

Planning Committee

(21st Meeting)

25th September 2025**Part A (Non-Exempt)**

All members were present, with the exception of Connétables R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen and D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence, Deputies A.F. Curtis of St. Clement, T.A. Coles of St. Helier South, and A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity, from whom apologies had been received.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity (Chair)  
 Connétable M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement  
 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour  
 Connétable M. Labey of Grouville  
 Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North

In attendance –

C. Carter, Planning Applications Manager  
 B. James, Planner  
 L. Davies, Planner  
 G. Vasselin, Planner  
 J. Gibbins, Planner  
 R. Hampson, Planner  
 L. Plumley, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A1 – 5)  
 E. Patterson, Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A1 – 5)  
 H. Roche, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A6 – 8)  
 C. Tucker, Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A6 – 8)

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

Minutes.	A1. The Minutes of the meeting of 4th September 2025, having been previously circulated, were taken as read and were confirmed.
Retreat Farm (Fields MY770 & L78), La Rue des Varvots, St. Lawrence: proposed chiller units and associated enclosure (PART RETROSPECTIVE).	<p>A2. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A7 of 4th September 2025, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the installation of chiller units with an enclosure at Retreat Farm, Fields No. 770, St. Mary, and No.78, St. Lawrence, La Rue des Varvots, St. Lawrence.</p> <p>The Committee recalled that it had been minded to refuse permission for the above application, 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 refusal.</p> <p>The Committee confirmed refusal of the application for the reasons set out in the Department report.</p>

P/2025/0124

Coppelia and Fieldings, Le Mont Pinel, St. Helier:  
proposed demolition and redevelopment.

A3. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition and redevelopment of 2 dwellings known as Coppelia and Fieldings, Le Mont Pinel, St. Helier to provide 5 x 3 bedroom dwellings with associated amenity space, a communal bicycle and refuse store, car and bicycle parking, landscaping and a new vehicular access onto Le Mont Pinel. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd September 2025.

P/2025/0144

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area, the Green Backdrop Zone and the Eastern cycle route network. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP7, H1, H2, H3, H4, PL1, GD1, GD5, GD6, GD8, GD10, CI6, CI8, NE1, NE2, TT1, TT2, TT4, 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), Density Standards (2023), Residential Parking Standards (2023) and Design Guidance for St. Helier (Character Area 10 – Town Edges and Slopes).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, to include a similar application (planning application reference No. P/2023/0799 refers) for the construction of 6 new dwellings (one x 4 bedroom and 5 x 3 bedroom) which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers in February 2024. An appeal had subsequently been dismissed by the Minister for the Environment in August 2024 (MD-ENV-2024-631 refers).

The Committee was advised that the proposed demolition of the existing dwellings, which were in poor condition, and the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes remained acceptable in principle. Following the refusal of the previous application, the scheme had been amended and the number of dwellings reduced from 6 to 5. The density and overall design of the scheme were considered acceptable in the context of the Green Backdrop Zone, and the surrounding area and the proposals met or exceeded the minimum residential space and parking standards. On balance, it was considered that the previous reasons for refusal had been overcome, and the application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions set out in the Department report.

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

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, who expressed concern regarding the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy and sunlight. He urged the Committee to consider the impact of the proposals on neighbouring properties and refuse permission.

[REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, highlighted the loss of green space arising from the proposals and expressed concerns regarding traffic intensification and pedestrian safety. She believed the existing dwellings on the site were capable of refurbishment and questioned whether the proposals represented the optimal solution for the site. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to refuse the scheme.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, who was of the view that the design was bland and unattractive, the scheme would result in the

overdevelopment of the site and would exacerbate highway safety issues. [REDACTED] highlighted the impact on neighbouring amenities and urged the Committee to refuse permission.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED], who referenced the work undertaken in consultation with the Department with regard to the revised scheme. He added that the scheme would deliver family homes in a sustainable location and urged the Committee to approve the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED], of MS Planning Limited, who highlighted the extensive engagement undertaken by the applicant with the Department to address the previous reasons for refusal. The existing dwellings were beyond economic repair, and the redevelopment of the site would deliver 5 high quality, much-needed family homes in a sustainable location in the Built-Up Area. The impact of overlooking had been carefully considered, and the scheme had been designed to integrate into the surrounding context, with particular regard to the Green Backdrop Zone. [REDACTED] outlined the highway safety improvements that would arise, to include a passing space on Le Mont Pinel. He did not believe that the proposals would result in the overdevelopment of the site and stated that the scheme met or exceeded the required space standards. In concluding, [REDACTED] highlighted the design-led approach which had informed the proposals and urged the Committee to grant permission.

