

Planning Committee

(24th Meeting)

4th December 2025**Part A (Non-Exempt)**

All members were present, with the exception of Connétables K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour and D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence, from whom apologies had been received.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity (Chair) (items A1 – A5)
 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement (Vice Chair) (not present for items A1 – A3)
 Connétable M. Labey of Grouville
 Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen
 Connétable M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement
 Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity
 Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North
 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South

In attendance –

C. Carter, Planning Applications Manager
 M. Jones, Planner
 C. Jones, Planner
 S. Jones, Planner
 S. De Gouveia, Planner
 W. Johnson, Planner
 L. Davies, Planner
 R. Hampson, Planner
 L. Plumley, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A1 – A8)
 S. Nibbs, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A1 – A7)
 H. Roche, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A8 – A11)

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

Minutes.	A1. The Minutes of the meeting of 6th November 2025, having been previously circulated, were taken as read and were confirmed.
Planning Committee – Procedures and arrangements	A2. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A5 of 10th March 2021, of the Committee as previously constituted, received and noted a report, entitled ‘Planning Committee – procedures and arrangements’ which had been prepared by Mr. C. Carter, Planning Applications Manager, Infrastructure and Environment Department, together with 2 appendices (‘Appendix 1 - Agreement between the Chief Officer and the Planning Committee’) and ‘Appendix 2 - Planning Committee Members Code of Conduct’).

Having heard from the Planning Applications Manager in this connexion, the Committee was asked to –

- endorse the agreement as indicated in Appendix 1 to enable functions to be appropriately allocated between the Planning Committee and the Chief Officer, Regulation Directorate, Infrastructure and Environment Department;
- adopt the Code of Conduct for the Planning Committee, as indicated at Appendix 2; and
- provide recommendations on planning policy on a monthly basis as appropriate, for consideration by the Minister for the Environment and inclusion in the annual report in accordance with Article 9A (6) and (7) of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002.

Having considered the matter, the Committee agreed the above, subject to a minor typographical amendment. It was noted that the documents would be published in due course.

Rochemer, La Grande Route de la Côte, St. Clement:
proposed demolition and construction (RFR).

P/2025/0381

A3. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A9 of 6th November 2025, 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 ground and first floor extensions to the south elevation of the property known as Rochemer, La Grande Route de la Côte, St. Clement. The removal of the roof and the construction of a second-floor extension was also proposed, together with the partial demolition and extension of a detached garage to the south of the site, various internal and external alterations and new hard and soft landscaping to include a split-level terrace. The Committee had visited the site on 4th November 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.

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.

Field No. 694, La Rue des Alleurs, Grouville:
proposed polytunnel, shed, access track, turning area and trellising.

P/2025/10148

A4. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the installation of a polytunnel, the construction of an agricultural shed and associated access track, turning area and agricultural trellising on Field No. 694, La Rue Des Alleurs, Grouville. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd December 2025.

Connétable M. Labey of Grouville did not participate in the determination of this application.

Members were advised that as the applicant was a States Member, the Committee was required to determine the application, in accordance with agreed procedures.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone, a Flood Risk Zone and was on the Eastern Cycle Route Network. A Grade 3 Listed wellhead (Croix de La Bataille) was located on an adjacent parcel of land. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, PL5, ERE5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE2, NE3, HE1, TT1, TT2, TT4, 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 Parking Guidelines – Policy Note 3 (September 1988) and the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape

Character Assessment.

The Committee noted that permission was sought for the construction of an agricultural storage shed which would be 7 metres wide, 21 metres long and 3.8 metres high (147 square meters in total), to provide secure storage for machinery, seeds, grain and fertiliser and the drying and processing of produce (predominantly hops and barley). The building would be flat roofed and timber clad, with solar panels and a toilet. The polytunnel would be 3 metres tall, 6 metres wide and 20 metres long (120 square metres in total) and would be used for the growing of seedlings, saplings and exotic botanicals. A series of 6 metre high hop trellis poles 3 metres apart in rows of varying lengths would be located to the north and east of the proposed buildings. A composting area was proposed to the west of the proposed polytunnel. The existing access to the field would be altered to improve visibility splays and a new hoggin pathway would be created along the western boundary of the field to allow agricultural machinery and tractors to access the site. 2 car parking spaces would also be provided.

The Committee was advised that the proposals were considered acceptable in principle and that sufficient justification had been provided to evidence the need for the proposed development in this sensitive location. The proposals would support the expansion of a bona fide agricultural business, and the environmental impact was considered acceptable. On balance, the economic benefits and mitigation measures would outweigh any harm to the landscape character and the impact on neighbouring residential amenity was not considered unreasonable. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, subject to certain conditions outlined in the Department report.

45 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], representing a number of neighbouring residents at Clos de Roncier. She expressed concerns regarding the 'industrial' scale of the proposed development. Whilst some forms of development in the countryside such as solar arrays were considered acceptable, the impact on neighbouring amenities was considered unreasonable and concerns were also expressed regarding traffic intensification. The height of the proposed trellis poles was considered excessive and out of keeping with the surrounding area. [REDACTED] noted that there had been no engagement with residents of Clos de Roncier and stated that alternative locations should be considered. In concluding, she advised that the proposals were not appropriate in this sensitive area and urged the Committee to reject the application.

