

KML/MH/283

PLANNING COMMITTEE

(17th Meeting)

19th September 2019PART A (Non-Exempt)

All members were present, with the exception of Connétables P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity and K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin.

Deputy R. Labey of St. Helier, Chairman
(not present for item No. A9)
Deputy G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade, Vice Chairman
(not present for item No. A7)
Deputy S.M. Wickenden of St. Helier
(not present for item No. A9 and A10)
Deputy J.M. Maçon of St Saviour
(not present for item No. A3)
Deputy R.E. Huelin of St. Peter
(not present for item Nos. A5, A7, A8, A9 and A10)
Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence
(not present for items Nos. A3, A4, A7, A8, A9)
Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence
(not present for item Nos. A4 and A7)

In attendance -

P. Le Gresley, Director, Development Control
C. Jones, Senior Planner
L. Davies, Planner
R. Greig, Planner
A. Parsons, Planner
T. Ingle, Principal Historic Environment Officer
K.M. Larbalestier, Committee Clerk, States Greffe

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| Minutes. | A1. The Minutes of the meetings held on 11th July and 20th August 2019, having been previously circulated, were taken as read and were confirmed. |
| Rosemount Bungalow, Le Mont les Vaux, St. Brelade: demolition and proposed redevelopment. | A2. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A8 of 23rd February 2017, considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition of the property known as Rosemount Bungalow, Le Mont les Vaux, St. Brelade and its proposed replacement with a new 4 bedroom dwelling with car parking and landscaping. It was also intended to create a new vehicular access on to Le Mont les Vaux. The Committee had visited the site on 17th September 2019. |
| P/2016/1286 | A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Green Zone and that Policies SP1, SP4, SP7, GD1, GD7, NE2, NE7, LWM2, LWM3 and WM1 of the 2011 Island Plan were relevant. |

The Committee recalled that it had previously refused permission for the construction of a new dwelling on the application site on the grounds that the

increase in development proposed in the Green Zone was just too great, contrary to Policy NE7. It had also been agreed that the opportunity should be taken to review the proposed new access arrangements to ensure that they were workable and would not have a detrimental impact on highway safety.

The Committee noted that the former dwelling on the site had previously been associated with the Shell Garden (the latter having been retained). In 2015 permission had been granted for extensions to the south and west elevations of the property. During the early stages of work to implement this permit, the property had been found to be in poor structural condition and had been deemed unsafe. Consequently, it had been demolished without consent.

The Committee was advised that, whilst the site was within the Green Zone, the relevant policy context allowed for replacement dwellings on the basis that this did not result in a significant increase in occupancy; exceptional environmental gains could be accrued; and, there was no adverse impact on landscape character.

The current scheme was considered to have overcome the concerns previously raised. The footprint of the proposed dwelling was less than that of the former bungalow and outbuildings on site and a more compact development than the linear scheme previously refused was being proposed. It was considered that the development complied with the relevant policy context in that it delivered a high quality, well-designed dwelling together with environmental benefits which would enhance the character and appearance of the area. The materials chosen and the proposed landscaping would also help to integrate the development into this Green Zone setting. The application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the officer report.

A total of 14 letters of representation had been received in connexion with the application. The Committee's attention was also drawn to responses from statutory consultees, to include the comments of the highway authority regarding inadequate visibility splays and surface water run-off onto the highway.

The Committee heard from Mr. S. Traynor, who advised that whilst the proposed development would affect his privacy, he did not object to the scheme. However, he expressed considerable concern regarding the safety implications of the proposed new access, which would be situated opposite a bus stop on a very busy section of road. Mr. Traynor believed that the access would be reliant upon an adjacent property to achieve the required visibility splays. There appeared to be no consent for this and the applicant had no control over the land in question. He was also concerned that adequate turning could not be achieved and that scheme did not include adequate car parking. In concluding he requested that a road safety audit should be undertaken.

The Committee heard from the applicant, Ms. L. Adams and her agents, Messrs. J. Dyson and J. Carney. Mr. Dyson advised that the application had been assessed as acceptable by the Department's Transport Section. Mr. Dyson drew the Committee's attention to copies of the submitted plans on which he had highlighted the visibility splays. It was noted that the visibility splays could be achieved over land within the applicant's ownership so maintenance of the same was not an issue. On site turning and car parking met the Department's requirements and it was noted that there was also a small car parking area on the road.

Ms. Adams informed the Committee that she wished the proposed development to blend in with the surrounding context.

17th Meeting
19.09.19

The Committee heard from Mr. Carney, who reiterated that the Department's highway engineers had been consulted and were satisfied with the proposed access arrangements. Similarly, the provision of car parking and turning also complied with the Department's standards.

The Committee, having considered the scheme, unanimously approved the application, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the officer report.

Jersey College
for Girls
Primary
School,
Claremont
Road, St.
Saviour:
proposed
pedestrian
bridge between
junior and
senior schools.

A3. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the construction of a pedestrian bridge between Jersey College for Girls Preparatory School and the Jersey College for Girls (senior school), Claremont Road, St. Saviour. The Committee had visited the site on 17th September 2019.

Deputies J.M. Maçon of St Saviour and K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence did not participate in the determination of this application.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Built-Up Area and was on the Eastern Cycle Route. Jersey College for Girls was a Listed Building. Policies SP1, SP7, GD1, GD7, HE1 NE4, SCO1, TT3 and TT5 of the 2011 Island Plan were relevant.

