

Planning Committee

(20th Meeting)

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

All members were present, with the exception of Connétables M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement, R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen, and D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence, and Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity, from whom apologies had been received.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity (Chair)
 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement (Vice Chair)
 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour
 Connétable M. Labey of Grouville
 Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North
 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South

In attendance –

C. Carter, Planning Applications Manager
 C. Jones, Senior Planner
 J. Gibbins, Planner
 B. James, Planner
 M. Popa, Planner
 L. Plumley, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe

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

Minutes.

A1. The Minutes of the meeting of 3rd July 2025, having been previously circulated, were taken as read and were confirmed.

The Cottage,
 Ville au Veslet
 Farm, Le Mont
 Isaac, St.
 Lawrence:
 revised plans.
 (RETRO-
 SPECTIVE)
 (RFR).

RP/2025/0020

A2. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers. The application sought retrospective permission for revisions to the previously approved plans for a 2 storey, lean-to extension to the northeast elevation of the property known as The Cottage, Ville au Veslet Farm, Le Mont Isaac, St. Lawrence. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd September 2025.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Green Zone and a Water Pollution Safeguard Area, and adjoined Ville au Veslet Farm, which was a Grade 3 Listed Building. Policies PL5, GD1, GD6, H9, HE1 and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Landscape and Seascape Character Guidance.

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, including a previously approved application for the redevelopment of the site, to include a 2 storey extension to the north-east elevation of Unit No. 4 (now known as The Cottage) (planning application No. P/2018/0414 refers).

The Committee noted that retrospective permission was sought for a number of alterations to the previously approved plans for the extension. The ground floor level had been lowered relative to the principal dwelling and the roof pitch had been

modified, resulting in increased headroom at first floor level, enabling the space to be used for habitable accommodation rather than storage. The footprint of the extension had also been adjusted to align more closely with the front of the host building. 3 first floor windows had been installed to the south and east elevations, together with bi-folding doors at ground floor level. A timber cladding finish was proposed instead of painted render, to create a visual distinction between the existing building and the extension. The alterations were designed to enhance the functionality of the building and had resulted in an increase of 3.5 square meters to the footprint of the building and the creation of an additional 27.4 square meters of habitable floorspace.

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the increased height, enlarged footprint, altered roof pitch, reduction in previously approved setback and additional fenestration arrangements resulted in a built form that was visually bulky, poorly integrated and unsympathetic to the character and setting of the adjoining Grade 3 Listed Building. Consequently, it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application on the basis that it was contrary to Policy HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Origin Architecture Studio, who advised that a late request for the withdrawal of the application had been declined. The applicant had intended to submit a new application following engagement with the Department. Notwithstanding this, [REDACTED] explained that the proposed changes were minor in nature and made better use of the space. The revised fenestration arrangements were intended to provide additional light and ventilation, and the proposed timber cladding would create a visual hierarchy between the extension and the host building.

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

Field No.
1822, Le Mont
Rossignol, St
Ouen:
proposed
construction of
shed
(RFR).

P/2025/0262

A3. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which sought permission for the construction of a shed to the southwest corner of Field No. 1822, Le Mont Rossignol, St Ouen. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd September 2025.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was an agricultural field located in the Protected Coastal Area and a Water Pollution Safeguard Area which was at low risk of inland flooding. Policies SP1, SP2, SP4, SP5, SP6, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE2, NE3, ERE1, ERE5, WER2 and WER5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Landscape and Seascape Character Guidance (2023) and the Protection of Employment Land (2012).

The Committee noted that the field was used as a vineyard and the purpose of the proposed shed, which would measure 5.5 meters by 3 meters by 2.8 meters, was to store equipment associated with this use, including small tractors. The proposal was supported by the Rural Economy Team, but an objection had been raised by the Environmental Land Controls Team due to the loss of agricultural land.