The Committee heard from the applicants, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], of La Côte Distillery. [REDACTED] referenced the character of the area, which bordered the primary route network and residential properties in the Built-Up Area. Neighbouring residents had been consulted on the proposals but as Clos de Roncier was 100 metres from the proposed shed, the impact was considered minimal, and residents had not been contacted directly. The site had been carefully chosen, following a lengthy site selection process and was considered suitable for the intended purpose. The storage and drying of crops was an agricultural process and not industrial. The proposed facilities were modest and were essential for the processing of crops. The height of the proposed trellis poles was dictated by the crops which required space to climb. Vehicle movements would be in the order of one to 3 per day, which was not considered excessive. The proposals were supported by the policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, and the scheme had been carefully

designed to minimise any impact on neighbouring properties, with sustainability being a key consideration. Solar panels and biodiversity improvements were being proposed.

██████████ outlined the business objectives and advised that all production would be undertaken in-house. The proposed polytunnel and market garden would support the production of local and seasonal flavourings and reinvigorate the local brewing industry. Ms. Fauvel stated that there was a proven need for the facility and urged the Committee to support the diversification of the rural economy.

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

- the proposed trellis poles would be evenly spaced, with between 2 and 4 poles per row, and these would be installed to a depth of one metre and could be removed if necessary;
- a plant and drying room within the proposed shed would be fully insulated and it was not anticipated that any noise or odour nuisances would arise;
- a market garden was planned to the east of the proposed polytunnel;
- communications had been sent to nearby residents, including a property on Rue a Don;
- hops were a perennial crop and the plants would remain in the ground for up to 30 years, with pruning being undertaken in the autumn;
- trial planting of barley was planned in a separate field nearby, which was also in the ownership of the applicant;
- craft malting processes would be used, including static malting beds; and
- borehole water was available for irrigation purposes.

Having considered the proposals, the Committee unanimously approved the application, subject to the conditions outlined in the Department report.

Retreat Farm,
La Rue des
Varvots, St.
Lawrence:
proposed
acoustic
enclosure and
retention of
chillers.
(PART
RETROSPEC
TIVE)

P/2025/10234

A5. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A7 of 4th September 2025, considered a report in connexion with a part retrospective application which sought permission for the retention of some existing chiller units at the property known as Retreat Farm, La Rue des Varvots, St. Lawrence. The construction of an acoustic enclosure around the chillers, new landscape bunding, planting and screening were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd December 2025.

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, a Water Pollution Safeguard Area and Sustainable Travel Zone 6. The site housed an agricultural glasshouse used by Northern Leaf Plc (the applicant company) for the cultivation of medicinal cannabis, with ancillary plant and equipment and associated car parking, along with a larger (partially demolished) glasshouse to the northwest. Policies SP1, SP2, SP4, SP5, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, HE1, ERE1, ERE2, TT2, WER6, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Guidance (2023). The Committee noted that an Environmental Impact Assessment had been submitted as part of the application.

The Committee recalled the complex and protracted planning history of the site, which included a previous part retrospective application for the retention and enclosure of the chillers, which had been refused by the Committee in September 2025 (planning application reference number P/2025/0124 refers). The reasons for

refusal had included design quality, landscape harm, visual impact, and insufficient information in respect of the proposed landscaping scheme. It was noted that a first party appeal had been lodged in respect of P/2025/0124 and this was due to be considered on 17th December 2025. The Committee further recalled that an enforcement notice had been issued in respect of the chillers (ENF/2023/00004 refers) and that an application for Judicial Review by the Royal Court had been withdrawn on 13th March 2025. The compliance date for the enforcement notice had subsequently been varied to 13th September 2025.

The Committee noted that permission was sought for the retention of the chillers, the construction of an enclosure around the units, 2 adjoining tanks and a plant room. A single pitched roof, portal framed building was proposed, measuring 49 metres by 13 metres by 4.7 metres. The proposed enclosure had been reduced in height and length to reflect standard agricultural design and scattered planting was planned. Kingspan cladding would be used on the walls and roof respectively (green metal profiled cladding had been proposed previously), with acoustic panels in the walls and acoustic louvres in the roof panes to mitigate sound emissions. A 3 metre by 7 metre landscape bund was proposed to the southern and western elevations of the proposed building, along with reinforced planting and tree screening.