P/2019/0682

The Committee noted that the scheme proposed the construction of a pedestrian footbridge over Claremont Road to link the secondary and primary school sites. The bridge would measure 14.5 metres long by 1.9 metres wide, would sit with 5.5 metres clearance above the road and measure 7.5 metres high in total. Cedar cladding panels, galvanised steel beams and columns and cedar clad balustrading were to be used in its construction. The bridge would be accessed by a series of steps on either side of it, all similarly enclosed by cedar panels and balustrading.

The Committee noted that the size, height, massing and design of the proposed footbridge were considered to be visually incongruous in the street scene. The design and appearance of the footbridge was neither modern, nor traditional and the excessive use of cedar cladding introduced another material into the street scene.

The rationale behind improving pedestrian safety and allowing easier access between the 2 school sites was understood and a contribution from the Parish of St. Saviour as the highway authority was noted. However, the chosen solution in the form of a footbridge was not supported given the height, design, scale and massing, which would be visually unattractive, detrimental to the street scene and to the character and appearance of the area as a whole. Consequently, the application was recommended for refusal on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies SP7, GD1, GD7, TT5 and NE4 of the 2011 Island Plan.

A total of 38 letters of representation had been received in connexion with the application – 5 of which raised objections. The Committee had also been provided with a copy of an additional letter of representation from Deputy I. Gardner of St. Helier, which had been received after the publication of the Committee's agenda. The Committee's attention was also drawn to responses from statutory consultees, to include the comments of the Transport Section of the Growth, Housing and Environment Department (which Department did not administer the road) expressing concerns regarding the wider impact on the surrounding road network.

The Committee heard from Mr. A. Davey of J.S. Livingston Architects, representing the applicant. Mr. Davey advised that the proposed footbridge would link the 2 schools, giving rise to a whole range of educational benefits as well as improving

road safety. There was widespread support for the scheme and whilst there would be a visual impact it was not considered to be a negative one. A simple palette of materials which would complement existing buildings had been selected and detachable panels would be used for ease of maintenance. The height of the bridge had been determined in conjunction with the Parish of St. Saviour and the Department's Transport Section, with reference to the Highway Encroachments (Jersey) Regulations 1957. There followed some discussion around covering the bridge and it was noted that suicide prevention had been taken into account when determining the height of the high level balustrading. Furthermore, measures would be put in place to ensure the bridge was used primarily by the schools. It was pointed out by a member that the bridge did not appear to comply with the Discrimination (Disability) (Jersey) Regulations 2018, Article 7(a), which aimed to ensure that disabled persons were not put at a substantial disadvantage in comparison with persons who were not disabled by reason of a physical feature of premises. Mr. Davey advised that this issue would be addressed by Mr. C. Howarth, Principal, Jersey College for Girls.

The Committee heard from Ms. D. McMillan, Children's Commissioner, who wished to ensure that, in determining the application, the Committee had due regard to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, a human rights treaty which set out the civil, political, economic, social, health and cultural rights of children and to which the Island of Jersey was a signatory. Ms. McMillan advised that a part of an Islandwide survey undertaken in 2018, children had spoken strongly about their concerns around road traffic, the speed at which vehicles travelled, insufficient crossings and narrow footpaths. The Chairman pointed out that it appeared that the proposed footbridge did not take into account the rights of disabled children. Ms. McMillan confirmed that the Convention referred to the rights of all children and she too stated that Mr. Howarth would address this issue.

Mr. Howarth addressed the Committee, reiterating that Jersey was a signatory to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and reminding the Committee that the Government Plan prioritised the protection of children and sought to improve opportunities and outcomes. This was the aim of the application under consideration and Mr. Howarth explained how the campus was used at present to enrich the learning experience. However, the campus was split down the middle by Claremont Road, which was a narrow 2 way road used as a 'rat run' by traffic. Children as young as 4 had to cross the road to access lessons, canteen facilities and after school activities. The provision of a bridge would eliminate the high risk associated with crossing the road and the scheme was supported by the Parish of St. Saviour. Mr. Howarth confirmed that the height of the bridge accorded with the requirements of the Highway Encroachments (Jersey) Regulations 1957 and he stated that the intention was not to slow traffic down but to provide a safe passage for children. Whilst one semi-mature tree would be lost to facilitate the proposed development, Mr. Howarth asked the Committee to balance this against the benefit to the daily lives of 1,200 children. With reference to comments regarding access by disabled persons, Mr. Howarth stated that these pupils would be supervised and guided. Whilst it was understood that there had been no injuries arising from road traffic accidents on Claremont Road, Mr. Howarth stated that parents frequently reported vehicles travelling at high speed. In response to a question from a member regarding the particular reasons behind the preference for a bridge as opposed to traffic calming measures, Mr. Howarth stated that this was the option supported by the Parish. He declined to comment on the reasons behind this as he felt it would be inappropriate for him to speak on behalf of the Parish. Another member asked whether consideration had been given to an underpass and Mr. Howarth informed the Committee that this would be a much more complex solution, particularly because of the presence of a main sewer. In terms of comments regarding enclosing the bridge, Mr. Howarth confirmed that the school would be willing to consider this.

The Committee heard from Mr. R. Sugden, Principal, Jersey College for Girls Preparatory School. Mr. Sugden addressed comments regarding disabled access and advised that arrangements would be made for students who were unable to use the footbridge to access all facilities at Jersey College for Girls.

