

Planning Committee

(17th Meeting)

8th May 2025

Part A (Non-Exempt)

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

Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement (Acting Chair)
 Connétable M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement
 Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North
 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South
 Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity

In attendance –

C. Carter, Planning Applications Manager
 C. Jones, Senior Planner
 B. James, Planner
 A. Elliott, Planner
 T. Venter, Planner
 P. Ilangovan, Planner
 L. Plumley, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A1 – A8)
 H. Roche, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items A9 – A10)

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

Minutes.

A1. The Minutes of the meeting of 10th April 2025, having been previously circulated, were taken as read and were confirmed.

Quarterdeck,
 Le Mont de
 Gouray, St
 Martin:
 proposed
 extensions/
 various works
 (RFR).

A2. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A10 of 10th April 2025, considered a report in connexion with an application for development at the property known as Quarterdeck, Le Mont de Gouray, St Martin. The application sought permission for the construction of a ground floor extension to form a garage to the east elevation, a first floor extension to the south elevation and a second floor extension to the north elevation. It was also proposed to construct first and second floor terraces to the south elevation, together with various internal and external alterations. The Committee had visited the site on 8th April 2025.

P/2024/0973

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.

La Mielle du
 Parcq, La

A3. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A5 of 10th April 2025, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for

Grande Route
des Sablons,
Grouville:
proposed
demolition and
construction of
residential
dwellings.

P/2024/1174

the demolition of a residential dwelling and associated structures known as La Mielle du Parc, La Grande Route des Sablons, Grouville, and the construction of 4 residential dwellings with stores, garages and associated car parking. Landscaping and alterations to the access route were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 8th April 2025.

The Committee recalled that it had been minded to refuse 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 refusal.

The Committee confirmed refusal of the application for the reasons set out in the Department report.

No. 27
Roseville
Street, St.
Helier:
proposed
conversion and
associated
construction
(RFR).

P/2024/0683

A4. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A7 of 10th April 2025, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the conversion of a one bedroom flat and 6 bedsits to provide a new one bedroom flat and 2 x 2 bedroom flats, with associated external storage and bicycle parking, at the property known as No. 27 Roseville Street, St. Helier. The installation of dormer windows to the east and west elevations was also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 8th April 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.

Land at
Plémont,
La Rue de Petit
Plémont,
St Ouen:
proposed
seabird
sanctuary.

P/2024/1198

A5. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A14 of 18th May 2023, of the Committee as previously constituted, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the erection of a 907 metre long predator exclusion fence on Land at Plémont, La Rue de Petit Plémont, St. Ouen. The Committee had visited the site on 6th May 2025.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was within the Coastal National Park (CNP), the Protected Coastal Area (PCA), proximate to the Marine Zone, and at medium risk of inland flooding. Policies SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL5, GD1, GD6, GD9, NE1, NE2, NE3, HE1, HE5 and WER2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment 2020 (JILSCA).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, including an application for the erection of a 15-metre-long section of predator fencing for a trial period, which had been approved by the Committee, as previously constituted (planning application reference No. P/2023/0091 refers).

The Committee noted that the predator fencing was proposed in order to create a sanctuary for seabirds including puffins, razorbills and guillemots. The proposed fence would be 2 metres high, with approximately 200 fence posts spaced 5 metres apart and would run beneath the coastal footpath on the headland. Approximately 3.34 hectares of the cliffs and headlands would be enclosed. The fence would be industrial and utilitarian in appearance, with concrete foundations, steel beams, a steel hood, and steel mesh. 5 service and pedestrian gates were proposed, along with a 2 metre wide landscaping strip on either side of the fence, with vegetation

restricted to a height of no more than 100-150 millimetres to avoid damage and prevent access by predators.

The Committee was advised that the proposal represented a complex balance between environmental enhancement and visual impact within a highly sensitive coastal setting. Whilst the Historic Environment Team had no objection to the proposals, the Landscape Officer had objected due to the adverse visual impact on short and long range views from the land and the sea. Notwithstanding this, the Department considered that the proposal had been designed to minimise visual intrusion whilst having regard to functionality and was supported by sufficient technical detail to justify its acceptability when assessed against the policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Additionally, a number of mitigation measures were proposed, including a long-term programme of bracken removal and native habitat restoration. On balance, the proposal aligned with the strategic objectives of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and was recommended for approval, subject to certain conditions outlined in the report, to include archaeological safeguards, ecological monitoring, long-term landscape management, and a time-limited permit valid for 15 years.