The Committee was advised that the use of the site for cannabis production was established and that the chillers generated noise, which had led to complaints. However, they were essential to the operation of the business and needed to be regularised and housed within a suitably designed structure. Sufficient information had been provided to indicate compliance with Policy GD1 and the Department did not believe that the proposal would have an adverse impact on residential amenity. The proposed materials, design, scale and appearance were considered acceptable. Ecological impacts would be suitably addressed, and the scheme had been revised to overcome the previous reasons for refusal. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, subject to certain 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], representing neighbouring residents. [REDACTED] stated that following the unsuccessful Royal Court appeal, the applicant had been required to remove the unauthorised chillers and failure to do so amounted to contempt of court. [REDACTED] questioned whether the proposed conditions relating to the implementation of the scheme were realistic, given that the applicant had indicated that the works would most likely require 6 months to complete. She was concerned that the noise disturbance, which was causing significant and unreasonable harm to neighbouring amenities, would continue due to the continued operation of the chillers. She expressed reservations regarding the technical specifications of the proposed building and doubted that sufficient noise abatement could be achieved. The proposals would exacerbate pre-existing harm to the landscape character, would industrialise the Green Zone and would have a negative impact on biodiversity. [REDACTED] believed that neighbours who were opposed to the proposals had been discouraged from speaking and she urged the Committee to reject the proposals.

[REDACTED], representing [REDACTED], an adjacent landowner, addressed the Committee. She reminded members that the chillers had been installed in 2021 without planning permission and remained unlawfully on the site. Similarly,

megablock walls and haybales had also been unlawfully installed. Endorsing the applicant's conduct would set a dangerous precedent and encourage others to behave in a similar fashion, making a mockery of the planning system. [REDACTED] highlighted the applicant's 'poor track record' in the context of compliance and longstanding issues related to operations undertaken on the site, which included noise disturbance and odour pollution. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] advised that technical specifications had not been provided until just prior to the meeting, and accordingly, she requested that the Committee defer consideration of the application to enable an informed decision to be made. Alternatively, she urged the Committee to refuse the application based on the unreasonable impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], representing [REDACTED], a nearby property. [REDACTED] concurred with points made by previous speakers, noting that the applicant was making a mockery of both planning and legal processes. She suggested that the Committee should not feel compelled to grant permission for machinery which was *in situ* and had been installed without the necessary consent. [REDACTED] questioned whether the proposals would successfully mitigate the noise disturbance and highlighted safety concerns, noting that 3 fires had occurred on the site. She stated that no assessment had been undertaken in connexion with the impact on bats and urged the Committee to reject the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], representing the applicant company, Northern Leaf Plc. Whilst historic issues were acknowledged, extensive efforts had been made to engage with neighbouring residents to improve community relations and address outstanding matters. [REDACTED] highlighted the company's international profile, adding that 50 members of staff were employed and 100 per cent of the product was exported, principally to Germany. The proposals supported diversification of the rural economy and would resolve the noise disturbance from the chillers, which were essential to the operation of the business. Biodiversity improvements were also proposed, and [REDACTED] urged the Committee to support the application.

The applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of HD Planning and Design, addressed the Committee. He advised that the proposals had been revised to address the previous reasons for refusal. The scale and height of the proposed building had been reduced, the design and appearance improved, landscape and biodiversity improvements were proposed, and extensive community engagement had been undertaken. The retention of the chillers was essential to the successful operation of the business, and the proposed enclosure represented a permanent, engineered solution which was designed to mitigate noise impacts. The applicant was committed to addressing historic issues and being a responsible neighbour. [REDACTED] stated that, for technical reasons, a 6 month timeframe for implementation was required, rather than the 3 months specified in the Department report and requested that the relevant condition be amended to this effect, in the event that the application was approved. He noted that there had been no objection from the Environmental Health Department and that the proposals complied with the policy requirements of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. He urged the Committee to grant permission.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Manager, Housing and Nuisance Team, Environmental Health Department, who advised that a noise abatement notice was in place. The method of compliance proposed was acceptable, as were the proposed mitigation methods. [REDACTED] further advised that, if the enclosure was constructed in accordance with the specification, noise attenuating to an acceptable level could be achieved. Compliance with the noise abatement notice would be assessed once

the development was completed (if approved), and any future nuisance complaints would be investigated fully in accordance with procedures.

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

- legal advice had been sought in relation to the current status of the enforcement notice and the applicant was not considered to be in contempt of court;
- fire hydrants were present on the site;
- the chillers operated 24 hours a day and automatically maintained the required temperature, with noise assessments having been undertaken when they were running at maximum capacity;
- concrete would be removed prior to the construction of the proposed landscape bund; and
- a 6 month implementation period was required due to the planned methods of construction, which would require the production of bespoke fabricated parts.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen, decided to grant permission, subject to the conditions outlined in the Department report. In doing so, the Committee agreed to extend the period specified for the completion of the development from 3 months to 6 and directed that the conditions be amended to reflect this.

Lucas House,
St. Clement's
Road, St.
Helier:
proposed
demolition and
redevelopment.

P/2025/0767

A6. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition and redevelopment for residential and commercial purposes of the property known as Lucas House, St. Clement's Road, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd December 2025.

Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South did not participate in the determination of this application. As Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair was not present for the remainder of the meeting, Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement, Vice Chair, acted as Chair.