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the proposed shed would be visually dominant within the Protected Coastal Area

and would result in harm to the natural setting and landscape character of the area. In addition, insufficient information had been provided to justify the loss of agricultural land or demonstrate that the proposal was essential to the viability or running of the vineyard. Consequently, it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application on the basis that it was contrary to Policies SP1, SP2, SP4, SP5, PL5, GD6, NE3, ERE1, ERE5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Richard Le Sueur Architects, who addressed the various reasons for refusal. He stated that the support for the application from the Rural Economy Team was evidence of the sustainability of the location. The size, design and location of the proposed shed had been carefully considered to provide a windbreak and would not result in visual harm. The applicant was a bona-fide agriculturalist who required the shed for the storage of equipment and vehicles associated with the vineyard. [REDACTED] stated that the proposals would support the existing agricultural use of the site. In concluding, he advised that there would be no noticeable landscape impact and highlighted the changing nature of the Island's agricultural industry.

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

- the location of the shed had been chosen for practical reasons and it would be constructed on a concrete base;
- the vineyard harvest would be processed locally;
- dedicated equipment was required for the operations undertaken in the vineyard and the ability to store this equipment on the site would result in efficiencies.

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

Retreat Farm,
Fields No. 770,
St. Mary, and
No.78, St.
Lawrence, La
Rue des
Varvots, St.
Lawrence:
proposed
extension to
glasshouse and
construction of
shed
(RETRO-
SPECTIVE).

P/2025/0022

A4. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A2 of 5th September 2024, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought retrospective permission for the construction of an extension to an agricultural glasshouse and a new detached shed at the property known as Retreat Farm, Fields No. 770, St. Mary, and No.78, St. Lawrence, La Rue des Varvots, St. Lawrence. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd September 2025.

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 consisted of 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 to the south, along with a larger (partially demolished) glasshouse to the northwest. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, HE1, ERE1, ERE2, TT2, WER6, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. The Committee noted that an Environmental Impact Statement had been submitted as part of the application.

The Committee noted the complex and protracted planning history of the site, which included a number of previous retrospective applications relating to Northern Leaf Plc's operations at the site. These included an application which had encompassed, amongst other matters, the proposed extension and shed (planning application No. P/2024/0391 refers). This application had been refused by the Committee as previously constituted due to other elements of the scheme having been considered unacceptable.

The Committee also noted ongoing enforcement proceedings (ENF/2023/00004 and

ENF/2024/00017 refer) in respect of a walled compound housing air filtration and chilling plant machinery, pipework, ductwork and air extraction ducts, all of which had been constructed without planning permission. The air filtration and chilling plant machinery within the walled compound was also the subject of an active Noise Abatement Notice. In addition, a complaint about the Department's handling of retrospective planning applications and statutory nuisance complaints had recently been the subject of a States of Jersey Complaints Board Hearing (R.101/2025 and associated Ministerial Response refer).

The Committee further noted that the application was one of 6 applications relating to the site (items No. A4 – 9 refer), all of which would be considered at the extant meeting, to provide a holistic view of the development of the built area of the site.

The Committee noted that retrospective permission was sought for the following –

- a timber clad extension with a single external door, located to the northeast corner of the main building, which was used as an entrance porch and which was a required security feature required under the operator's Medicinal Cannabis licence; and
- a detached single storey shed constructed to the eastern side of the main building, which was used for the storage of inert fertiliser. This structure was prefabricated, clad in black sheeting with an up-and-over door and a pedestrian door on the east elevation and was necessary for the operation of the facility.

The Committee was advised that the development was considered acceptable in principle. The entrance porch extension was a security requirement, and raised no concerns in terms of its scale, appearance or materials. The shed would support the established use on the site and was of an appropriate, scale, material and colour. It was visually unobtrusive and would not result in harm to the character of the area. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval.

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

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, who highlighted the retrospective nature of the application, despite the Committee as previously constituted having actively discouraged further retrospective applications in respect of the site (Minute No. A2 of 9th March 2022 refers). [REDACTED] noted that noise and odour issues from the site were longstanding, unbearable and had led to a number of residents moving from the area. Some former residents had also passed away and these 2 factors had resulted in fewer objections being submitted.

In response to a question from the Committee, [REDACTED], Chief Operating Officer, Northern Leaf Plc, confirmed that the entrance porch was used for maintenance purposes.

In response to a further question from the Committee, the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Origin Architecture Studio, confirmed that the applicant was engaging with the Department on various planning matters.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously endorsed the Department recommendation to grant unconditional permission.

Retreat Farm,
Fields No. 770,
St. Mary, and
No.78, St.