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

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Landscape Officer, Infrastructure and Environment Department. She noted that the fence and associated 2 metre clear zone either side would appear as a managed strip in an otherwise semi-natural remote landscape. The proposals would adversely impact the character and visual amenity of the local landscape, as well as degrade the landscape setting of several nearby Listed assets. Whilst it was acknowledged that the work to manage and remove bracken would be beneficial to the local landscape character, the proposals could not be supported due to the anticipated landscape visual impacts. A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan was recommended in the event that the proposals were approved and [REDACTED] noted that careful consideration should be given to the colour of the proposed fence in order to mitigate the visual impact of the same.

[REDACTED], a local architect and environmentalist, addressed the Committee. He highlighted the strength of the opposition to the scheme, noting that objections had been received from members of the National Trust for Jersey, surrounding residents and landowners, the Grève de Lecq Boat Owners' Association and the Connétable of St. Ouen. [REDACTED] noted that the proposed costings did not include the cost of removing the fence after 15 years and stated that inadequate consideration had been given to the topography of the area. Concerns were also expressed regarding the accuracy of the site boundary and the plans which had been provided. [REDACTED] highlighted the fact that local seabirds had suffered a significant decline in numbers in the early 20th century, which was not connected to the presence of predators. He questioned the findings of the ecological consultation response that had been provided, noting that it had been assessed by an independent consultee due to the Land Resource Management Team's involvement in the proposals. Turning to the design of the proposed fence, [REDACTED] noted that due to the density of the mesh required to exclude predators, it would be industrial in appearance and cause unacceptable visual harm. The proposals failed to take account of the ecology and natural beauty of the area and represented an industrial intrusion into a pristine stretch of coastline. He concluded by urging the Committee to reject the proposals as contrary to Policies NE1, NE2 and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], a nearby resident, who outlined concerns regarding both the funding and the feasibility of the scheme. He noted that

private funding had been secured for the scheme on the basis that it represented a compensatory measure for the loss of guillemots and razorbills elsewhere. [REDACTED] advised that the funding was dependant on the outcome of an application in the United Kingdom for a wind farm development which would cause harm to seabirds and he alleged that the evidence provided in favour of the scheme was biased. [REDACTED] noted that an extensive media campaign had been undertaken by the applicant and proponents of the scheme and that there had been a lack of transparency regarding the source of the funding. Attention was drawn to a report prepared by Natural England, an advisory body to the United Kingdom Government, which cast doubt on the technical feasibility of predator fences in general and the efficacy of the proposed fence. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to protect Jersey's landscape and reject the application.

[REDACTED], a neighbouring resident, addressed the Committee and expressed concerns regarding the objectivity of the supporting evidence which had been provided to justify the proposals. [REDACTED] noted that the independent expert assessment undertaken by Natural England identified major uncertainties and cast doubt on the technical feasibility of the proposed fence. Additionally, insufficient consideration had been given to the adverse effects on the landscape and the CNP. [REDACTED] urged the Committee not to grant permission.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Chief Executive Officer of the National Trust for Jersey. He explained that the application had been made by Birds On The Edge, a partnership between the National Trust for Jersey, Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust and the Government of Jersey's Natural Environment Team. The proposals represented an opportunity to put Jersey on the front line of seabird conservation efforts and address wider biodiversity concerns. The scheme had been 8 years in the making and was backed by robust evidence, with public consultation having been undertaken. The proposals had been amended to reduce the length, scale and visual impact of the proposed fence and there would be no impact on the public footpath, with access to the shore being maintained via secure access gates. The proposals represented the only viable solution to protect and restore seabird habitats, by removing predators. The method was proven, as demonstrated by the recovery of puffin numbers in a similar reserve on Alderney and the Committee was reminded of the time limited nature of the proposals. [REDACTED] advised that funding was not a material planning consideration, and it was not accepted that there had been a lack of transparency in this regard. There was every reason to believe that the project would be successful and [REDACTED] urged the Committee to support the application.