In response to questions from the Committee, confirmation was received in respect of the following –

- the request of the Parish of St. Helier Roads Committee for an increase in the number of car parking spaces was considered unnecessary as the proposed car parking provision (8 spaces) significantly exceeded the minimum standards;
- the existing dwellings on the site were in a poor state of repair, with a number of structural defects;
- private amenity space exceeded the minimum standards, a communal open space was proposed, and landscaping would screen the development;
- potential overlooking had been comprehensively considered to address privacy concerns;
- a party wall to the south of the site would be repaired as necessary; and,
- an existing transformer would remain in its current location, following consultation with the Jersey Electricity Company.

Having considered the scheme, the Committee unanimously approved the application, subject to the imposition of the conditions set out in the Department report.

Les Minquiers,  
Le Mont Gras  
D'Eau,  
St. Brelade:  
proposed  
demolition and  
redevelopment.

A4. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition and redevelopment of an existing dwelling, outbuildings and tennis court at the property known as Les Minquiers, Le Mont Gras d'Eau, St Brelade and its replacement with a 4-storey block of 5 flats (comprising 2 x 2 bedroom and 3 x 3 bedroom units) with basement car parking, refuse and cycle storage, landscaping and amenity space. It was noted that alterations to the vehicular access were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd September 2025.

P/2025/0388

A plan, site drawings and 3-dimensional model were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Backdrop Zone, the Local Centre of St. Brelade's Bay in the Built-Up Area and Sustainable Transport Zone 5.

Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, H1, H2, H3, H4, PL3, GD1, GD6, GD8, G10, CI8, NE1, NE2, TT1, TT2, TT4, 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), Density Standards (2023) and Residential Parking Standards (2023).

The Committee was apprised of the relevant planning history of the site, which included a similar application (planning application reference No. P/2023/1371 refers) which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers in April 2024. An appeal against the decision had been dismissed by the Minister for the Environment (MD-ENV-2024- refers) in October 2024, and the reasons for refusal had subsequently been varied in December 2024 (MD-ENV-2024-952 refers). It was noted that the application had been refused on the basis of unreasonable harm to the amenities and privacy of future occupants and neighbouring uses, due to the close relationship with neighbouring properties to the east and west of the site and the absence of mitigation.

The Committee was advised that the demolition of the existing dwelling and the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes was considered acceptable, having effectively been agreed in principle as part of the appeal proceedings. The scale, design, layout and landscape impact of the proposal were also considered acceptable. The design of the scheme had been modified to address concerns regarding overlooking and privacy. The proposed building had been repositioned and reoriented within the site, to move it further away from the eastern boundary. Proposed wrap-around balconies at second floor level had been redesigned and reduced in size, with structural planters and obscurely glazed fins having been introduced to limit accessibility and views to the east and west. Landscape mitigation was also proposed by way of new boundary planting, to include the removal of existing Leylandii hedgerows and their replacement with evergreen trees and linear hedging of a sufficient size to provide immediate screening. The proposal was considered to accord with the policy framework of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions outlined in the Department report.

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

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] of Duffell Planning Limited, on behalf of neighbouring residents who objected to the proposals. She began by stating that no rationale had been provided to justify the variation of the reasons for refusal in respect of the previous scheme. Notwithstanding this, neighbouring residents remained concerned by the overbearing scale of the proposed development. [REDACTED] advised that Eden House and Maison St. Brelade would be severely impacted by the proposals, with unreasonable harm to amenities and loss of privacy. She highlighted the potential for overlooking from both the proposed first and second floor balconies. [REDACTED] questioned whether the proposed landscaping treatment would provide adequate screening and expressed concern regarding the impact on the Green Backdrop Zone. In concluding, she urged the Committee to refuse permission.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, who stated that the development would tower above neighbouring properties and would have an unreasonable overbearing impact. A significant loss of privacy would ensue, which

would not be addressed by the proposed landscaping arrangements. [REDACTED] also highlighted the need for the maintenance of the proposed planting. The potential for due to the proposed location of the basement car park entrance was also referenced. He urged the Committee to refuse the application due to the unreasonable impact on neighbouring properties.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, who outlined the impact of the proposed development on his property, Eden House. In addition to the overbearing impact resulting from the height of the proposed apartment block, its proximity to the boundary would lead to overlooking and loss of privacy. The proposed landscaping would not address this issue and [REDACTED] urged the Committee to refuse permission.

