres of additional storage capacity in the St. Peter's catchment area. The tank would contain combined flows of sewage and surface water runoff during times of high rainfall to mitigate the risk of flooding and would terminate at ground level, with access hatches and associated concrete slab surrounds being the only visible element. 6 switch operated lighting columns 2.8 metres high would facilitate operational access at night, if required. The installation would be enclosed by a powder coated dark green fence measuring 1.8 metres high, with low-level bollards adjacent to the tank to prevent vehicular access onto the tank roof. 4 x vent stacks which would be 4 metres high would be situated on the tank roof to allow for air flow within the tank during emptying/filling. The existing access to the site would be retained and widened, with the loss of 2 trees.

The Committee was advised that the proposal had been identified as a key infrastructure project in the Liquid Waste Strategy 2023-26, which sought to provide the necessary infrastructure for the provision of affordable homes, as identified in the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Whilst some agricultural land would be lost, the residual land to the east of the tank would be returned to agriculture. The environmental impact would be mitigated/managed via the use of planning conditions. On balance, it was considered that the public benefit would outweigh any harm to the landscape character and the application was recommended for approval, subject to the conditions outlined in the Department report.

All representations received in connexion with the application had been included within the Committee's agenda pack, including a number of late submissions.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] on behalf of neighbouring residents who were concerned about the sustainability of the proposals, inconsistencies within the policy framework of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, procedural failings and a lack of transparency with regard to the proposals. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to refuse the application in its current form or alternatively, defer consideration of the application to allow residents' concerns to be fully addressed.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Head of Liquid Waste, Infrastructure and Environment Department, who outlined the strategic importance of the proposals. Similar facilities existed in the east of the Island with no noticeable odour or noise issues arising. Additional capacity was required to future proof the network and facilitate additional residential development.

[REDACTED], Capital Delivery Projects Lead, Infrastructure and Environment

Department, addressed the Committee and highlighted technical changes which had allowed for a reduction in the anticipated size of the tank, to 6,100 cubic metres. He outlined details of the proposed installation and the mitigation measures which were intended to address the concerns of nearby residents. [REDACTED] also provided details of the site selection process and noted that the proposals allowed for the future installation of odour control measures, should this prove necessary.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] of Andium Homes, who spoke in favour of the application, on the basis that the scheme would facilitate the development of affordable homes in the north and west of the Island, as envisaged in the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The scheme would also increase resilience for existing residents and address the impacts of climate change.

In response to questions from the Committee, the following responses were received

- no odour issues were anticipated as sewage would be stored in the tank on a temporary basis only;
- the proposed fencing would include measures to permit the passage of small animals through the site;
- public consultation had been undertaken in connexion with the proposals;
- the proposed construction methods included mitigation measures in respect of potential impacts on private water supplies and ground water movement;
- alternative sites had been assessed which had been considered unsuitable for various practical and technical reasons;
- the scheme would proceed only in accordance with the conditions proposed; and
- significant investment was required in order to upgrade the Island's drainage network, following historic underinvestment; and
- it was noted that, notwithstanding the comments made by [REDACTED] regarding a potential reduction in the size of the proposed tank, the application being determined by the Committee was that for a larger tank, as set out in the submitted application documents and the officer presentation.

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 requested that condition No. 12 be amended to require those parts of the site not occupied by the development to be leased to a *bona fide* agriculturalist.

Fields No. 594
and 595, La
Rue de La
Croix, St.
Ouen:
proposed
construction of
new dwellings.

A4. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the construction of 37 affordable homes on Fields No. 594 and 595, La Rue de La Croix, St. Ouen. Car and bicycle parking, private gardens, new vehicular and pedestrian access, landscaping and communal areas were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 17th June 2025.

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

P/2024/1482

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site had been designated for affordable housing and was situated in the Green Zone, Sustainable Transport Zone 6 and a Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP7, PL5, GD1, GD2, GD3, GD6, GD10, NE1, NE2, NE3, HE1, HE5, H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, C16, 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) relating to the Development Briefs for Affordable Housing (2023), Residential Space Standards

(2025), Residential Parking Standards (2023), Density Standards Guidance (2023), Planning Obligation Agreements (2017), and the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (2023).