The Committee received Mr. J. Overland, whose children were pupils at the Preparatory School. Mr. Overland stated that the principal aim of the footbridge was to protect children from the danger associated with crossing the road. The focus was on this rather than any benefit to other road users. He stated that he did not wish his children to cycle to and from school because he was not confident that they would be safe from traffic. He suggested that, if permission was granted, the school might wish to plant more trees to compensate for the loss of one semi-mature tree. He felt this was a small price to pay in return for safer access to the campus.

The Committee heard from Mrs. R. Stott, whose children were pupils at both Jersey College for Girls and Victoria College Preparatory School. Mrs. Stott described how, in the last 5 years, efforts to combine the schools had resulted in significant educational benefits. Furthermore, the transition from the Preparatory School to the senior school was much easier for pupils. Mrs. Stott described how her son accessed Chinese lessons at Jersey College for Girls and advised that he had to walk from Victoria College Preparatory School to Jersey College for Girls, crossing a busy road. In terms of the loss of the mature tree, Mrs. Stott felt sure the school would wish to plant some new trees to compensate for this. She also stated that it was disappointing that more sustainable modes of transport, such as cycling, were not an option for pupils but she felt that cycling on the surrounding road network was just too dangerous, especially for younger children. She concluded by stating that she wished her children to be able to access the campus safely and was concerned about providing a secure environment for them. She was not convinced that traffic calming measures were the answer to the particular problem and reminded the Committee of the fatal accident which had occurred just outside the Millennium Town Park (where traffic calming measures were in place) and which had resulted in the death of a young child. Just because there had not been any accidents on Claremont Road did not mean traffic did not pose a risk.

The Committee heard from Dr. R. Gregg, an Accident and Emergency Consultant, whose children were also pupils. Dr. Gregg stated that the provision of a bridge like this represented the gold standard in pedestrian safety as it separated pedestrians and traffic. Whilst he considered the comments regarding disabled access to the bridge to be fair, he pointed out that from a risk perspective a disabled person would be accompanied and assisted by a teacher. In terms of mental health issues among young people, whilst mental illness appeared to be on the increase, raised awareness of this was probably a factor. Dr. Gregg referred to the Hawthorne Effect - a well-documented phenomenon where human subjects in an experiment changed their behaviour simply because they were being studied. However, Dr. Gregg agreed that it was probably sensible to consider a means of enclosure for the bridge. In concluding, he stated that the roads around the school were extremely busy and he described the current situation as 'an accident waiting to happen'.

The Committee heard from Mr. C. Bird, a parent Governor at the school. Mr. Bird stated that considerable effort and thought had gone into the project and there was a huge commitment to increasing opportunities across the campus. The safety of students was of paramount importance and the bridge would facilitate safe access to the full range of facilities.

The Committee heard from Mrs. K. Werry, who lived on Claremont Road and whose children attended the school. Mrs. Werry advised that the proposed footbridge would give her peace of mind in terms of safe access to the campus.

The Committee heard from Miss P. Le Maistre, Deputy Head Girl at Jersey College for Girls Preparatory School. Miss Le Maistre stated that connecting the 2 schools via the proposed footbridge would provide safe access to a wider range of facilities, to include the new music block and the science block. She concluded by stating that the Government of Jersey had pledged to put children first and the footbridge would give safe access to a range of learning opportunities.

The Committee heard from Miss L. Dobber, Academic Head Girl, Jersey College for Girls. Miss Dobber advised that the provision of a footbridge linking the 2 schools would enlarge the campus and eradicate the need for any duplication of facilities. The scheme was only the first step of many in terms of future plans to strengthen links between the 2 schools. Miss Dobber went on to state that high walls enclosed the school and students were not inclined to scale these walls or throw anything over them.

The Committee heard from Miss B. Christopher, Head Girl, Jersey College for Girls Preparatory School. Miss Christopher advised the Committee that she frequently crossed the road to access activities and the proposed footbridge would make this safer. Safe access to the wider campus would also help with learning and would provide an opportunity to get to know senior school students. Miss Christopher expressed a desire to see Jersey College for Girls Prefects more often. She went on to state that she would use the bridge every day and invited questions from members.

The Committee invited Mr. Davey to respond to questions from a member regarding the reasoning behind the choice of a footbridge over traffic calming measures. Mr. Davey understood that a footbridge was considered to be the safer option. There followed some discussion regarding potential alternative options suggested by Committee members but the Director, Development Control reminded the Committee of its duty to determine the application as submitted and not to seek to re-design the scheme during the course of the meeting. He went on to clarify that whilst the Committee must give due consideration to Conventions and other relevant legislation, these did not take precedent and the application should be determined in accordance with the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Deputy R. Labey of St. Helier, Chairman, was minded to support the application on the grounds of safety and the educational benefits which would arise, which were considered to outweigh objections raised by the Department. In approving the application the Committee requested that a condition be attached to the permit requiring the planting of additional trees elsewhere on the site.

Having noted that its decision was contrary to the officer recommendation to refuse permission, the Committee was advised that the application would be re-presented at the next scheduled meeting for formal confirmation of the decision and any other conditions proposed by the Department.

Les Bardeaux,
La Rue de
Haut, St.
Lawrence:
proposed
demolition and
redevelopment.

A4. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition of the property known as Les Bardeaux, La Rue de Haut, St. Lawrence. The Committee had visited the site on 17th September 2019.

Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence and Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence did not participate in the determination of this application.