[REDACTED], a neighbouring resident addressed the Committee and echoed the views of previous speakers regarding loss of privacy and overbearing. She also highlighted highway safety issues arising from the proposed increase in density levels. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to reject the proposals in favour of a more modest and considered scheme.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED], who advised that the existing dwelling was dated and in a poor state of repair. [REDACTED] stated that refurbishment had been considered but was not economically viable. The proposed development would make better use of the site and deliver 5 units of residential accommodation, one of which would be retained by the applicant.

Whilst the applicant's intention to live in one of the units was noted, this did not constitute a material planning consideration.

The Committee heard from the applicant's landscape architect, [REDACTED], who advised that the existing Leylandii hedgerows were overgrown and nearing the end of their life. The proposed landscaping scheme included mature trees suited to the local climate, which would provide robust screening and would give rise to biodiversity improvements. [REDACTED] advised that planters measuring 1.6 metres high would be set back from the boundary to allow for planting of 4 to 6 metres high to replicate the existing arrangements. Significant aesthetic improvements would arise, together with improved access for ongoing maintenance. It was intended that the boundary landscaping treatment would be implemented at an early stage in the construction process, to allow for the planting to become established prior to completion of the development. In concluding, [REDACTED] stated that the proposals complied with the policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and urged the Committee to approve the application.

The applicant's agent, [REDACTED], of MS Planning Limited, addressed the Committee and highlighted the changes which had been made to the design and layout of the scheme to address the previous reason for refusal. These included the relocation and reorientation of the apartment block and revisions to the balconies and landscaping to address overlooking and privacy concerns. [REDACTED] reminded the Committee that overbearing impact had been removed from the reasons for refusal and that the proposals were therefore acceptable in this regard. The scheme would deliver increased density on the site and accorded with the strategic objectives of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to grant permission on this basis.

In response to questions from the Committee, the following was confirmed –

- the landscaping treatments to the boundary of the site would be completed at an early stage in the construction process (following the demolition of the existing dwelling) to allow planting to become established prior to the completion of the development;
- the landscaping scheme was achievable and included mixed evergreen planting and mature trees suited to local conditions; and,
- the new planting would tolerate pruning, in contrast to the existing Leylandii hedge, and would be set back from the boundary to allow for maintenance.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour, endorsed the Department recommendation to grant permission, subject to the imposition of the conditions detailed in the Department report. In doing so, the Committee requested that the conditions be amended to require the submission of a landscape phasing plan, with the precise wording to be agreed by Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair.

The Tree House Restaurant and Bar, La Marquanderie, St. Brelade: proposed extension and change of use.

A5. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A3 of 5th September 2024, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition of a conservatory and extension, the construction of a 2 storey extension and a change of use to staff accommodation at the property known as The Tree House Restaurant and Bar, La Marquanderie, St. Brelade. Alterations to the vehicular access and the creation of a new public footpath were also proposed, together with various external alterations. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd September 2025.

P/2025/0196

A site plan, drawings and 3-dimensional model were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Protected Coastal Area and Inland Flooding low-risk area. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, GD1, GD2, GD6, ER4, NE1, H1, H2, H3, H4, H9, H10, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER1, WER2, WER6, WER7 and UI3 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 (2023) and Planning Obligation Agreements (2017) and the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment.

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, which included an extant permission for the change of use of the site to a horticultural laboratory (P/2021/0123 refers), which had not been implemented. In addition, an application similar to that which was under consideration, had proposed the construction of ground and first floor extensions and a change of use to provide 25 units of staff accommodation (19 x one bedroom, 2 x 2 bedroom and 4 studios). This had been refused by the Committee in September 2024 (planning application reference No. P/2023/0701 refers).