[REDACTED], Chief Executive Officer of Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust (Durrell), addressed the Committee in support of the proposals. Species conservation was at the heart of the organisation's mission and [REDACTED] highlighted the role played by human activity in the context of habitat destruction. Predator fences were used by Durrell in Montserrat and had proven to be effective. [REDACTED] concluded by advising members that the proposals represented an opportunity to make a positive contribution to habitat conservation and save species from extinction.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED], Senior Natural Environment Officer, Infrastructure and Environment Department. He advised that the land east of Plémont had been administered by the Department since 2010 and that the proposals aligned with Departmental objectives. The proposed fence would provide a safe haven for seabirds including puffins and increase biodiversity on a depleted stretch of coastline. The scheme was based on sound scientific evidence and the biodiversity improvements would also benefit other species including invertebrates. [REDACTED]

highlighted the habitat enhancement work and social attraction methods which were proposed and urged the Committee to support the application.

██████████, Executive Officer, Jersey National Park, addressed the Committee. He explained that he had initially been opposed to the idea of a predator exclusion fence in his former role as Principal Ecologist, Government of Jersey, due to a lack of evidence. A significant amount of research had taken place in the years since, which had persuaded him to change his view. He outlined protective measures which had been trialled to protect seabird populations such trapping, poisoning, tracking, decoys and the creation of burrows and advised that fencing was considered the most effective solution. Substantial benefits to many forms of wildlife would result and the creation of a seabird sanctuary and world class monitoring site would benefit Jersey. The proposed fence was intended as a long-term trial and would be removed after 15 years if it was unsuccessful. On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Jersey National Park, ██████████ urged the Committee to support the proposals.

The Committee heard from ██████████, Chair of the National Trust for Jersey's Seabird Sub-Committee, in support of the application. ██████████ advised that the principle of creating protected areas for seabirds was supported by strong evidence. He highlighted that whilst the appearance of the fence was understandably controversial, it would serve a valuable purpose. Refusal of the application would have profound consequences for seabirds, and the protection of their remaining nesting habitats was critical to their survival. ██████████ concluded by saying that he was proud to support the application.

The applicant's agent, ██████████ of MS Planning, addressed the Committee and highlighted the level of public interest in the proposals. The application represented a unique opportunity to protect and enhance seabird habitats. ██████████ discussed the requirements of Policy NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, noting that the proposals met all 4 limbs of the policy tests set out therein. In particular, clear, direct evidence of the predicted public benefit had been provided, which demonstrably outweighed any harm to the landscape and seascape character of the area. The proposals would result in the creation of a more natural landscape, with bracken no longer dominating the area, and would help to restore a thriving seabird population. ██████████ reminded the Committee of the temporary nature of the proposals and the benefits that would result. In concluding, he urged members to support the application.

The Committee heard from ██████████ of St. Brelade, a former Minister for the Environment, who added his support to the proposals. He reminded members that funding was not a relevant planning consideration, and that the principle of biodiversity net gain was supported by the policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. ██████████ ██████████ advised that, in accordance with the Sandford Principle, conservation interests in the CNP were afforded priority. Non-native predators were a major concern and the creation of a seabird sanctuary would help to reverse the decline in population. He urged the Committee to grant permission.

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

- the design and appearance of the fence was constrained by the technical specification required to prevent ingress by predators;
- consideration would be given to the colour of the fence in order to minimise the visual impact;
- the removal of the fence would include the removal of concrete used to secure the footings and tethers as far as reasonably practicable;
- it was anticipated that seabird population recovery could take 10 to 15 years in practice, due to the breeding lifecycles of certain birds;

- the anticipated overall lifespan of the proposed fence, with regular maintenance, was 30 to 35 years;
- 5 secure access gates would be provided, which would require the use of a code;
- Birds On The Edge and the National Trust for Jersey would be responsible for ongoing biosecurity management; and
- small, secure culverts were proposed, which would allow water to pass under the fence.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Deputies S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North and A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity, decided to grant permission, subject to the conditions detailed in the Department report. In doing so, the Committee requested an additional condition requiring an enclosure access management plan, to ensure that access through the secure gates could be obtained by relevant users. The Committee also requested that a Planning Obligation Agreement be entered into, to ensure the ongoing maintenance of the fence and its surrounds, as well as the eventual decommissioning of the fence. 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.