17th Meeting
19.09.19

P/2019/0166

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Built-Up Area, the Green Backdrop Zone and the Green Zone. Policies SP1, SP2, SP6, SP7, GD1, GD3, GD7, BE3, NE2, H6, NR7, WM1, LWM2 and 3 of the 2011 Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted that Les Bardeaux was a detached 20th-century dwelling, with associated outbuildings, located on a substantial elevated site (approx. 1.29 acres), on the north side of La Rue de Haut. The southern half of the site was within the Built-Up Area, whilst the northern half formed part of the Green Zone. Other properties within the vicinity of the site were of various scales and styles. The 2 immediate neighbouring sites (to the east and west) were both currently undergoing significant redevelopment.

The application proposed the comprehensive redevelopment of the site, which would involve the demolition of all existing structures, and thereafter the construction of a new residential apartment block comprising a total of 11 units of accommodation. The proposed development would be confined to the Built-Up Area. The accommodation would be arranged over 4-storeys, set above a basement car park level. At its highest point, the new development would be around 5.5 metres higher than the existing building and around 2 – 3 metres higher than the newly-constructed apartment development at neighbouring West Grove. The main 4-storey block of accommodation would be set back from the roadside wall by around 20 metres and would be just under 40 metres from the neighbouring properties opposite. The new apartments comfortably met and exceeded the Department's required residential standards in all regards. Each unit would have access to sufficient outdoor space, and would have at least 2 parking spaces per unit (together with visitor parking).

The application proposed alterations to the site's roadside boundary, including the re-positioning of the vehicle entrance and the formation of a new pedestrian footpath. Initial concerns raised by the highway authority on the grounds of highway safety had been satisfactorily addressed. In line with a further request from the highway authority, the applicants had agreed to contribute towards improvements in off-site sustainable transport infrastructure (including the provision of a bus shelter and pedestrian safety measures).

A tiered design approach was proposed with generous terraces and large expanses of glazing – particularly to the main (southern) elevation – in order to make the most of the far-reaching views towards St Aubin's Bay. The palette of materials included a mix of granite, painted render and dark-grey stone cladding. The design would also incorporate glazed balustrades at each level, as well as a series of bespoke laser-cut shutters which would enclose the recessed terraces to the lower 2 levels. A detailed landscaping scheme had been submitted as part of the application. In the Department's view, this was an elegant and well designed contemporary scheme which would sit comfortably within the site, and which would not have an overbearing presence. The comments received from nearby residents were noted but the Department did not believe that the proposed development would unreasonably harm the residential amenity of neighbours.

In summary, the application was considered to be justified with reference to the relevant policies of the Island Plan, which sought to ensure that Built-Up Area sites were developed to the highest reasonable density. Approval was recommended, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the officer report. A Planning Obligation Agreement (POA) was also recommended pursuant to Article 25 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law, 2002 (as amended), in order to guarantee the provision of the following –

- the implementation of a speed limit reduction along La Rue de Haut (including appropriate consultation);
- a bus shelter and proper standing area – to be located within the grounds of Bel Royal School, at the nearest (east-bound) bus stop on La Vallee de St Pierre;*
- footway improvements to provide an easier pedestrian crossing point within La Vallee de St Pierre at its junction with La Rue de Haut.

It was recommended that the Director (Development Control) be authorised to grant planning permission under the powers delegated to him, subject to the completion of the POA referred to above. Alternatively, in the event that a suitable POA was not agreed within three months, the application would be returned to the Committee for further consideration.

** the applicants had committed, in principle, to the delivery of the above improvements but precise costings had not yet been worked out. In the event that the Committee granted permission for the application, the precise financial contribution would need to be established and agreed by the applicants prior to permission being formally granted.*

A total of 23 letters of representation had been received in connexion with the application. The Committee's attention was also drawn to responses from statutory consultees, to include the comments of the Transport Section of the Growth, Housing and Environment Department which sought a contribution towards the provision of improved off-site infrastructure (secured via a Planning Obligation Agreement), as detailed above.

The Committee heard from Mr. M. Vellum and Mrs. J. Kenny. Mr. Ballum was concerned about loss of privacy and the overbearing impact of the proposed development. He also believed that it would have a detrimental effect on the Green Backdrop Zone and he noted the loss of shrubbery and trees at the front of the site. He stated that there had been significant disruption over the last 3 years from a number of new developments in the immediate vicinity of the site. He concluded by stating that a number of elderly residents of the area were concerned about the proposals but were unable to attend the meeting due to ill health.

Mrs. Kenny echoed Mr. Ballum's comments regarding the impact of construction work on residents in the area. She was concerned that excavation work on the application site would affect the foundations of her property and believed that there would be some overlooking into her garden and bedrooms. The Committee was advised that the road was used as a 'rat run', with high volumes of traffic at peak times. 2 new developments under construction nearby would see a further intensification of traffic in an area where pedestrian safety was already an issue. Mrs. Kenny felt sure that emergency access to Stuart Court Residential home would be impossible at certain times of day.

The Committee heard from Mrs. C. Gill, who regularly cycled along La Rue de Haut and concurred with comments regarding the volume of traffic on the road, a problem which had been exacerbated by construction traffic associated with new developments. Mrs. Gill advised that the number of parked cars on the road and on Mont Cambrai had increased with contractors also parking on La Providence estate. She complained of spoil being dumped under a protected tree by contractors working on an adjacent site. In concluding, Mrs. Gill stated that the proposed development was inappropriate in this context and would only add to the existing traffic problems.