The Committee noted that permission was sought for 37 new homes of mixed tenure comprising 17 social-rented dwellings (10 flats spread over 2 blocks, 2 bungalows and 5 houses) and 20 assisted purchase 2 storey homes, slightly above the minimum density requirements. Occupation of 12 of the social-rented dwellings (the flats and bungalows) would be restricted to individuals over the age of 55 years, and these units would be purchased and managed by the St. Ouen's Housing Association. It was anticipated that the remainder of the properties would be acquired by Andium Homes Limited, as the affordable housing provider for the site. It was noted that the scheme relied upon the completion of a strategic drainage storage attenuation tank in St. Peter (planning application No. P/2024/1285 and Minute No. A3 of the present meeting refer).

The Committee noted that the scheme would deliver 37 much needed affordable homes on a site designated for this purpose. The proposal had been designed to respond to the site constraints and aligned with the policy requirements of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and relevant SPG. The mix and density of housing was considered appropriate and was supported by the Strategic Housing and Regeneration Team. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, subject to the conditions outlined in the Department Report, and on the basis of the applicant entering into a suitable Planning Obligation Agreement (POA) to secure a contribution towards transport improvements (£183,000); a landscape and ecology management plan; affordable housing and the proposed tenure split; management and maintenance plans and the establishment of a residents' forum. In the event that a suitable POA could not be agreed within 6 months, 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, including a number of late submissions.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Principal Transport Planner, Infrastructure and Environment Department, who outlined various access and transport considerations which informed the design proposals. The proposed access route represented the only viable option and a condition requiring a road safety audit was proposed. The Committee was advised that following a change in approach, road safety audits would be required at an earlier stage in the process in future. The POA contribution towards transport improvements would be directed towards traffic calming measures to provide walking and cycle routes to the development and to improve the bus service.

The applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Godel Architects, addressed the Committee and highlighted the collaborative approach which had been adopted. The proposal featured a high quality design which responded to the local context and the scale, massing and materials had been carefully considered to reduce any visual impact and minimise overbearing. Ecological enhancements and sustainability measures were proposed and the scheme complied with the relevant policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to support the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Head of Strategic Housing and Regeneration, Cabinet Office, who advised that a pragmatic approach would be adopted with regard to the allocation of the age-restricted units within. Whilst Parish connections would be taken into account, it was anticipated that homes would be allocated to eligible persons through the Affordable Housing Gateway. [REDACTED]

confirmed that this would be addressed within the proposed POA.

██████████ of Andium Homes Limited addressed the Committee in support of the proposals. He advised that Andium Homes fully supported the application and that discussions were progressing with regard to the company's involvement. ██████████ highlighted the design quality and widespread support for the proposals and urged the Committee to approve the application.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously approved the application, subject to the imposition of the conditions set out in the Department report and on the basis of the applicant entering into a suitable POA, as detailed above. The Committee specified that any significant changes to the proposed housing tenure split should be approved by the Committee.

Traders House,
Nos. 1-3
L'Avenue Le
Bas, La Rue
des Pres
Trading Estate,
St. Saviour:
Proposed
demolition and
construction of
new
warehouse.

P/2025/0033

A5. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A8 of 11th January 2024, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition of the existing structures and the construction of a new warehouse at the property known as Traders House, 1 – 3 L'Avenue Le Bas, La Rue des Pres Trading Estate, St. Saviour. The proposals included alterations to the existing car park and landscaping improvements. The Committee had visited the site on 17th June 2025.

A site plan, drawings and a 3 dimensional model were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was a Protected Industrial Site situated in the Built-Up Area, a Local Centre, on the Eastern Cycle Route Network and a low and medium inland flooding risk area. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, PL3, GD1, GD2, GD3, GD5, GD6, GD10, NE1, NE2, NE3, EO1, EI1, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER1, WER2, WER6, WER7, ME1 and ME3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, which included a number of previous applications (planning applications Nos. P/2004/2048, P/2009/1956, P/2012/1676, P/2013/1129, P/2013/1175 and P/2023/0305 refer), the most recent of which had proposed the demolition of the existing building structures on the site and the construction of a new warehouse with a new vehicular access. Whilst the application had been approved by the Committee in February 2024, permission had subsequently been refused by the Assistant Minister for the Environment in October 2024, following a successful third-party appeal (MD-ENV-2024-752 refers).