The Committee was advised that the previous scheme had been revised to address concerns regarding scale, mass and design. Permission was sought for the creation of 22 units of staff accommodation, comprising 11 x one bedroom units, 2 x 2 bedroom units and 9 studio flats/bedsits, with a maximum anticipated occupancy of 44 persons. It was noted that whilst certain units did not meet the minimum space standards, smaller units of accommodation were acceptable in certain circumstances. A communal lounge area, laundry facilities, landscaping, revised site access and car and bicycle parking were also proposed. A Planning Obligation Agreement (POA) was recommended to secure a financial contribution of £44,151.70 towards enhancing bus services.

The Committee was advised that the provision of staff accommodation had to be considered in the context of competing policy objectives. The proposal was considered to meet the tests outlined in Policy H10 and an appropriate condition was proposed to control occupancy, specifically for hospitality staff working at 4 named hotels (the Golden Sands Hotel, the Somerville Hotel, the Hotel Cristina and L'Horizon Hotel and Spa). With regard to the proposed change of use, whilst it was acknowledged that a relatively limited marketing exercise had been undertaken, the overall benefit arising from the provision of staff accommodation for hotels in close proximity to the site was recognised. Flexibility was permitted in relation to the minimum space standards on the basis that the proposed accommodation was not designed for occupation on a permanent basis. Overall, the proposals were considered acceptable, and the application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions outlined in 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 a suitable POA could not be agreed within a set timeframe, the application would be returned to the Committee for further consideration.

13 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], residents of St. Brelade's Bay, who expressed concerns regarding the location of a proposed bus shelter. Due to the narrow width of the road, it was suggested that it would be difficult for vehicles to pass safely. [REDACTED] asked that consideration be given to widening the road. He also expressed concern regarding the size of some of the proposed units, which did not meet the minimum space standards. [REDACTED] highlighted the sensitive nature of the location and suggested that a residential or tourism use would be more appropriate.

The applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Duffel Planning Limited, highlighted the need for high-quality staff accommodation to support the tourism industry and noted that the scheme would provide 22 much needed units of staff accommodation in a sustainable location. The proposed POA would enhance sustainable transport options for staff occupying the units. [REDACTED] requested that, if permission was granted, proposed condition one, which related to occupancy be amended to remove the reference to the 4 named hotels to allow the units to be occupied by workers employed in the tourism industry.

The Committee heard from the applicant's architect, [REDACTED] of Morris Architects, who highlighted the changes made to the design and layout of the scheme to address the previous reasons for refusal. The proposal had been refined to address key policy considerations and would provide much needed staff accommodation to support the tourism industry. [REDACTED] advised that the proposed condition controlling the occupancy of the development was overly restrictive and requested that it be amended to refer to workers employed in the hospitality industry in St. Brelade.

In response to questions from the Committee, the following was confirmed –

- the proposals included the creation of a 1.5 metre wide public foot path which would be ceded to the Parish of St. Brelade; and
- the proposed accommodation would be professionally managed;

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously approved the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the Department report and the

entering into a suitable POA within a set timeframe to secure enhancements to the bus service. In doing so, the Committee specified that the conditions should remain as proposed and suggested, without prejudice, that the applicant submit a separate application which proposed changes to the condition relating to the occupancy of the units.

Beachcroft, La  
Cache du  
Bourg, St.  
Clement:  
proposed  
demolition and  
redevelopment.  
  
P/2024/1334

A6. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition of an existing dwelling and the construction of a new 4 bedroomed dwelling at the property known as Beachcroft, La Cache du Bourg, St. Clement. The construction of a garden and pool to the south-west of the site and associated vehicle parking to the north-east were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd September 2025.

Connétable M. O'D. Troy 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, Local Area, Shoreline Zone and was on the Eastern Cycle Route Network. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL3, GD1, GD5, GD6, GD9, NE1, H1, H2, H3, H4, TT1, TT2, TT4, ME1, WER1, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Parking Space Standards (2023) and Residential Space Standards (2025).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, to include an application which sought permission for the demolition of the dwelling known as Greta, La Cache du Bourg, St. Clement and the construction of a 2 bedroom dwelling with associated storage space and parking. This application had been approved by the Department under delegated powers on 28th November 2018 (application reference No. P/2018/1113 refers). Additionally, an application which sought permission for the demolition and redevelopment of the dwelling known as the Beach House (Villa Paloma), Le Bourg, La Grande Route de la Cote, St. Clement, had been approved in March 2017 (application reference Nos. RP/2017/0089 and P/2014/1119 refer).