A site plan, drawings and 3-dimensional model were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area, was on the Eastern Cycle Route Network and medium risk coastal flooding area. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, SP7, PL1, GD1, GD2, GD3, GD5, GD6, GD10, EI1, H1, H2, H3, H4, NE1, ME1, CI8, TT1, TT2, TT3, 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), St. Helier Design Guide (2023), Density Standards (2023), Site Waste Management Plans (2013) and Protection of Employment Land (2012).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, which included a similar previous application for the demolition and redevelopment of the site, which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers in January 2025 (planning application reference No. P/2024/0652 refers). The application had proposed the construction of 32 residential units (18 x one bedroom, 12 x 2 bedroom and 2 x 3 bedroom), a commercial unit and 13 car parking spaces. The proposal had been refused due to the design and scale of the proposed development, which was considered incongruous and overly dominant, having a detrimental impact on the character of the area and on neighbouring residential amenities. Planning permission had also been refused at a Ministerial Hearing on 7th June 2013, for a scheme which proposed the demolition of the buildings on the site and the construction of 16

residential dwellings (later amended to 15 dwellings) with basement car parking (planning application reference P/2010/1422 refers).

The Committee noted that permission was sought for the demolition of the buildings on the site (with an electricity substation being retained) and the construction of a mixed-use development comprising 29 residential units (15 x one bedroom, 13 x 2 bedroom and one x 3 bedroom unit) split across 3 blocks, together with a commercial unit measuring 98.1 square metres fronting onto St. Clements Road. 13 car parking spaces (including 2 public electric vehicle spaces), 3 motorcycle parking spaces and 55 bicycle parking spaces were proposed at ground floor level with an entrance on Rodney Avenue. The proposals also included photovoltaic panels, refuse storage, landscape amenities, such as connected mews and ginnel (a narrow passage between buildings), biodiverse roofs, shared podium gardens with play areas and shared roof gardens. A financial contribution towards off-site play space provision (in nearby Howard Davis Park) was also proposed. A public pedestrian access way would be provided through the centre of the site, connecting St. Clements Road, Cleveland Avenue and Rodney Avenue. Hard and soft landscaping were proposed within this space and the private amenity areas for a number of the units would be immediately adjacent to this area.

The Committee was informed that following the refusal of the previous scheme, the applicant had engaged with the Department, statutory consultees and the Jersey Architecture Commission to address the reasons for refusal and revise the proposals. The loss of employment use (*viz.* 1,230 square metres of light industrial space) was accepted due to a lack of viable reuse options and the poor condition of the buildings on the site. This would be offset by a mixed-use development which included a commercial space and which aligned with strategic policies for sustainable land use. The existing buildings were beyond economic repair due to their age and condition and the case for demolition had been made. The proposals would increase the density of the use and result in aesthetic improvements. The application aimed to strike a careful balance between maintaining neighbouring residential amenity, whilst optimising the development potential of the site. The proposed development was considered to respond to the local context through appropriate scale and massing, high quality materials and detailing and would deliver improvements to the public realm. The scheme also complied with technical requirements and relevant residential space and parking standards. 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) pursuant to Article 25 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 (as amended), to secure a financial contribution totalling £90,822, as follows: £56,322 towards the Eastern Cycle Route Network, £27,000 for off-site play space provision and £7,500 for residents to access the Evie Credit Mobility Platform. In the event that a suitable POA could not be agreed within 6 months of the date of approval, the application would be returned to the Committee for further consideration.

49 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Principal Transport Planner, Infrastructure and Environment (I and E), Department in connexion with access and transport matters. [REDACTED] advised that the proposed development accorded with Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) and the site was on a good bus route. It was noted that any new access to the proposed development would have to be located at least 20 metres from existing junctions.

██████████ addressed the Committee on behalf of the Parish of St. Helier Roads Committee. He expressed concerns in relation to the potential use of Rodney, Cleveland and Nelson Avenues, if access was not maintained to and from St. Clement's Road. Concerns regarding the provision of on-site car parking for the development, the absence of storage facilities and the ability to collect refuse safely were also noted.

The Committee heard from ██████████, a neighbouring resident, who believed that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area. She suggested that the scheme did not comply with Policies SP6 and ER4 of the Bridging Island Plan and referenced Policies GD1 and GD6, which sought to protect amenities. ██████████ expressed concerns regarding overlooking, traffic intensification and pressure on already limited car parking in the area. She urged the Committee to reject the proposed application.

██████████, a neighbouring resident, addressed the Committee and also expressed concerns regarding the impact of the development on the character of Havre des Pas. The height, massing and density of the proposed development were considered alien in this context. ██████████ referenced a history of subsidence in the area, and the potential impact of construction on existing properties. Furthermore, she noted that there were approximately 395 apartments for sale in St. Helier at the present time and questioned the need for a development of this nature. ██████████ urged the Committee to reject the scheme.

Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South addressed the Committee and highlighted the lack of dedicated onsite play space. The proposed offsite contribution did not strictly accord with the provisions of Policy CI8, as Howard Davis Park was located 800 metres from the site with no safe walking route and 2 main roads to navigate in order to reach the park. Deputy Coles stated that the application failed to meet a number of policy requirements in addition to CI8 and urged the Committee to reject the scheme.