The Committee noted that permission was sought for the demolition of the existing office building (Class C) on the site and the construction of a new warehouse (Class E). Alterations to the existing car park, landscape improvements and green walls were also proposed. No retail use was proposed, and the operational hours would be restricted as follows: 7am to 5pm - Monday to Friday and 8am to 12 noon on Saturdays, with no operation on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

The Committee was advised that the proposed development was considered acceptable in principle and the scale, mass and design of the scheme were in keeping with the local context. The proposals would not unreasonably impact the amenities of neighbouring properties or the existing ecology of the site. No highway safety or traffic concerns had been raised and the proposals would contribute towards sustainable forms of transport via a Planning Obligation Agreement (POA). Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, subject to the conditions outlined in the Department Report, and on the bases of the applicant entering into a suitable POA to secure a contribution towards improvements to the

Eastern Cycle Route Network (£47,607) and a bus enhancement subsidy (£4,629). In the event that a suitable POA could not be agreed within 6 months, the Department would be authorised to refuse the application.

All representations received in connexion with the application had been included within the Committee's agenda pack, including a number of late submissions.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Landscape Officer, Infrastructure and Environment Department, regarding the ecological aspects of the development. [REDACTED] advised that whilst the proposals required the removal of 5 mature trees, a tree protection plan, arboricultural method statement, detailed landscaping scheme and landscaping maintenance schedule would be required. Existing landscaping would be retained and new planting was proposed, to include 17 new trees, hedgerows and green walls.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] of MS Planning Limited, on behalf of neighbouring residents. [REDACTED] summarised the reasons for the refusal of the previous application, following the successful appeal and requested clarity with regard to the proposed use. He stated that it was imperative that the use was tightly controlled and restricted to dry storage/warehousing, as opposed to retail, which would have an impact on neighbouring amenities.

[REDACTED], representing neighbouring residents, addressed the Committee, outlining a number of concerns. These included a desire for the hours of operation during the demolition and construction phases to be controlled to minimise disruption and nuisance and the imposition of restrictions in relation to operational hours. Concerns were expressed with regard to the potential for future retail use and the associated impact on neighbouring properties. Residents also supported the retention of 3 lime trees to provide an attractive barrier to the site. [REDACTED] advised that a noise complaint relating to a similar industrial unit nearby was currently being investigated by the Environmental Health team.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident representing 7 households at Longueville Court. He concurred with previous speakers and expressed concerns regarding the potential for noise pollution if external machinery (such as air conditioning units) were required in future. [REDACTED] was also highlighted the loss of trees on the site following Storm Ciarán and the degree of protection which had been afforded by these trees against noise from the Trading Estate.

[REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, addressed the Committee and confirmed that the loss of trees at the site had resulted in increased noise pollution, which would be exacerbated if further trees were lost. She also confirmed that a noise complaint was currently being investigated by the Environmental Health team, with noise levels being monitored.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Godel Architects, who outlined the rationale for the proposals, which had been amended to address the previous reasons for refusal. Extensive consultation had been undertaken, and no retail use was proposed. No external plant or machinery was required and any future installations or changes in the use of the unit would require planning permission. The site was well screened and no changes were proposed in this respect, with expert advice having been obtained regarding the condition of existing trees on the site. The proposals aligned with the policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and [REDACTED] urged the Committee to grant permission.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously approved the

application, subject to the imposition of the conditions set out in the Department report, together with an additional condition restricting the use of the building to dry storage warehousing, such wording to be agreed by the Committee, and on the basis of applicant entering into a suitable POA. In doing so, members commented on the quantum of the contribution towards the Eastern Cycle Route Network, which was felt to be excessive in this instance, given the proposed use of the building. It was suggested that a degree of flexibility was required in this regard and the Committee directed that a recommendation be made to the Minister for the Environment in this connexion, in accordance with Article 9A of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002.

Union House,
Union Street,
St. Helier:
proposed
redevelopment.

P/2024/1418

A6. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the proposed redevelopment/change of use/extension of the property known as Union House, Union Street, St. Helier, for residential and commercial purposes. The Committee had visited the site on 17th June 2025.

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 and was on the Eastern Cycle Route Network. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, PL1, GD1, GD2, GD6, GD7, GD9, GD10, NE1, HE1, HE5, EO1, ER4, H1, H2, H3 and H4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to the Protection of Employment Land (2012), St. Helier Character Appraisal (2021), Residential Space Standards (2025) and Residential Parking Standards (2023).

The Committee was apprised of the planning history of the site, which included an approved application (now lapsed) for the conversion of the upper floors (planning application reference No. P/2020/0320 refers) to provide a residential unit. Most recently, an application for the change of use of the existing office accommodation to residential accommodation with 2 additional floors and extensions to the north elevation had been refused. The scheme had also included the creation of a ground floor coffee shop (planning application reference No. P/2024/0661) refers).