The Committee was advised that amended plans had been received which reduced the height and depth of the proposed dwelling, in order to retain the ridge height of the existing structure. It was noted that the design, size and relationship of the dwelling with neighbouring properties had been specifically considered in the context of reducing noise and light impact and managing loss of privacy. The scheme was in keeping with other modern flat roof dwellings in close proximity to and the proposed glazing and materials were considered acceptable. The Infrastructure and Environment (IE) Transport Department had indicated that the development would not impact highway safety or traffic, and secure bicycle storage and an electric charging point were proposed to support sustainable methods of travel. The Department did not believe that the scheme would have an unreasonable impact on neighbouring amenities or harm the character of the area. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval in accordance with Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL3, GD1, GD5, GD6, GD9, NE1, H1, H2, H3, H4, ME1, WER1, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, subject to the imposition of certain conditions outlined in the Department report.

12 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], who objected to the application on the grounds that it posed a significant and irreversible impact on the character of the area. [REDACTED] stated that the oversized subterranean plot, which encompassed the proposed basement car parking area, encroached on the boundaries of neighbouring properties. He expressed concerns regarding the structural impact of the basement excavation works and referenced the sand composition of foundations in the area. [REDACTED] requested that further consideration be given to the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and urged the Committee to refuse permission.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], who was of the view that the overall size and mass of the proposed development would have an overbearing impact and that it would extend further south towards the shoreline than the existing structure. He highlighted a loss of light to the south elevation, which would have an impact on neighbouring properties. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to refuse permission.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] of MS Planning Limited, representing the residents of La Cache du Bourg. [REDACTED] stated that the scheme did not align with the policy constraints of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. He questioned whether the case had been made for the demolition of the existing dwelling given that it had been constructed in 1989 with no reported defects. The carbon footprint and costs associated with the proposed demolition and replacement of the dwelling were referenced. The excavation of 378 cubic metres of sand was proposed in order to accommodate the basement, with only 20 cubic metres being reused on the site. [REDACTED] referred to the overbearing impact of the proposed development and the effect this would have on privacy and light. He suggested that the proposed marble finishes were out of keeping with the context of the area and urged the Committee to refuse permission.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Duffell Planning Limited, who advised that the applicant had liaised with the Department in connexion with the revised application. [REDACTED] stated that the scheme would result in the replacement of a tired building with a high quality modern development. The inclusion of a lift in the development would future proof the property. [REDACTED] advised that construction waste would be managed and that the highway authority had not raised any concerns. She added that the development would sit comfortably within the context of the area and that there was no reference in the Department report to overbearing.

The Committee heard from the applicant's architect, [REDACTED], who outlined the extensive process involved in assessing all options for the site. It was noted that retrofitting would involve a substantial amount of work and the construction of a basement under the existing structure was not feasible. [REDACTED] concluded by stating that the scheme would result in a modern, energy efficient, sustainable dwelling.

In response to a question from the Committee, it was confirmed that the construction of the development would be overseen by engineering professionals and structural surveys would be undertaken.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously refused permission, contrary to the Department recommendation. The Committee did not believe that the case for demolition had been made and was concerned that the scheme would result in the overdevelopment of the site, which would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenities, contrary to Policies GD1 and GD5 of the 2022 Bridging

Island Plan.

Having recognised that its decision was contrary to the Department's recommendation, the Committee noted that the application would be re-presented at the next scheduled meeting for formal decision confirmation and to set out the reasons for refusal.

Land South of Palm Grove Farmhouse, Palm Grove, St. Helier: proposed car parking and landscaping (RETRO-SPECTIVE).

P/2025/0349

A7. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A7 of 16th March 2023, of the Committee as previously constituted, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought retrospective permission for the creation of a car parking area and associated landscaping on land to the south of the property known as Palm Grove Farmhouse, Palm Grove, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd September 2025.

Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North 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 adjacent to a Grade 3 Listed Building in the Built-Up Area, a Water Pollution Safeguard Area and Sustainable Transport Zone 2. Policies PL1, GD1, GD6, NE1, ERE1, HE1, TT4, WER5, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to the Landscape and Seascape Character Guidance (2023) and Residential Parking Standards (2023).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, including an application to formalise the access path to the woodland for the National Trust and the construction of a car parking area and associated gardens, which had been refused in March 2023 (planning application reference No. P/2022/1600 refers).

The Committee noted the details of the proposal and was advised that the impact of the development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area had been considered. Whilst the Historic Environment Team had expressed concerns regarding the potential impact of the proposal on the setting of the Grade 3 Listed Building known as Palm Grove, the Department was satisfied that there would be no harm to the special interest of the building. The design and scale of the car parking area, together with the proposed landscaping scheme, were considered to mitigate the visual impact of the development and integrate the vehicle parking area into the existing residential context. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval in accordance with policies GD1, GD6, ERE1, HE1, NE1 and TT4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, and subject to the conditions detailed in the Department report.

11 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbour and stakeholder in Palm Grove. [REDACTED] believed the car parking provision to be excessive, and he was concerned that approval would set an undesirable precedent for further development in the area. He added that commercial vehicles were required access to the area as some properties were not connected to the mains water supply.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] of St. Helier North, who supported the application and the creation of accessible vehicle car parking spaces for the benefit of residents. She added that the absence of street lighting in the area had

previously led to unsafe conditions for residents. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to approve the application in order to revitalise a previously underused area.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Steedman Planning, who advised that the applicant had consulted the Department in connexion with the retrospective application. [REDACTED] referred to a recent planning consent for a new dwelling in close proximity to the site, which highlighted the development and regeneration of the area. Consequently, [REDACTED] urged the Committee to support the Department's recommendation and approve the application.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously refused permission, contrary to the Department recommendation, on the basis that the scheme failed to satisfy the requirements of Policies SP4 and GD6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

Having recognised that its decision was contrary to the Department's recommendation, the Committee noted that the application would be re-presented at the next scheduled meeting for formal decision confirmation and to set out the reasons for refusal.

The Barn,  
Palm Grove,  
La  
Pouquelaye,  
St. Helier:  
proposed  
alterations to  
fenestration  
(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 installation of 2 first floor windows to the north elevation of the property known as The Barn, Palm Grove, La Pouquelaye, St. Helier. The replacement of one first floor window with a door and a Juliet balcony to the west elevation and the construction of a dormer window to the east elevation were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 23rd September 2025.

P/2025/0277

Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North 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 adjacent to a Grade 3 Listed Building in the Built-Up Area and a Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies SP2, SP4, PL1, GD1, GD6, HE1 and WER5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the scale, mass and visual dominance of the proposed dormer window would have a detrimental impact on the character of the host building and the surrounding area. The new fenestrations would have an unreasonable impact on neighbouring amenities in terms of increased overlooking and loss of privacy. Furthermore, it had not been possible to assess the potential harmful impact of the proposal on the setting of the adjoining Grade 3 Listed Building due to the absence of detailed information. Consequently, it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies GD6, GD1, SP4 and HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Historic Environment Officer, Historic Environment Team (HET), who advised that the large dormer window was not in keeping with the historical context of the site. Whilst it was acknowledged that the barn itself was not Listed, it formed part of a group of historic Listed Buildings. [REDACTED]

██████ suggested that consideration could be given to amended proposals which revised the scale and design of the window.

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

New hospital  
Overdale Site,  
Westmount  
Road, St.  
Helier –  
Update.  
  
P/2024/1025

A9. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A4 of 2nd February 2025, received an update in connexion with planning application reference No. P/2024/105, which related to the construction of the new hospital on the former Overdale Hospital site, Westmount Road, St. Helier.

It was recalled that the application had been unanimously approved by the Committee, subject to amendments to certain conditions detailed within the Department report. The Committee had also requested that the Planning Obligation Agreement (POA) specified when the permission for planning application reference No. P/2021/1670 would be rescinded. This was to prevent the implementation elements of both approved schemes.

The Committee was advised that agreement had been reached with the applicant with regard to the content of the POA and it had been signed on 24th September 2025. A Decision Notice would be issued in due course, and the Department would proceed to consideration of the conditions attached to the permit.

The Committee noted the position.