17th Meeting
19.09.19

The Committee heard from Ms. L. Le Maistre-Macauley, who was also concerned about traffic on the road, pollution from vehicles and pedestrian safety.

The Committee heard from Mrs. S. Steedman and Mr. C. Dunne, representing the applicant. Mr. Dunne advised that there had been considerable consultation with the Department prior to the submission of the scheme. The design was of a high quality and reduced the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy through its offset position and tiered set back structure. Density levels were in accordance with the guidelines. The building would be 2 – 3 metres higher than the Westgrove development to the east with the vast majority of the additional height being invisible from the roadside.

Mrs. Steedman stated that the scheme was in accordance with the approved Island Plan and made the best use of land within the Built-Up Area. She believed that the proposed development complied with Policies SP1, 2, 7 and GD1 and 3 of the 2011 Island Plan. A landscaping scheme had been submitted which would provide screening and this could be supplemented to improve the relationship with neighbouring properties. With regard to comments regarding disruption arising from construction on other sites in the vicinity, Mrs. Steedman stated that whilst this was unavoidable steps would be taken to mitigate any adverse impact and a construction environmental management plan would be prepared. The site was similar to others in the Green Backdrop Zone where an increase in density had been approved. Mrs. Steedman concluded by reminding the Committee that there had been no objections from statutory consultees.

Having considered the application the Committee, with the exception of Deputy G. Truscott of St. Brelade, decided to refuse the application on the grounds of the increased height of the development, its impact on the Green Backdrop Zone and the effect it would have on the property known as Highgrove House.

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

Mount Martin,
Old St. John's
Road, St.
Helier:
proposed
refurbishment
and extension.

A5. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the refurbishment and extension of the property known as Mount Martin, Old St. John's Road, St Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 17th September 2019.

Deputies R.E. Huelin of St. Peter did not participate in the determination of the application.

P/2019/0282

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Built-Up Area and the Green Zone and included land designated as Protected Open Space. Policies SP1, SP4, SP7, GD1, GD7, NE7, HE1, BE6, NE1 and NE2, H6 and SCO4 of the 2011 Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted that Mount Martin was a detached 2-storey dwelling, with associated outbuildings, located to the immediate south of Mont à l'Abbé Cemetery. The site was accessed via an entrance from Old St. John's Road, and the applicants also owned a field to the south. The applicant proposed to refurbish and extend the existing dwelling (which was in poor condition) and also construct 3 new detached dwellings alongside. The works to the existing dwelling were considered to be acceptable. However, in order to create the 3 new building plots, it was necessary to extend beyond the existing boundary of the Built-Up Area into the Green Zone. Indeed, one of the new dwellings (Unit No. 3) would be located entirely within the Green Zone.

In addition, that part of the site which fell within the Built-Up Area was also designated as Protected Open Space (along with the adjoining cemetery) and was, therefore, afforded additional protection against development within the Island Plan. Under the provisions of Policy SCO4, there was a presumption against the loss of such land. Finally, it was considered that the development would negatively affect the setting of the adjoining cemetery (a Grade 2 Listed Place) by obscuring public views towards, and from its southern boundary. For these reasons, the application was considered to be fundamentally problematic and was recommended for refusal on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies SCO4, NE7, SP4 and HE1 of the 2011 Island Plan.

A total of 38 letters of representation had been received in connexion with the application – 5 of which raised objections.

The Committee heard from Mr. P. Mesney, Archaeology Section, La Société Jersiaise, who requested that, if permission was granted, an archaeologist be present during pre-construction as it was possible that there might be a Neolithic dolmen or burial chamber on the site.

The Committee heard from Ms. T. Ingle, who lived to the south of the site at Beehive Cottage. Ms. Ingle stated that the scheme did not comply with the relevant Island Plan Policies. She believed that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the setting of the Listed cemetery and on views towards it. However, she was not opposed to appropriate development which passed the policy test.

The Committee heard from the applicant, Mr. J. B. Young, who discussed his desire to provide affordable homes for Islanders. He spoke passionately about the Island and the opportunities he had benefitted from, despite difficult personal circumstances. He explained that he had trained as a building surveyor and had moved into development.

Whilst he accepted that views towards the graveyard would be affected, he pointed out that planting trees across the boundary to screen the development would also have an impact. Mr. Young stated that there was a need to develop appropriate sites on the boundary of the town and he discussed his aspirations to provide affordable homes for older people to free up larger accommodation. He referred to a recently completed development of 3 units at St. Peter, of which he was most proud.

In terms of the application under consideration, Mr. Young stated that he was more than willing to work with the Department to come up with a revised design approach, if the Committee felt this was appropriate.

In concluding, Mr. Young stated that he was motivated to ‘give something back’ to the Island and was not driven solely by financial gain.

Whilst the Committee agreed that Mr. Young’s ambitions were laudable, members recognised that the application was contrary to policy and endorsed the officer recommendation to refuse the application for the reasons set out above.

Bonne Nuit
Apartments,
Les Charrières
de Bonne Nuit,
St. John:
proposed
extension and
alteration.

A6. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the extension and alteration of the property known as Bonne Nuit Apartments, Les Charrières de Bonne Nuit, St. John. The Committee had visited the site on 17th September 2019.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Coastal National Park and that Policies GD1, GD7 and NE6 of the 2011 Island Plan were relevant.