The Committee noted that the existing mixed use (residential/office accommodation) building comprised a 9 storey southern section and a 4 storey northern section. The application under consideration sought approval for the construction of one additional floor to the south section of the building, with a resultant increase to 10 storeys, and 4 additional floors to the north section of the building, with an increase to 8 storeys. A change of use was also sought in respect of the existing office accommodation to facilitate the creation of 21 new residential units with balconies and external stores. The scheme included the retention and refurbishment of the existing residential units, and a coffee shop with a covered seating area at ground floor level. Associated car parking, bicycle storage and landscaping were also proposed. The Committee was advised that the previous reasons for refusal were considered to have been addressed, and attention was drawn to revisions to Supplementary Planning Guidance in relation to residential space and car parking standards, which were relevant in the context of the proposals. Concerns regarding noise from the proposed café had been addressed by restricting opening hours and the imposition of conditions in relation to lighting. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval on the basis that the scheme accorded with the relevant Bridging Island Plan Policy context. The location of the site was considered acceptable for a development of the scale proposed, with the presence of other buildings of a similar scale providing an established context. The proposed new residential units would provide a good standard of accommodation which accorded with residential space standards and the improvements to the layout of the existing residential accommodation and the provision of amenity space were noted.

The scheme was not considered harmful to neighbouring amenities, to include the setting of nearby Listed Buildings in an area which had undergone significant contextual changes.

Approval was recommended subject to the imposition of certain conditions and the entering into of a Planning Obligation Agreement (POA), as detailed within the Department's report. The POA sought to secure financial contributions towards the Eastern Cycle Route Network and play area facilities. In the event that a suitable POA could not be agreed within 6 months, the Committee was requested to authorise the Department to refuse the application.

6 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee received [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] of MS Planning Limited, representing the applicant. [REDACTED] highlighted the relevant Island Plan Policy context and the benefits which would arise from the scheme. He confirmed that the applicant was satisfied with the conditions proposed in relation to the hours of operation of the café.

Having considered the application, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to grant permission, subject to the conditions detailed within the Department report and on the basis of the entering into of a POA, as set out above. In doing so, the Committee requested that condition No. 8 be amended to require the submission of a sample of the cladding material to be used on the exterior of the building for approval by the Department.

La Trigale, La
Route de
L'Eglise, St.
Lawrence:
proposed
cattery and
construction of
retaining wall
(PART
RETROSPEC
TIVE).

P/2023/0345

A7. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A2 of 5th December 2024, considered a report in connexion with an application which proposed the construction of a cattery with 13 boarding units at the property known as La Trigale, La Route de L'Eglise, St. Lawrence. Retrospective permission was also sought for the construction of a concrete deck and retaining wall. The Committee had visited the site on 17th June 2025.

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

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and a Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies SP2, SP3, SP5, SP6, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, ERE2, TT1, TT2 and WER6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee recalled the planning history of the site, to include an approved application for the construction of a 2 storey extension to the north elevation of the property and the replacement of the existing conservatory with a new sun room (planning application No. P/2022/0383 refers). The Committee was advised that works were underway on site in connexion with the approved scheme.

Most recently, an application for the construction of an outbuilding comprising 13 cattery boarding units and a retaining wall (retrospective) had been refused by the Committee in December 2024, on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies PL5, GD6, NE2 and NE3 (planning application No. P/2024/0673 refers). The application under consideration sought to address the concerns expressed in relation to the previously refused scheme by providing additional landscaping and planting. Vehicular movements associated with the proposed use were considered to be minimal and there had been no objections from the relevant highway authority. Similarly, the Environmental Health team had raised no objections in connexion with noise or odour nuisance.

It was noted that the 2022 Bridging Island Plan made provision for rural economic development where there was no harm to the landscape character and the Department was satisfied that the proposals were discreet and constituted a low key commercial operation which would not unreasonably harm neighbouring amenities. Consequently, it was recommended that permission be granted, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the officer report.

The Committee noted that a number of letters of support for the application had been received, together with 9 letters of objection and copies of the same had been included with the Committee's agenda packs.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, who spoke against the application. [REDACTED] did not believe that the scheme overcame the previous reasons for refusal or that it was supported by a proper business case. He was of the view that the proposed landscaping scheme was inadequate and did nothing to compensate for the removal of trees from the application site. He also stated that, as a member of the Parish Roads Committee, he was not convinced that the absence of comments from the highway authority could be interpreted as support for the scheme. [REDACTED] concluded by expressing concerns regarding the suitability of the existing access driveway for the intended purpose and the ability to manoeuvre on site.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED], who highlighted the revisions to the scheme since the refusal of the previous application, to include landscaping details. It was noted that the number of cat pens had also been reduced and these would be installed on an existing area of hardstanding. With regard to the retrospective elements of the scheme, [REDACTED] advised these issues had arisen as a result of a lack of awareness/understanding.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Page Architects, who was confident that the proposed landscaping scheme would address the concerns expressed previously. The scheme had been carefully considered to provide a safe environment for cats.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], an animal behaviourist, who highlighted the significant differences between the operation of a cattery and dog kennels, with particular regard to noise and odours.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], who suggested that if concerns existed regarding the loss of trees, more could be planted on a strip of land to the east, which was in her ownership. She also drew attention to the number of new trees which had been planted in the area.