A5. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A4 of the extant meeting, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the removal of 4 roof extraction vents from a glasshouse and the reinstatement of the roof line to match the surrounding development, at the property known as Retreat

Lawrence, La
Rue des
Varvots, St.
Lawrence:
proposed roof
alterations.

P/2025/0032

Farm, Fields No. 770, St. Mary, and No.78, St. Lawrence, La Rue des Varvots. St. Lawrence. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd September 2025.

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 consisted of an agricultural glasshouse used by Northern Leaf Plc (the applicant company) for the cultivation of medicinal cannabis, with ancillary plant and equipment and associated parking to the south, along with a larger (partially demolished) glasshouse to the northwest. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, HE1, ERE1, ERE2, TT2, WER6, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. The Committee noted that an Environmental Impact Statement had been submitted as part of the application.

The Committee noted the complex and protracted planning history of the site and ongoing enforcement activity, as outlined in Minute No. A4 above. The application was one of 6 applications for development on the site (items No. A4 – 9 refer), all of which would be considered at the extant meeting, to provide a holistic view of the development of the built area of the site.

The Committee was informed that one of the vents had come off during high winds in 2024, and that the remaining 3 were redundant. External ventilation was no longer used and internal ventilation via carbon filtration was now operational. It was noted that the roof of the glasshouse would be repaired when the remaining vents had been removed.

The Committee was advised that the proposals were considered acceptable in principle and were minor in scale. The removal of the redundant vents and making good of the roof would not lead to visual harm. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of a condition outlined in the Department report, which would require the vents to be removed within one month of the date of approval.

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

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a former resident of the area. [REDACTED] stated that the roof extraction vents served a room which was used for drying cannabis. She expressed the view that this constituted an industrial process which did not accord with the agricultural use of the site.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], who questioned whether the proposals would lead to a reduction in the odour emanating from the site.

[REDACTED] addressed the Committee and expressed concern regarding the continued odour emanating from the site.

[REDACTED], Chief Operating Officer, Northern Leaf Plc, addressed the Committee and confirmed that the roof extraction vents were redundant and had been disconnected, with carbon filters having been installed internally. He advised that ventilation and cleaning now took place inside the glasshouse, reducing the potential for odour to escape. In response to questions from the Committee, [REDACTED] confirmed that the proposed timeline for the removal of the vents was achievable and that a maintenance plan was in place for the carbon filters.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously endorsed the Department recommendation to grant permission, subject to the imposition of the condition detailed in the Department report.

Retreat Farm,
Fields No. 770,
St. Mary, and
No.78, St.
Lawrence, La
Rue des
Varvots, St.
Lawrence:
proposed
relocation of
heat pump.

P/2025/0034

A6. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A5 of the extant meeting, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the relocation of an air source heat pump at the property known as Retreat Farm, Fields No. 770, St. Mary, and No.78, St. Lawrence, La Rue des Varvots, St. Lawrence. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd September 2025.

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 consisted of an agricultural glasshouse used by Northern Leaf Plc (the applicant company) for the cultivation of medicinal cannabis, with ancillary plant and equipment and associated parking to the south, 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. The Committee noted that an Environmental Impact Statement had been submitted as part of the application.

The Committee noted the complex and protracted planning history of the site and ongoing enforcement activity, as outlined in Minute No. A4 above. The application was one of 6 which proposed development on the site (items No. A4 – 9 refer), all of which would be considered at the extant meeting, to provide a holistic view of the development of the built area of the site.

The Committee noted that permission was sought for the removal of an existing air source heat pump from the eastern elevation of the glasshouse and its relocation inside the glasshouse. It would be remounted at ground floor level inside the metal lining internal skin of the glasshouse to service the room that it would be located in.

The Committee was advised that the proposals were considered acceptable in principle. In addition, the air source heat pump had been the subject of noise complaints and relocating the equipment internally would be beneficial in this regard. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions outlined in the Department report, including a requirement for the development to be implemented and completed within one month of the date of approval and a condition relating to noise levels.

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

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

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

Retreat Farm,
Fields No. 770,
St. Mary, and
No.78, St.
Lawrence, La
Rue des
Varvots, St.
Lawrence:
proposed
chiller units
and associated

A7. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A6 of the extant meeting, considered a report in connexion with a part retrospective application which sought permission for some chiller units and the construction of an enclosure around the chillers at the property known as Retreat Farm, Fields No. 770, St. Mary, and No.78, St. Lawrence, La Rue des Varvots, St. Lawrence. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd September 2025.