The Committee heard from the applicant, ██████████ of ROK Construction, who highlighted the opportunity to regenerate an underused site and improve the surrounding area. The scheme had been carefully designed to accord with relevant planning policies and the scale and design were considered appropriate. ██████████ urged the Committee to grant permission.

The applicant's agent, ██████████ of MS Planning Limited, addressed the Committee, stating that the revised scheme had been informed by pre-application advice and would lead to the regeneration of a brownfield site in St. Helier. The previous light industrial use was demonstrably redundant, and the repair of the existing buildings was not economically viable. The proposals would optimise the use of the site and responded to changing market demand. The new homes were policy compliant and there would be no unreasonable harm to neighbouring amenities. The proposed access arrangements had been designed in accordance with advice received from the I and E Department. ██████████ stated that the proposals had been positively received by the JAC and would deliver a well-integrated and vibrant streetscape. He urged the Committee to approve the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's architect, ██████████ of Waddington Architects, who outlined the considerations that had informed the design. A car-free, tree-lined mews was proposed, reminiscent of a railway setting,

with thoughtful details which took cues from other areas of Havre Des Pas. A variety of safe, shared open spaces were proposed, with a contribution towards off-site play space provision. The proposed units would benefit from dual or triple aspects and the design was of a high quality. Gallery access decks would help to shield residents from traffic noise and place-making, and a sense of community were at the heart of the scheme. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to support the proposals.

In response to questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that the site had been marketed over a period of 18 months for rental at a price of £168,000 per year, with without success and that a managed refuse collection system was proposed, with 3 stores, including one for the proposed commercial unit.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North, concluded that it could not support the proposals as it was not convinced that the redundancy of the employment use had been proven. Concerns were also expressed regarding the scale and mass of the proposed development and the impact on neighbouring residential amenities, together with a lack of dedicated children's play space. Whilst not cited as a reason for refusal, members were concerned about the provision of car parking. Reference was made to P.54/2025 (Supplementary Planning Guidance: Parking), which had been adopted, as amended, by the States Assembly on 22nd October 2025, which required the Minister for the Environment to consider revising the relevant SPG to ensure that, where practicable, a minimum of one car parking space was provided per unit of accommodation. For the avoidance of doubt, it was noted that the application complied with the current SPG.

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.

Albert Bartlett
and Sons, Le
Manoir de
Rooster, La
Route de La
Trinite, St.
Helier:
proposed
variation of
condition of
permit.

A7. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the variation of a condition of the permit associated with planning application reference No. P/2007/2654. If approved, the variation of the condition would facilitate the extension of the operating hours of a potato processing building at the property known as Albert Bartlett and Sons, Le Manoir de Rooster, La Route de La Trinite, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd December 2025.

Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North did not participate in the determination of this application.

RC/2025/0713

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies SP1, SP2, SP4, SP6, PL5, NE3, ERE2, GD1, TT1 and WER5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, including an approved application for the construction of a replacement portal frame building for potato sorting and washing, administration block, water treatment plant and revised vehicular access (planning application reference No. P/2007/2654 refers). A retrospective application for a seasonal change of use of part of the potato processing building to facilitate a general storage and distribution warehouse use had been approved at a Ministerial Hearing on 26th November 2010 (planning application reference No. P/2010/1426 refers).

The Committee noted that permission was sought to vary the hours of operational use of the facility, which were restricted by condition No. 19 on permit P/2007/2654. The current permitted hours of operation were from 8.00 am to 6.00 pm from Monday to Friday; from 8.00 am to 1.00 pm on Saturdays; and no noisy working on Sundays and Bank Holidays. It was proposed that operating hours be extended as follows: from 7.00 am to 7.00 pm from Monday to Friday; from 7.00 am to 6.00 pm on Saturdays; from 8.00 am to 6.00 pm on Bank Holidays; and no noisy working on Sundays for the months April to July inclusive.

The Committee was advised that no physical alterations to the existing building were proposed and the application was considered acceptable in principle. Subject to the implementation of mitigation measures, the proposed variation in operating hours would not result in significant or unreasonable harm to neighbouring amenities or have a detrimental impact on the site or the character of the area. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, subject to certain conditions outlined in the Department report.

7 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of MS Planning Limited, who outlined the rationale for the request. Operational changes and the seasonal nature of the business meant that a change in operating hours was required in order to meet market demand.

In response to questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that daffodils were stored on a temporary basis on the site and would be returned to growers in due course. Operations were undertaken on the site on Bank Holidays during the potato season in order to meet market demand, but these were not noisy activities and a water pump on the site operated only twice a day for 20 minutes.

The Committee unanimously approved the application, subject to the conditions outlined in the Department report.

Field Nos.
T1197 and
H1421 (to the
north of
Augres
House), La
Rue de la
Roulerie,
Trinity:
proposed
visitor / staff
accommoda-
tion.