17th Meeting
19.09.19

P/2019/0657

The Committee noted that Bonne Nuit Apartments was located in an elevated position above Bonne Nuit Bay with access from Les Charrières de Bonne Nuit. It was a 3-storey former hotel building containing 11 apartments in total. There were a number of other residential properties within the immediate vicinity.

The application proposed a series of extensions and alterations to the existing building – specifically, extensions to 5 of the units along the south-eastern side of the building. The site was located within the Island’s Coastal National Park, wherein there was a strong presumption against development under the provisions of Policy NE6 of the Island Plan. However, Policy NE6 allowed for certain forms of development, including alterations and extensions to existing dwellings. In the Department’s view, the proposed works would not have a significant landscape impact and, because no additional bedrooms were being created, there would not be any increase in occupancy on the site. On this basis, it was considered that the application accorded with Policy NE6. The impact upon the neighbouring property to the south-west had been assessed and with the additional landscaping proposed the relationship between the properties was considered to be acceptable. Approval was recommended, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the officer report.

4 letters of representation had been received in connexion with the application and the Parish of St. John opposed the scheme on the grounds of the increase in the scale of the building.

The Committee heard from the applicant, Ms. N. Millar and her agent, Mr. S. Mulholland. Mr. Mulholland explained that there would be no increase in occupancy. The scheme would improve the existing sub-standard living space for occupants with little impact on surrounding buildings.

Ms. Millar advised that the proposed additional landscaping would reduce the impact on the neighbouring property. Furthermore, the scheme would significantly improve the appearance of the building, making it blend in with its surroundings.

Having considered the application, the Committee decided to grant permission, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the officer report.

La Rochelle,
Les Charrières
Malorey, St.
Lawrence:
proposed
variation of
condition.

A7. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the variation of a condition attached to the permit in respect of the property known as La Rochelle, Les Charrières Malorey, St. Lawrence. The Committee had visited the site on 17th September 2019.

Deputies R.E. Huelin of St. Peter, K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence, G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade and Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence did not participate in the determination of the application.

RC/2019/0669

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Green Zone, Airport Noise Zone 3 and Airport Public Safety Zone (APSZ) 2. Policies SP1, NE7, GD1, TT16 and TT17 of the 2011 Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted that the application related to condition (No. 2) which had been attached to a permit issued in July 2011. Condition No. 2 restricted the permission for a first floor extension above the garage to ancillary accommodation only. The accommodation could not be occupied as a separate dwelling. The current application sought to vary the condition to allow the accommodation to be used “more independently”, as a self-contained residential unit.

The Committee was advised that the site comprised a single dwelling house with detached garage building. In 2011 a grant of planning permission had been issued to construct a first floor extension above the garage building. The permitted use of the approved first floor extension had been made explicit, in both the description of development and by condition, as ancillary accommodation for the main house. The current application sought planning permission for the variation of the aforementioned condition to allow the ancillary accommodation to be used 'more independently' of the main dwelling. The submitted layout clearly illustrated a self-contained residential unit, which was separate from and would not be reliant upon facilities within the main house.

The submitted application did not provide the mechanism for the formation of the desired self-contained residential unit, independent of La Rochelle as the proposed developed was described as "ancillary accommodation for main house." Notwithstanding the above, within the Green Zone and the APSZ there was a specific presumption against proposals for new dwellings and those facilitating the creation of a separate household. Accordingly, the proposals were contrary to the relevant policies of the 2011 Island Plan and the Department was not aware of any compelling grounds which would be sufficient to justify a departure from policy. Consequently, the application was recommended for refusal on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies NE7 and TT17.

10 letters of representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee received the applicants, Mrs. J. Banks, Ms. K. Lawrence, the applicants' neighbour and the agent, Mrs. S. Steedman.

The Committee heard from the applicant, Mrs. Banks, who advised that the accommodation had been occupied by family members since 2018, without any adverse impact on neighbouring amenities or the environment. Mrs. Banks' daughters, both of whom were front line professionals, had occupied the unit, variously, but were unable to attend the meeting due to work commitments. The variation of the condition would merely allow for the installation of a cooker in the unit so that Miss L. Banks, the current occupant, was not reliant upon the main house kitchen for cooking facilities. There was no absolutely intention of separating the ancillary unit from the main house and it was totally reliant upon La Rochelle for all utility services, car parking and amenity space.

Mrs. Lawrence advised that the accommodation had been occupied by family members since January 2018, without issue. She foresaw no difficulty at all in varying the condition of the permit to effectively allow the installation of cooking facilities in the accommodation. In terms of the Green Zone location of the site, Mrs. Lawrence did not envisage any adverse impact as the accommodation already existed and the installation of cooking facilities could result in fewer car journeys. With regard to the Aircraft Public Safety Zone and the Airport Noise Zone designation of the area, Mrs. Lawrence advised that she lived happily in the area without concern.

Mrs. Steedman advised that the application proposed the inclusion of cooking facilities to allow the occupiers of the ancillary accommodation to use it more independently and flexibly. The use of all existing car parking and garden areas would be shared with the principal dwelling and the purpose of the unit as ancillary accommodation would not change. Mrs. Steedman argued that, as there was no change of use, there were no planning policy issues to address. It was arguable whether any development was actually proposed in the legislative context as the installation of cooking facilities could not be viewed as operational development.