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 consisted of an agricultural glasshouse used by Northern Leaf Plc (the applicant company) for the cultivation of medicinal cannabis,

enclosure
(PART
RETROSPEC
TIVE).

P/2025/0124

with ancillary plant and equipment and associated parking to the south, 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 Assessment. The Committee noted that an Environmental Impact Statement had been submitted as part of the application.

The Committee noted the complex and protracted planning history of the site and ongoing enforcement activity, as outlined in Minute No. A4 above. The application was one of 6 applications for development on the site (items No. A4 – 9 refer), all of which would be considered at the extant meeting, to provide a holistic view of the development of the built area of the site. It was recalled that the chiller units were the subject of an Enforcement Notice with a compliance date of 13th September 2025, requiring the removal of the chillers and surrounding ‘megablock’ walls (ENF/2023/00004 refers), as well as a Noise Abatement Notice.

The Committee noted that permission was sought for the construction of an enclosure around the chiller units and 2 adjoining tanks, located in the northwestern part of the site, along with retrospective permission for the chiller units. The proposed structure was intended to mitigate the noise generated by the chillers and would be constructed over a steel framework, with dual roof ridges running along its length and a central valley. The enclosure would be 50.8 metres long, 13.27 metres wide and 4.65 metres to the apex of the 2 ridges. The proposal also included the means for air intake and extraction and landscaping with an evergreen holly hedge which would encircle the development.

The Committee was advised that that the chillers were required as part of the established agricultural use on the site and that their retention and enclosure as proposed was considered acceptable in principle. The design, height, scale and appearance of the proposed enclosure was in keeping with the context and the proposed use and acoustic materials were considered appropriate. It was recognised that the continuous operation of the chiller units had generated significant negative noise-related impacts. The proposed development would effectively enclose the chiller units and ensure that noise levels accorded with requirements, resulting in significant benefit to neighbouring residential amenity. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions outlined in the Department report, including a condition requiring the development to be completed within 3 months of approval. In the event that this requirement was not met, operation of the chillers would be required to cease.

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], Regulation Standards Manager, Housing and Nuisance Team, who highlighted the need for abatement of the noise nuisance. The proposals would result in a significant attenuation of the noise and the proposed materials were considered appropriate for this purpose. [REDACTED] explained that the proposed conditions included a requirement for the noise generated from the retained chiller units to be at a level at least 5dBA (A-weighted decibel) below background noise levels when measured (in accordance with BS4142:2014) from within the curtilage of any nearby property.

The Committee heard from former Senator, [REDACTED], who stated that the regulatory section of the Department had a poor record in relation to ensuring compliance with planning conditions. [REDACTED] also questioned the impact of site operations on neighbouring residents, with particular regard to peaceful enjoyment

of their properties. He urged the Committee to refuse the application.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], representing Willin Limited, an adjacent landowner. She reminded the Committee that the chillers were operating without planning permission and noted that no specification had been provided as part of the application. [REDACTED] stated that, due to issues with the Department's automated email notification system, residents had not been properly notified of changes to the planning application. She highlighted the fact that the chillers had been installed without permission and urged the Committee to defer consideration of the application.

[REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, addressed the Committee and highlighted the retrospective nature of the application which, if approved, would effectively permit the retention of the chillers, which had been installed without permission. Approval of retrospective applications made a mockery of the planning system and sanctioned the use of the site for industrial purposes. [REDACTED] expressed the view that the application was intended to thwart the Enforcement Notice, which required the chillers to be removed by mid-September 2025. She contended that repeated delays by the applicant showed a lack of respect for due process and urged the Committee to refuse the application.

In response to a question from the Committee, [REDACTED], Chief Operating Officer, Northern Leaf Plc, confirmed that the company fully intended to comply with the implementation timescale proposed, though he noted that this was subject to factors outside the company's control, such as weather conditions. He also confirmed that the chillers were necessary to the operation of the business.

In response to a further question from the Committee, the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Origin Architecture Studio, stated that engagement with suppliers was underway to ensure timely implementation of the proposals. He also noted that the proposed landscaping formed part of a larger scheme of landscaping for the site.