The Committee, with the exception of [REDACTED] of St. Clement, concluded that it could not support the application on the grounds that the scheme did not overcome the concerns previously expressed. Consequently, the application was refused, contrary to the Department's recommendation. The Committee noted that the application would be re-presented at the next scheduled meeting for formal decision making and to set out the reasons for refusal.

Le Port Car
Park, La
Grande Route
des Mielles, St.
Peter:

A8. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which sought retrospective permission for the siting (on a permanent basis) of a portacabin with additional attached structures, to the south of Le Port Car Park, La Grande Route des Mielles, St. Peter. The Committee had visited the site on 17th June 2025.

proposed
installation of
portacabin
(RFR)
(RETROSPEC
TIVE)

P/2024/1226

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Protected Coastal Area, the Coastal National Park and Airport Noise Zone 3. The application site was a designated Archaeological Site and a Grade 3 Listed German defensive structure was situated to the south-east. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, PL5, GD1 and GD6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted that a time limited permission had been granted in 2018, for the portacabin to be remain on the site from May to October annually. The permit had expired on 1st July 2023, but the portacabin remained *in situ*.

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to the strategic objectives of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, which required the majority of new development to be concentrated within existing built-up areas. Whilst the proposed development supported an existing business (Le Port Surf School) and was therefore compliant with Policy SP6, it was contrary to Policy PL5, which required new development to protect or improve the special landscape and seascape character of the Protected Coastal Area and the Coastal National Park. The application was also considered to be contrary to Policies C15 and NE3. Consequently, the application had been refused on these grounds and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Historic Environment Officer, Historic Environment Team, who outlined the sensitivity of the area from both a historic and heritage perspective. Particular reference was made to the impact of the proposal on the setting of a German bunker and gun emplacement, and for this reason the application could not be supported.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], who spoke on behalf of the applicant. [REDACTED] confirmed that the applicant had been unaware of the planning issues when he had purchased the business. He wished to regularise matters in order to continue operating and the use of the portacabin was essential for storage purposes.

The Committee sympathised with the applicant's position and recognised the community benefit of the business. However, the application as submitted was difficult to properly assess and the accuracy of the drawings presented some challenges. Consequently, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out above but encouraged the applicant, without prejudice, to work with the Department and submit a revised application.

Richmond, La
Grande Route
de St. Clement,
St. Clement:
proposed
extension
(RFR).

P/2024/0753

A9. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers, and which sought permission for the construction of a 2 storey extension to the south elevation of the property known as Richmond, La Grande Route de St. Clement, St. Clement. Various external alterations, to include new surface drainage were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 17th June 2025.

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 Built-Up Area and was on the Eastern Cycle Route Network. Policies SP2, SP3, PL3, GD1, GD6, NE1, H1, H2, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted the planning history of the site, which included an approved application for the demolition of existing structures and the construction of new single storey extensions to the east and south elevations.

The application under consideration proposed a 2 storey extension to the south of the existing building, to include a double garage (with tandem car parking) at ground floor level and a one bedroom flat above the garage (with the bedroom of the new flat being located within the principal dwelling). The application had been refused on the grounds that the form and design of the proposed extension was considered unsympathetic and harmful to the character of the local area, contrary to Policies SP3 and GD6. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Origin Architecture, who highlighted the need for housing in the Island and the benefits which would arise from the scheme. The application was considered to accord with the relevant policy context and there would be no unreasonable harm to neighbouring amenities or to the character of the area.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED], who advised that the proposed accommodation would be used by family members who were currently renting accommodation.

Having considered the application, the Committee was satisfied that the application complied with the relevant policy context, to include Policy GD6. Consequently, permission was granted, contrary to the Department recommendation and it was noted that the application would be re-presented at the next scheduled meeting for formal decision confirmation and the approval of any conditions which were to be attached to the permit.