17th Meeting
19.09.19

The accommodation had been occupied independently by family and friends since its creation but could not be completely separated from the principal dwelling without great expense. Mrs. Steedman referred the Committee to the UK planning system Development Control Practice manual which referred to the primary uses of land often involving one or more activity. Reference was also made to genuine ancillary uses not constituting a material change of use and tests of severability and environmental impact were set out therein. She went on to stress that all services utilised by the ancillary accommodation were entirely reliant on La Rochelle so there was clear linkage and dependency. Neighbours had confirmed that there was no harmful or negative impact arising from the use of the accommodation. It was arguable whether permission was actually needed but the applicants wished to ensure that they were acting properly and in accordance with the Law. Mrs. Steedman concluded by reminding the Committee that it had the ability to make decisions which were inconsistent with the Island Plan Policies if this was considered to be the case, as long as members were satisfied that there was sufficient justification for doing so.

The Director, Development Control advised that the application proposed the formation of a separate dwelling; it was not about the installation of cooking facilities, which did not require planning permission. Whilst the unit might be ancillary to the principal dwelling it was capable of being occupied independently and what prevented it from being severed from La Rochelle were things for which there were no planning controls. However, he acknowledged that the wording on the condition on the permit was vague/imprecise. Mrs. Steedman responded by stating that the applicants should not be penalised because of a poorly worded decision permit. If the Committee was minded to support the application the applicants would be willing to accept a condition tying the garaging and gardens to both properties and the removal of permitted development rights. It was also open to the Committee to request the entering into of a Planning Obligation Agreement to tie the ancillary unit to the main house but Mrs. Steedman believed this would be a maladroit way of handling the matter.

Having considered the application, the Committee decided to grant permission, contrary to the officer recommendation and on the basis that permitted development rights were removed and that the use of the gardens and car parking were shared.

Having recognised that its decision was contrary to the officer recommendation, the Committee noted that the application would be re-presented at the next scheduled meeting for formal approval.

Villa Capri, La
Route de la
Cote, St.
Martin:
proposed
remodelling.

A8. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the remodelling of the property known as Villa Capri, La Route de la Cote, St. Martin. The Committee had visited the site on 17th September 2019.

Deputies R.E. Huelin of St. Peter and K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence did not participate in the determination of the application.

P/2019/0407

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Built-Up Area, the Coastal National Park, the Green Backdrop Zone and was in a Tourist Destination Area. The Committee was advised that the development was focussed around the existing property, which was located within the Built-Up Area, wherein there was a presumption in favour of development, provided that the proposals met the requirements of the relevant Island Plan Policies. In this particular case Policies SP4, SP7, GD1, GD7, BE3, BE6, H6, NE2 and NE4 of the 2011 Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted that the application sought consent for the remodelling of the existing dwelling, including the removal of the pitched roof and its replacement with a flat roof, allowing for additional usable space and an external terrace at third floor level. Also included within the proposal was the installation of a gate on the southern elevation, the removal of the existing granite cladding and its replacement with painted render above ground floor level. The proposal also sought to extend the current gravel driveway further toward the north-east corner of the site. This would include the construction of a new retaining wall which would be finished in granite. No details of the finished surfacing materials for the driveway had been received and this would be necessary prior to the start of any works on site, should permission be granted. In addition to the works described above, various internal works were proposed in order to make more efficient use of the internal space in line with the applicant's aspirations. These changes did not expressly require planning consent so had not been assessed as part of the proposals.

As a result of discussions with the Department the scheme had been amended so that the retaining walls and ground floor of the property would now be clad with granite, thus reducing the vast amount of white render originally proposed. In addition to the above changes to the ground floor and retaining walls, the approach to the second and third floors had also been discussed. The third floor parapet wall had been amended to reduce the amount of white render visible in between the second and third floors and the side walls and the roof detail on the third floor had been amended to show a darker contrasting material to the floors below, further reducing the visual impact of the property. The second floor balcony had also been amended and reduced in size to minimise the potential for overlooking of the proposed dwelling at Soleil du Matin. The full length window on the southern elevation of the second floor would now be a directional bay window, which would provide views towards the coastline, but would have obscured views toward Soleil du Matin. In response to comments received from neighbours, 1.8 metre high privacy screens had been added to the cheeks of the balcony on the third floor, eliminating any perceived overlooking issues. The case officer advised that the amendments to the scheme failed to address the concerns of the owners of Soleil du Matin, who had contacted the Department on 16th September 2019, setting out their objections.

The application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the officer report.

4 letters of representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from Mrs. L. Sims, who owned the property known as Soleil du Matin with her husband. Mrs. Sims expressed concerns regarding loss of privacy and light to her son's bedroom. She advised that the amendments to the scheme did not address all of the concerns she had expressed in a meeting with the applicant and his architect. She also provided the Committee with a comprehensive summary of the interactions she had had with the applicant and the Department throughout the progression of the scheme. The Chairman urged Mrs. Sims to make good use of the time allocated for oral representations and focus on the planning issues. In response she confirmed that her principal objections related to the wraparound balcony, the second floor window and the landscaping scheme – she had not had sight of the latter.

The Committee heard from the applicant, Mr. R. Newton and his agents, Messrs. C. Riva and I. Alder. Mr. Newton advised that he was most interested in Art Deco modernism and he was of the view that the property had an Art Deco beach-front feel. He owned a collection of furniture, some of which had been hand made by his grandfather, which he felt would complement the style of the property. The design envisaged an Art Deco modernist house which would be appropriate in this context

17th Meeting
19.09.19

and would not detract from the historic Gorey Castle.