The Committee, whilst recognising that the chillers were necessary to the agricultural use of the site and raising no objection to the principle of enclosing the same, was unable to reach a majority decision after full consideration of the application, with Connétables P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair, and K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour, and Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement, Vice Chair, being opposed to the application. Concerns were expressed regarding the impact on neighbouring residential amenity, the design quality, the deliverability of the scheme within the timescale proposed and the proposed landscaping. The remaining members, Connétable M. Labey of Grouville and Deputies S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North and T.A. Coles of St. Helier South, indicated support for the application on the basis that the noise impact of the chillers would be reduced.

In accordance with agreed procedures where a vote was tied, the application was determined in the negative (refused) and it was noted that formal reasons for refusal would be agreed in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair.

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 making and to set out the reasons for refusal.

No.78, St. Lawrence, La Rue des Varvots, St. Lawrence: proposed landscaping and pipework (PART RETROSPECTIVE).

P/2025/0126

planting at the property known as Retreat Farm, Fields No. 770, St. Mary, and No.78, St. Lawrence, La Rue des Varvots, St. Lawrence. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd September 2025.

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 consisted of 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 to the south, along with a larger (partially demolished) glasshouse to the northwest. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, HE1, ERE1, ERE2, TT2, WER6, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. The Committee noted that an Environmental Impact Statement had been submitted as part of the application.

The Committee noted the complex and protracted planning history of the site and ongoing enforcement activity, as outlined in Minute No. A4 above. The application was one of 6 applications for the site (items No. A4 – 9 refer), all of which would be considered at the extant meeting, to provide a holistic view of the development of the built area of the site. It was recalled that the pipework was the subject of an Enforcement Notice (ENF/2024/00017 refers) with a compliance date of 23rd September 2025.

The Committee noted that retrospective permission was sought for the retention of pipework that ran south to north where part of the former (now largely demolished) glasshouse was sited, along with new landscaping to form a screen on both sides of the pipework. The pipework had previously been enclosed by the glasshouse but was now external and a line of parallel planted native hedging was proposed to mitigate the visual impact. To the west of the pipework, a wild privet hedge was proposed which would provide ecological benefits for birds and bats. To the east of the pipework, new native hedging comprising of hawthorn, hazel, guelder and dog rose, elder and holly interspersed with crab apple, field maple and willow was proposed, to create a wildlife corridor and additional habitat. A line of native trees (alder, crab apple and willow) was also proposed along the southern boundary of the field.

The Committee was advised that whilst the pipework was visually intrusive, it was necessary for the operation of the site and was considered acceptable in principle. The provision of vegetation would visually screen the development and deliver biodiversity improvements and was therefore welcomed. The application 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, including a number of late submissions.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, who reminded those present that permission for the pipework had been refused by the Committee as previously constituted. The proposals represented the 19th retrospective application from Northern Leaf Plc and [REDACTED] believed it was designed to overcome the Enforcement Notice which had been issued in respect of the pipework. The applicant company's decision to withdrawing an appeal against the Enforcement Notice recognised that compliance with the same was required. [REDACTED] stated that the proposed development was contrary to the Policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and urged the Committee to refuse permission.

[REDACTED] addressed the Committee and reminded members that the pipework was connected to chillers which had been installed unlawfully and which

were due to be removed, in accordance with an active Enforcement Notice. She urged the Committee to refuse permission on this basis.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Origin Architecture Studio, who noted that the pipework had originally been enclosed within a glasshouse which had been demolished. The proposals were intended to address the visual impact of the pipework and the need for mature plants was recognised. [REDACTED] advised that planning permission had been secured for a replacement glasshouse (planning application No. P/2021/1705 refers).

In response to a question from the Committee, [REDACTED], Chief Operating Officer, Northern Leaf Plc, advised that there was no timeframe at present for the construction of the replacement glasshouse.

In response to a further question from the Committee, it was confirmed that any future proposed changes to the landscaping scheme would require the submission of an application. This was due to the imposition of a condition requiring the approved landscape scheme to be implemented in full and retained and maintained thereafter.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously endorsed the Department recommendation to grant permission, subject to the conditions detailed in the Department report. In doing so, the Committee requested that the conditions be amended to specify that planting should be undertaken during the first available planting season in 2025.