The Cottage,
Café Poste,
La Rue de la
Ville ès
Renauds,
Grouville:
proposed
demolition of
extension and
construction of
residential
dwellings.

P/2024/0805

A6. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition of an extension and the construction of 2 residential dwellings at the property known as The Cottage, Café Poste, La Rue de la Ville ès Renauds, Grouville. Alterations to the existing access were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 6th May 2025.

A site plan, drawings and a 3-dimensional model were displayed. The Committee noted that Café Poste was a Grade 4 Listed Building and that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area boundary and on the eastern cycle route network. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP7, PL3, GD1, GD3, GD5, GD6, NE1, HE1, HE2, ER4, H1, H2, H4, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER1, WER6, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) relating to Residential Space Standards (2025), Parking Standards (2023), Density Standards (2025), Disposal of Foul Sewage (2012), Jersey's Future Housing Needs (2023-2025), Retrofit of Historic Buildings in Jersey (2023), Managing Change in Historic Buildings and Spaces (2024), Protection of Historic Windows and Doors (2025), Protection of Employment Land (2012), Access onto the Highway (2019) and Planning Obligation Agreements (POA) (2017).

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, including a number of historic applications relating to the use of the site as a café/restaurant.

The Committee noted that permission was sought for the demolition of a modern extension to the Listed Building and the construction of one 3 bedroom (2 storey) and one 4 bedroom (3 storey) residential dwellings. The proposals included the relocation of the existing site access, car parking, soft landscaping, amenity space, external storage, and refuse and cycle stores. The Committee was advised that whilst development of the site for residential purposes was considered acceptable in principle, insufficient information had been provided to evidence the redundancy of the employment land use. Furthermore, the design, scale, height, and massing of the proposed development would be visually dominant and was considered inappropriate in the context of the site. The proposals would have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area, as well as causing unreasonable harm to neighbouring residential amenity due to loss of privacy and outlook.

Additionally, the quality of the proposed development was considered substandard and this would have a detrimental impact on future occupants. The scheme would result in the overdevelopment of the site and was considered contrary to Policies SP3, SP7, GD1, GD6, H1 and H2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Consequently, the application was recommended for refusal.

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 the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of JSL Architecture, who outlined how the proposals would enhance the setting of the Listed Building. The removal of the modern extension would allow for improvements to the site access and facilitate achievement of the required visibility splays. The proposed development would result in a reduction in the intensity of traffic to the site compared to the current use and the proposed residential dwellings had been designed in accordance with the relevant standards. The proposals would deliver new homes in the Built-Up Area and the design was considered appropriate in the local context, which was varied in nature. The scheme had been designed to respond to the constraints of the site and would improve the streetscape. [REDACTED] did not consider the impact on neighbouring amenity to be unreasonable and stated that a degree of overlooking was to be expected in the Built-Up Area. The reasons for refusal were not accepted and he urged the Committee to consider the proposals in the round.

The applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of JSL Architecture, advised that the site had been professionally marketed by an estate agent in order to demonstrate the redundancy of the employment use.

Having considered the application, the Committee unanimously decided to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Department report. In addition, members requested that the reasons for refusal include reference to the fact that insufficient evidence had been provided to demonstrate the redundancy of the employment use.

Clos du
Menage,
La Rue,
St. Ouen:
proposed
demolition and
replacement of
extension and
various
alterations.
(RFR)

P/2024/1378

A7. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which sought permission for the demolition of an existing extension and the construction of a new single storey pitched roof extension to the west elevation of the property known as Clos du Menage, La Rue, St. Ouen. A covered veranda to the south and new hard and soft landscaping were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 6th May 2025.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-up Area, the Protected Coastal Area and a Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies GD1, GD6, PL5, NE3, SP3 and H9 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, including applications for a single-storey extension to the south (planning application reference P/2014/1938 refers); the demolition and reconstruction of an ancillary building (planning application reference P/2009/1539 refers); and the raising of the roof to create habitable first floor accommodation and a detached double garage to the south (planning application reference P/2007/0612 refers). The Committee noted that all of the above applications had been approved.