A8. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A2 of 5th July 2013, of the Committee as previously constituted, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the partial demolition of an existing agricultural shed and the proposed construction of an agricultural enterprise facility, offices, and training/education centre on Field Nos. T1197 and H1421 (to the north of Augres House), La Rue de la Roulerie, Trinity. The construction of 2 x 2 bedroom and one x 3 bedroom visitor accommodation units and 2 x one bedroom and one x 2 bedroom staff accommodation units were also proposed, together with car parking, and hard and soft landscaping to the northwest of Field T1197. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd December 2025.

Deputies A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity and S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North, did not participate in the determination of this application.

P/2025/10011

A site plan and drawings and were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone, Water Pollution Safeguard Area and was on the Eastern Cycle Route Network. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, PL5, GD1, GD2, GD5, GD6, GD10, NE1, NE2, NE3, HE1, EO1, EV1, ERE1, ERE2, ERE5, H10, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT3, TT4, WER1, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to the Jersey

Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (2023).

The Committee noted the extensive planning history of the site, which included a similar application which had been withdrawn in February 2025 (planning application reference No. P/2024/0531 refers).

The Committee noted that permission was sought for the redevelopment of the existing barn to create a 2 storey, granite clad agricultural enterprise facility with a gross internal area of 691 square metres. The building would replicate the scale of the existing agricultural shed located to the east of the site. It was noted that the application referenced both retaining and refurbishing the existing shed and also redeveloping it. However, it was not clear which components of the shed would be retained, given the significant proposed alterations. The proposed training and education centre (Block B) with office accommodation would have a gross internal area of 246 square metres and would be located to the south-east of the agricultural enterprise facility. 2 further blocks were proposed, including Block C, which would be a 2 storey building providing 326 square metres of visitor accommodation and Block D which would provide 217 square metres of staff accommodation,

The Committee was advised that the application failed to justify the redevelopment of the existing agricultural shed and the loss of agricultural land for the intended purposes. Furthermore, the construction of visitor accommodation outside of the Built-Up Area would result in harm to the character of the countryside. The requirement for staff accommodation located outside of the Built-Up Area and not associated with an existing agricultural operation had not been justified and the application failed to evidence the need for office accommodation in this location. The proposals failed to provide a safe, inclusive and accessible transport solution, and the cumulative impact of the proposed quantum, scale and mass of the development would urbanise the character of the countryside. Consequently, it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies SP2, SP4, SP6, GD5, GD6, NE3, PL5, H10, EO1, ERE1, ERE2, ERE5, EV1, TT1, TT2 and TT3 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022.

21 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, who advised that the once peaceful area had been impacted by the ongoing development at Augres House over the past decade. She expressed concerns in connexion with light pollution, loss of wildlife and suburbanisation of the Green Zone.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, who expressed concerns regarding the overdevelopment of the site and the loss of agricultural fields. [REDACTED] further questioned whether the site continued to operate as a commercial farm and advised that there was no evidence to suggest that this was the case.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, who expressed concerns regarding the impact of the access/egress and driveway which had been installed without the required planning permission. She stated that the lane had already been affected by the increase in vehicular movements, impacting upon the safety of pedestrians.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], representing his mother, a neighbouring resident. [REDACTED] expressed concerns regarding the disruption to wildlife which would be caused by the further development of the site. [REDACTED] further questioned the need for the staff accommodation as there appeared to be no evidence that the

site was a working farm.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] of MS Planning Limited on behalf of neighbouring residents, who endorsed the Department's recommendation to refuse the application. [REDACTED] referred to the 6 reasons for refusal in the Department report, which focussed on the policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. He added that the proposals represented a departure from policy and that there was no justification for this quantum of development in the Green Zone. [REDACTED] noted that the business plan was vague and aspirational and was not sufficiently robust to meet the policy tests for development in the Green Zone. Issues regarding drainage and landscaping had yet to be resolved and Mr. Nicholson urged the Committee to maintain refusal of the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a former employee of the Department for the Economy, who advised that investment in rural economy for the next generation of farmers in the Island was essential. He noted that the introduction of the Government of Jersey Rural Support Scheme, which had been adopted in 2025, had seen an increase in activity within the rural economy. There were currently no facilities such as the proposed for research, training, development and inspiring young people to join the agricultural industry. [REDACTED] added that the applicant was an investor in the agricultural sector and that he supported approval of the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], President, Jersey Farmers Union, who highlighted the lack of facilities available to young people with an interest in entering the agricultural industry. [REDACTED] added that the closure of the Philip Mourant Training Centre had resulted in a reduction in locally trained farmers and efforts were being made to address this. He suggested that the proposed development would provide a privately invested facility which would encourage the next generation into rural enterprises.

The committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED], who outlined his history within the agricultural industry. [REDACTED] confirmed that Augres House was a commercial farm with 50 to 60 cattle and the largest sheep flock in Jersey and that a previously approved farm office had not been constructed due to the onset of the pandemic. He advised that research suggested that the provision of facilities such as that proposed encouraged young people to take up farming. [REDACTED] stated that farming and the associated infrastructure belonged in the Green Zone, and he cited various agricultural business which operated from rural sites. He believed that the policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were outdated and acted as a barrier to success.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of HD Planning and Design, who advised that climate change and technology were shaping agricultural land use. He stated that the proposed development would help Jersey prepare for future changes and provide relevant infrastructure which the Island currently lacked. The development accorded with the Green Zone policy and supported essential rural operations designed to secure the future of the rural sector. 90 per cent of food was now imported and Government investment in agriculture had collapsed. There was a lack of education, innovation and infrastructure, creating a need for investment and modern facilities. [REDACTED] added that there would be no harm to the landscape character, and the scheme aligned with the Island's wider ambitions for the agricultural sector. He was concerned that some misunderstanding had arisen as to what was proposed and confirmed that the accommodation was

intended for trainees and visiting specialists and the facilities would be utilised for compliance, testing and education. A permanent covenant would be in place to restrict the use solely to agricultural. ██████████ outlined the proposed uses and referred to the traditional rural form of the design which reflected the local character, together with the intended native tree planting. He urged the Committee to consider the long-term future of the rural sector, and the substantial public benefit at no cost to the taxpayer.

In response to a question from the Committee, ██████████ confirmed that he had received support for the application from the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development and the Department for the Economy (DFE). He added that the DFE had assisted with the development of the business plan for the application and that a DFE representative had been due to attend the meeting but had been unable to do so.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Connétable M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement, endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report. In doing so, the Committee urged the applicant to work with the Department in connexion with a revised application.

The Town House Public House and Restaurant, 57-59 New Street, St Helier: proposed demolition and redevelopment.

A9. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A4 of 17th October 2024, considered a report in connexion with an application which proposed the demolition of internal walls and storeys and retention of the Grade 4 Listed façade and the construction of a 4 storey building to create 15 residential units at the Town House Public House and Restaurant, No. 57-59 New Street, St. Helier. The scheme proposed 8 x one bedroom flats, 5 x 2 bedroom flats, and 2 x one bedroom duplexes, together with 3 short-term visitor accommodation units on the ground floor, balconies, motorcycle parking, cycle and refuse storage, external storage and hard and soft landscaping. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd December 2025.

P/2025/10005

A site plan, drawings and 3-Dimensional model were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the St. Helier Historic Town and Harbour Area, the Built-Up Area, a Primary Centre (Town of St. Helier), was on the Eastern Cycle Route Network, sustainable Transport Zone One and an Inland Flooding Low Risk area. The application site was also comprised a Grade 4 Listed Building. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, SP7, PL1, GD1, GD2, GD3, GD5, GD6, GD10, NE1, HE1, HE2, HE5, ER1, ER4, H1, H2, H3, H4, ME1, CI8, TT1, TT2, TT3, 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 and Parking Standards 2023, Density Standards 2023, St. Helier Design Guidance 2023, Site Waste Management Plans 2013 and Planning Obligation Agreements 2017.

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, which included an application for the change of use and redevelopment of the site (to include the retention of the Grade 4 Listed façade) to facilitate the creation of 20 flats with associated car parking (planning application reference No. P/2020/1726 refers). The application had been refused by the Committee as previously constituted, due to concerns about the impact of the proposals on the character of the area, the quality of the proposed design and the design and scale of proposed extensions. Planning application reference No. P/2023/0442 sought permission for the construction of a second and third floor and the change the use of the existing ground and first floors to create 18 x one bed and 2 x 2 bedroom residential units. The existing listed façade would be retained. This application had been refused by the Committee in October 2024.

The current application proposed the demolition of the existing structure and the construction of a new 4-storey residential building incorporating the retained Grade 4 Listed façade. The new building would comprise 15 residential apartments and 3 short-term holiday lets together with associated facilities and amenities and alterations to the vehicular access onto Craig Street. A car-free development was proposed, with a 12-month subscription to the Evie shared mobility scheme being submitted as a shared transport offer, to be secured as part of a Planning Obligation Agreement (POA) should the application be approved.

The Committee was advised that the 2022 Bridging Island Plan supported development for residential purposes, particularly where this was achieved through the reuse of under-used land and buildings. The 4-storey scale, and architectural design of the proposed development was considered appropriate and the impact on neighbouring development acceptable. Whilst the extent of demolition involved and the associated heritage impacts, together with the loss of a large commercial/hospitality premises were challenging, it was acknowledged that the building had been vacant since March 2019. The applicant had also been unsuccessful in securing a new commercial tenant. The concerns raised by the Historic Environment Team relating to the loss of the majority of the Grade 4 Listed Building were noted. The repair and refurbishment of the façade, which had been designed by renowned modernist architect, Mr. A.B. Grayson was included in the proposals.

