

**Classification level**

Official.

**Freedom of information exemption(s)**

Decision summary: None.

Written report: None.

Supporting document(s): None.

**Reason for the application of a freedom of information exemption(s)**

Decision summary: N/A - There are no exemptions being applied.

Written report: N/A - There are no exemptions being applied.

Supporting document(s): N/A - There are no exemptions being applied.

**Data protection**

[Data Protection principles](#) have been applied to this Written Report and the Supporting Document(s), if any. The following can be shared with Scrutiny and/or published:

Decision summary: Yes - redaction(s)/pseudonymization is not required.

Written report: Yes - redaction(s)/pseudonymization is not required.

Supporting document(s): Yes - redaction(s)/pseudonymization is not required.

**Legal advice**

In accordance with the [Ministerial Code](#), its supplementary guidance on [Ministerial Decisions](#), and legal privilege principles: no verbatim legal advice, nor any text alluding to legal advice having been sought, is found in any of the documentation supporting the Ministerial Decision.

**Preparatory information****Ministerial decision type:** Determination(s)**Ministerial Office:** Environment**Signatory:** Minister**Lead department:** Cabinet Office (CABO)**Lead directorate:** Housing, Environment and Placemaking (CABO)

<b>Lead officer:</b>	Head of Place and Spatial Planning
<b>Required for the States Assembly:</b>	The document(s) supporting this Ministerial Decision DO NOT require presenting/lodging with the States Assembly.
<b>Children's rights impact Assessment:</b>	A children's rights impact assessment is not required for this type of decision.
<b>Human rights impact Assessment:</b>	A human rights impact assessment is not required as part of this decision.

## **Planning appeals decision: P/2024/1484 (13 Oaktree, Clos de l'Ecole, St. John)**

### **Introduction**

This is a written report to support a Ministerial Decision and is to be read alongside the supporting documents, if any. This report has been prepared by officers and is viewed to be in accordance with the [Ministerial Code](#), supplementary guidance on [Ministerial Decisions](#), appropriate [Freedom of Information exemptions](#), and with consideration of [Data Protection Principles](#).

### **Supporting documents**

Report to the Minister for the Environment in respect of two third-party appeals under Article 108 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law, 2002 against a decision to award planning permission (P/2024/1484) at 13 Oaktree, Clos de l'Ecole, St. John dated 13 June 2025 by Sue Bell MSc., BSc, FCIEEM, CEcol, CWEM.

### **Reason for the decision**

Following two third-party appeals against the award of planning permission for the demolition of an existing single storey lean-to extension and the construction of a single and two storey extension with first floor Juliet balcony to the north elevation at 13 Oaktree, Clos de l'Ecole, St. John, Sue Bell was appointed as the independent planning inspector to consider the appeals, including all plans and documentation associated with them.

The inspector visited the site and surroundings, considered written representations and held a hearing before preparing and submitting a report for the Minister's consideration. As the two appeals were against the same grant of permission, they were considered together in the same report.

The Minister has given full consideration to the inspector's report and to the material factors referred to in it and is required, under Article 116 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law, 2002, to determine the appeals, and in so doing to give effect to the inspector's recommendation unless the Minister is satisfied that there are reasons not to do so.

### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Minister dismisses these appeals and that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraphs 31 – 33 of the inspector's report.

### **Action required if the recommendation is adopted**

The Ministerial Office to advise the Judicial Greffe of the decision.

### **Resource implications**

There are no new financial and/or human resource implications arising from this decision

### **Conflict of interest**

The decision-maker does not have an actual or perceived conflict of interest as relates to this decision.