The Committee noted that the property had been significantly extended over the years, resulting in an incremental increase in the built footprint of the site. The current application had been refused on the grounds that the proposed development,

by virtue of its location, design, scale, height, footprint, massing and appearance, constituted unsympathetic and dominant development, harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the established setting of Protected Open Space. The application was contrary to Policies GD6, H9, NE3, SP3 and PL5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

No representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Riva Architects, who stated that the scheme had been designed to respond to the local context, which included St. Owen Parish Church, a Grade One Listed Building located opposite the site. Whilst the incremental development of the site was acknowledged, [REDACTED] argued that the extensions and ancillary buildings on the site remained subservient to the host dwelling. The proposed development would be in keeping with the character of the site and was sensitive to the setting. The height was considered acceptable and planting would be introduced to provide visual screening. Consequently, the proposals would not have an adverse visual impact. Traditional materials such as slate and granite would be used and an existing oil tank would be removed. Sustainable heating options were being considered, including solar panels which would not be visible from the public realm. [REDACTED] concluded by stating that the proposals would provide practical benefits and have a positive impact on the character of the area and he urged the Committee to grant permission.

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

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

A8. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which sought permission for the demolition and replacement of a triple garage at the property known as Le Tresor, La Rue Ville Es Gazeaux, St. Lawrence, with 3 single storey garages. The Committee had visited the site on 6th May 2025.

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

P/2024/1298

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was a Strategic Countryside Access Site situated in the Green Zone and a Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, PL5, GD1, GD5, GD6, NE1, NE2, NE3, H9, TT1, TT2, TT4 and WER1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted the relevant planning history of the site, including an approved application for the demolition of the existing house, barn and outbuildings and the construction of a 5 bedroom dwelling, 2 bedroom guest accommodation, and one bedroom staff accommodation with associated landscaping and car parking (planning application reference No. P/2019/1079 refers). The Committee was advised that the permission was presumed to have lapsed as no works appeared to have commenced in connexion with the same.

The Committee noted that permission was sought for the replacement of the existing garage (which provided 47 square meters of parking space) with a block of 3 single storey garages to the east of the site, which would provide 138 square meters of parking space. A bakehouse adjoining the existing garage would be retained. The Committee was advised that the proposed development, by virtue of its increased

scale and footprint, was considered disproportionate and contrary to Policies NE3, PL5 and GD6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. Accordingly, 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], who explained that the permission granted under P/2019/1079 had not lapsed, as works had commenced in connexion with the same. A garage and glasshouse had been demolished by the previous owner of the site and these works implemented the permit. The applicant wished to retain and refurbish the existing house and was a bona fide agriculturalist who needed safe, secure storage for agricultural vehicles and machinery, including a modern tractor. The proposed garage would also allow for vehicle maintenance to be undertaken, with sufficient roof height to enable vehicles to be lifted for this purpose. The footprint of the proposed development was similar in size to the structures which had previously been demolished and there was a genuine need for the facility. [REDACTED] urged the Committee to take a pragmatic view and grant permission.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED], who outlined his credentials as a bona fide agriculturalist. He confirmed that he wished to retain the existing house and required storage for vehicles and machinery associated with his business. The existing garage was unsightly and could not accommodate a modern tractor. Dry and secure storage was needed to store agricultural equipment currently being stored outside, which had deteriorated following exposure to the elements.

In response to a question from a Member, the Committee was advised that whilst it was accepted that the permission in respect of application reference P/2019/1079 had not in fact lapsed, approval of the application under consideration would preclude the implementation of the earlier scheme.

Having considered the application, the Committee decided to grant permission, contrary to the Department recommendation, on the basis that there was a genuine need for the proposed development in accordance with Policy ERE5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

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 and the approval of any additional conditions which were to be attached to the permit.

No. 4 Rose
Cottage,
Retreat Farm,
La Rue des
Varvots,
St. Lawrence:
proposed
removal of
shed /
construction of
extension
(RFR).