The application was recommended for approval, having regard to all material planning considerations and the relevant policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and subject to the applicant entering into a suitable POA contribution to secure a contribution towards bus service enhancements and the eastern cycle network. 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.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Historic Environment Officer, Historic Environment Team who advised that the Historic Environment Team (HET) did not support the application on the grounds that the majority of the Listed Building would be demolished, with only the outer walls and façade remaining intact. Furthermore, no feasibility assessment had been undertaken. [REDACTED] added that the demolition of the historic building was not supported by the policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and that no overriding public benefit would arise from the proposals. He confirmed the restoration of the Grade 4 Listed façade was welcomed by the HET.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Castletree Architectural Services, who advised that the Société Jersiaise had been consulted on the proposals, and it had been confirmed that the 'Grayson' façade was the only worthwhile asset of the Listed Building. [REDACTED] referred to the reasons for the refusal of the previous application and noted that alternative uses for the building had been explored. Plans had been amended to mitigate the lack of light in the lower units, and the size of the residential units had been increased so that it exceeded the SPG relating to Residential Space Standards (2023) by 15 per cent. 38 bicycle and motorcycle parking spaces would be provided together with a large vehicle delivery area. A flood barrier was proposed, and all roofs would benefit from a water recycling system. [REDACTED] confirmed that pre-application advice had been sought from the Department in connexion with the revised application.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously endorsed the recommendation to grant permission, subject to the conditions outlined in the Department report. In doing so, the Committee decided to remove the requirement for a POA contribution towards improvements to the bus service on the basis that the application site was located in a highly sustainable transport area.

Fliquet House,
La Rue de
Fliquet, St.
Martin:
proposed
extensions
(RFR).

P/2025/0583

A10. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A15 of 29th June 2023, 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 demolition of an existing conservatory and the construction of an extension to the north elevation of the property known as Fliquet House, La Rue de Fliquet, St. Martin. The construction of single and 2 storey extensions to the north and east elevations respectively was also proposed, together with the formation of a new driveway, vehicle parking and a garage. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd December 2025.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Protected Coastal Area. Policies SP3, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE3, H2 and H9 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in respect of Density Standards (2023).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, which included an application for the construction of a single storey extension to the west elevation and the creation of 2 new staircases had been approved by the Department under delegated powers in October 2023 (planning application reference No. P/2023/0344 refers). Revised plans had subsequently been refused by the Department under delegated powers.

The Committee was apprised of the details of the current application and was advised that the excessive scale, footprint, mass, design and appearance of the development were considered harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the established setting of the Protected Coastal Area. Consequently, the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies GD6, H2, H9, NE3, SP3 and PL5 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022, and the SPG relating to Density Standards 2023. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agents, ■■■ ■■■ ■■■ of AD Building Design, and ■■■ of Duffell Planning Limited, who advised that the application sought to overcome the previous reasons for refusal. She advised that there would be no significant increase in height, with the existing conservatory being removed and replaced with a small extension. 2 x 2 bay garages and a porch were also proposed. In response to a question from the Committee, ■■■ confirmed that pre-application advice had been sought, and the Department had suggested that a smaller extension might be acceptable.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Connétable M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement and Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North, endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report. In doing so, the Committee was mindful of the Protected Coastal Area location of the application site and the relevant policy context.

Woodlands Farm (Field No. 1140), La Rue de Maupertuis, St Helier: proposed hardstanding (RETROSPECTIVE) (RFR).

P/2025/0777

A11. 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 retrospective permission for the creation of a hardstanding area within Field No. 1140, La Rue de Maupertuis, St Helier for the storage of agricultural machinery and overflow car parking for Woodlands Farm. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd December 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 in the Green Zone and a Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies SP2, SP3, SP4, SP6, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, HE1, ERE1, TT1, WER1 and WER6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in respect of the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (JILSCA).

The Committee noted the extensive planning history of the site.

The Committee was informed that the hardstanding had been created by removing the grassed field topping and forming a bund to the south-eastern site boundary which adjoined the remainder of Field No. 11400, which remained in agricultural use.

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the loss of agricultural land in the Green Zone was unacceptable and contrary to the Green Zone Policy. The formation of a hardstanding area for car parking and agricultural machinery storage purposes within Field 1140 was considered visually harmful and detrimental to the landscape character. Consequently, the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies SP2, SP3, SP4, GD6, NE3, ERE1 and PL5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and the JILSCA. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Steedman Planning, who advised that Woodlands Farm included a butchery and farm shop, together with commercial farming operations. It was noted that the farm attracted a high number of customers and provided 20 per cent of the Island's milk. Prior to the construction of the hardstanding area, the milk tanker would park on the road obstructing oncoming vehicles. The hardstanding would also provide vehicle parking for staff, visitors, agricultural and plant machinery. Consequently, it was considered essential to the safe operation of the working farm. [REDACTED] stated that the application aligned with Policies SP2, SP6, PL5, ERE1 and ERE2 (second limb) of the Bridging Island Plan 2022. She did not believe that the small area of hardstanding was visually harmful as it was nestled below the profile of the field. In concluding, [REDACTED] urged the Committee to approve the application.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously agreed to grant permission, contrary to the Department recommendation, on the basis that the proposals aligned with Policies SP6, GD1, ERE1 and ERE2 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022. In doing so, the Committee expressed concerns regarding the retrospective nature of the application.

As the Committee's decision was contrary to the Department recommendation, it was noted that the application would be re-presented for formal decision confirmation at the next scheduled meeting.