Retreat Farm
Fields No. 770,
St. Mary, and
No.78, St.
Lawrence, La
Rue des
Varvots, St.
Lawrence:
proposed
alterations to
manifold room
and
construction of
roof enclosure
(PART
RETROSPEC-
TIVE).

P/2025/0127

A9. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A8 of the extant meeting, considered a report in connexion with a part retrospective application which sought permission for the retention of an existing air handling unit (AHU5) and modifications to an existing manifold room at Retreat Farm, Field Nos. 770, St. Mary and No.78 St. Lawrence, La Rue des Varvots, St. Lawrence. The construction of an extended roof enclosure over the air handling unit to the northwest corner of the eastern glasshouse was also proposed, along with cladding and landscaping. The Committee had visited the site on 2nd September 2025.

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. Polices 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. The Committee noted that an Environmental Impact Statement had been submitted as part of the application.

The Committee noted the complex and protracted planning history of the site and ongoing enforcement activity, as outlined in Minute No. A4 above. The application was one of 6 applications for development on the site (items No. A4 – 9 refer), all of which would be considered at the extant meeting, to provide a holistic view of the development of the built area of the site.

The Committee noted that permission was sought for modifications to the existing manifold room and the construction of a new roof enclosure around and over existing mechanical and electrical equipment (AHU5). The proposed enclosure would be constructed over a steel portal framework with a profiled insulated cladding panel in a dark green colour. The profile of the existing shed structure would be extended, and the adjacent section of the pre-existing eastern glasshouse would project to the northern site boundary. To the west, the roof of the mono-pitch manifold room would be expanded to cover the entire area. The current open area (to the east) would be completely roofed and would adjoin the existing glasshouse. Along the western

face of the proposed structure new facing cladding would be introduced, with vertical cladding covering this area and closing any remaining gaps. The end gable of the proposed structure was intended to provide the air intake to service the mechanical plant, with acoustic louvres being used for noise mitigation. Appropriate material would be installed to provide an acoustic lining within both the internal ceiling space and wall space. Planting was proposed to partially screen the development, including native hedging of hawthorn, hazel, guelder, dog rose, elder and holly.

The Committee noted that the construction of a roof enclosure would provide sound attenuation which was intended to ensure the noise output generated by the equipment was reduced to an acceptable level. This equipment had been installed without planning permission and represented the retrospective aspect of the application, and would be retained, if approved. The equipment was integral to operations on the site but had generated noise which had led to complaints in relation to the negative impact on neighbouring residential amenities. From a design perspective, the proposed construction was considered a logical and relatively minor extension to the existing building and once established, the screen planting to the west of the site would help assimilate the development into the landscape. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval subject to certain conditions outlined in the report, including a requirement that the development be completed within 3 months of the date of approval.

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] a neighbouring resident, who highlighted the retrospective nature of the application and noted that the equipment was of an industrial rather than agricultural nature. She added that Northern Leaf Plc intended to construct a large dual pitched roof structure over the equipment, raising the roof profile of the eastern glasshouse and converting the same to a solid metal clad building in the Green Zone. [REDACTED] believed that the construction of a large industrial building in a rural area was contrary to the Policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and urged the Committee to refuse permission.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], who expressed concern regarding the industrialisation of the site.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Manager, Housing and Nuisance Team, Environmental Health Department, who advised that the equipment was not currently subject to an abatement notice. He added that whilst the operation of the equipment could result in noise issues in future, any noise associated with the same was currently drowned out by chiller noise. [REDACTED] noted that a more detailed plan of the development had been requested but confirmed that if it was built to the indicated specifications, the Department was likely to be satisfied with the resulting noise mitigation.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Origin Architecture Studio, who advised that the existing air handling unit (AHU5) had been approved under planning application reference No. P/2020/0760 (Minute No. A10 of 6th May 2021 refers). The application sought to provide visual screening with the continuation of the roofline of the shed, enclosing the ductwork area and providing acoustic benefits. [REDACTED] added that the area had become exposed due to the demolition of the glasshouse.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously endorsed the Department recommendation to grant permission, subject to the conditions detailed

659
20th Meeting
04.09.2025

in the Department report.