P/2024/1339

A9. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers. The application sought permission for the removal of an existing shed and the construction of a single storey, flat roof extension to the south elevation of the property known as No. 4 Rose Cottage, Retreat Farm, La Rue des Varvots, St. Lawrence. The Committee had visited the site on 6th May 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 and was in a designated Water Pollution Safeguard Area. Policies SP2, PL5, GD1, GD6, WER5, NE3 and HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The application had been refused on the grounds that the design and projection of

the principal elevation of the proposed extension would be out of keeping with the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the scheme failed to use materials and finishes which were sympathetic to the character and identity of the existing building, in accordance with the conditions attached to the original 2012 consent (planning application reference No. P/2012/0272 refers). Consequently, it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application on the basis that it was contrary to Policy GD6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

2 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED], who advised that the proposed extension would be constructed in an unused area. The extension would house a sauna and bathroom facilities and would provide a downstairs toilet.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of BDK Architects, who reiterated that the property did not currently benefit from a downstairs toilet or utility area and that the sauna was required for the health and wellbeing of the applicant. [REDACTED] referred to the 2 reasons for refusal under Policy GD6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. He advised that the design, materials and finish had been carefully executed to blend with the host dwelling. The scheme took into account the 2008 Jersey Design Guide and the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment 2020, both of which aligned with the aims of Policy GD6. [REDACTED] did not believe that the projection of the extension would have any impact on the surrounding landscape and stated that the scheme accorded with Supplementary Planning Guidance and the relevant Policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. He urged the Committee to approve the application.

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

Seaholly, La
Ruelle de
Grantez, St.
Ouen:
proposed
demolition and
redevelopment
(RFR).

P/2024/0520

A10. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers. The application sought permission for the demolition of an existing dwelling and detached commercial workshop and the construction of a new 4 bedroom dwelling with first floor balcony and associated storage, vehicle parking and amenity space at the property known as Seaholly, La Ruelle de Grantez, St. Ouen. Ground contamination remediation works to the adjacent Field No. 1433, St. Ouen, the installation of ground source heat pump pipework, new hard and soft landscaping and the alteration of the vehicular access on to La Ruelle de Grantez were also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 6th May 2025.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Protected Coastal Area. Policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, GD1, GD5, GD6, ERE1, ERE2, EI1, NE1, NE3, TT1, TT2, TT4, ME1, WER1, WER6, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to the relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in relation to Residential Space and Parking Standards (2023) and Site Waste Management Plans (2013).

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds that the development was significantly larger than the existing development contrary to the SPG relating to Residential Space Standards (2023). The design and scale of the proposed development were considered intrusive and incongruous, and the scheme failed to conserve or enhance the character of the Protected Coastal Area. Whilst the proposed improvement to part of Field No. 1433 for agricultural purposes

was not considered contentious, the sub-division of the field would have a negative impact upon its agricultural viability, contrary to land controls. Consequently, it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application on the basis that it was contrary to Policies SP3, SP4, H9, GD6, NE3 and ERE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Duffell Planning Limited, who advised that the site was in a state of disrepair and that the development would result in aesthetic improvements. [REDACTED] understood that the SPG relating to Residential Space Standards (2023), had been amended to remove the cap on size. She advised that the proposed new dwelling would be the same height as the existing bungalow and that the footprint and mass of the development were in accordance with Policy H9 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The sub-division of Field No. 1433 would be well defined, and this could be managed by a condition, should the application be approved. Redundancy of the commercial aspect of the site had been proved, and the development passed the GD1 Policy test. Whilst the site was believed to be capable of accommodating 2 new dwellings, the applicant felt that a single dwelling would have less impact on the environment and landscape.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of Godel Architects, who advised that the thoughtful, contemporary design of the proposed new dwelling would enhance the area without being overly dominant. The site currently housed structures of varying heights and the approach to the proposed development sought to emulate this. The southern elevation would provide natural light and solar gain with the progressive design using materials such as timber, granite and zinc. [REDACTED] stated that the scheme proposed a modern, energy efficient home with ecological enhancements and which took into account the Protected Coastal Area context.

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