Mr. Alder advised that the proposed development would improve both the functionality and appearance of this very dated property. He discussed the details of the scheme and pointed out that there would be no increase in the size of the footprint. The style of the building was appropriate in this context and Mr. Alder referred to the number of recently approved developments within the immediate vicinity, to include Mr. and Mrs. Sims property. In response to a question from a member regarding the second floor window, Mr. Alder confirmed that it had originally been proposed to include a simple punched window, but in an attempt to address concerns regarding loss of privacy the scheme had been revised to include a directional bay window. This would provide views towards the coastline, but would have obscured views toward Soleil du Matin. It was noted that Mr. and Mrs. Sims' property benefitted from a large window which overlooked the application site.

Mr. Riva asked the Committee to consider the scheme as a whole and he referred the Committee to the amendments which had been made to address the concerns expressed by Mrs. Sims.

Having considered the application the Committee, with the exception of Deputy S.M. Wickenden of St. Helier, approved the same, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the officer report. In doing so the Committee was satisfied that the relationship between the application site and the neighbouring property would be unaltered by the proposed development.

Mrs. Sims expressed the view that she had not been given sufficient time to make her case and she believed that previous speakers had been afforded greater laxity. She noted that 3 individuals who had spoken on a previous item had been permitted to speak for 5 minutes each. The Director, Development Control advised Mrs. Sims that she too had been afforded a degree of forbearance and had been permitted to speak for a full 10 minutes.

No. 36
Leogran Villa,
Cleveland
Road, St.
Helier:
proposed
demolition of
garage/new
garage with
residential unit
above (RFR).

A9. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which sought permission for the demolition of the existing garage at the property known as No. 36 Leogran Villa, Cleveland Road, St. Helier and its replacement with a new garage with a residential unit above. The Committee had visited the site on 17th September 2019.

Deputies R. Labey and S.M. Wickenden of St. Helier, K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence and R.E. Huelin of St. Peter did not participate in the determination of this application. Deputy J.M. Maçon of St Saviour acted as Chairman for the duration of this item.

P/2019/0337

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Built-Up Area and that Policies HE1, H6, GD1 and GD7 of the 2011 Island Plan were of particular relevance. In addition, the Committee's attention was drawn to (Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG): Policy Note 6 – A Minimum Specification for New Housing Development - January 2009 and Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG): Policy Note 3 – Parking Guidelines – September 1988).

The Committee was advised that the application related to the construction of a new building, set over two floors, within the existing courtyard garden of No. 36 Cleveland Road (a Grade 3 Listed Building). The proposed building would accommodate a one-bedroom self-contained residential unit at first floor level with a single garage (serving the new unit) and double garage (serving the existing dwelling house) at ground level.

Notwithstanding the Built-Up Area designation and the general presumption in favour of residential development, the Department had concluded that the proposals failed to deliver the requisite high standard of design; amounted to a cramped, overdevelopment of the site; had an unacceptable adverse impact upon the setting of the Listed Building; and, failed to deliver the required level of accommodation or parking provision. Consequently, the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies HE1, GD7 and H6 of the 2011 Island Plan. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

The Committee heard from Ms. T. Ingle, Principal Historic Environment Officer, who advised that this was a Grade 3 Listed building with most of its exuberant seaside architectural embellishments on the front elevation. The property sat next to 2 other Listed Buildings – Charnwood and Cleveland House. Whilst the appearance of the rear elevation of the property was plainer, it did form part of the historic character and the impact on the setting as a whole had to be considered. Whilst Ms. Ingle accepted that a lane which ran behind the property had no real character, Policy HE1 required the quality and design of development to be appropriate to the setting of the Listed Building and the proposed development did not meet the quality test, being somewhat utilitarian in appearance. Therefore, the application could not be supported. Ms. Ingle did not rule out the redevelopment of the structure and suggested that further consultation with the Department might assist in arriving at a mutually acceptable solution.

The Committee heard from the applicants, Miss. J. Cannon and Mr. S. Cannon and their agent, Mr. M. Stein. Mr. Stein drew the Committee's attention to the similarities between the proposed development and a neighbouring development approved in 2016 at No. 38 Cleveland Road, which could be sold or let independently. Mr. Stein advised that it was intended that Miss Cannon would occupy the proposed new unit of accommodation. Miss Cannon was employed as a carer and could not afford to purchase or rent a property on the open market. Having seen what had been achieved at No. 38, this seemed to present an opportunity to provide an affordable unit of accommodation whilst giving Miss Cannon a degree of independence. Mr. Stein argued that the Listing related to the architectural features on the front elevation of the property and, as such, a photograph of the front elevation appeared on the Statement of Significance and reference was made to the large bay window on the front. No. 38 was also a Listed Building and the creation of an additional unit to the rear of this property had been considered acceptable. The proposed car parking provision would be no different to that on the neighbouring site and it was noted that whilst the spaces were marginally undersize, the residents had small vehicles. The proposed new unit would enjoy a shared amenity space with the principal dwelling and Havre des Pas beach was only 50 metres from the house. In response to Ms. Ingle's suggestion of negotiating an alternative approach, Mr. Stein advised that a pitched roof structure would mean losing head space so the submitted scheme presented the only viable option. In concluding, Mr. Stein urged the Committee to adopt a consistent approach in its decision making.

Mr. Cannon addressed the Committee, advising that, as a parent he was trying to help his daughter obtain independence and allow her to have some privacy. He too referred to the neighbouring development and stated that it was the approval of the same which had led to him submitting the current application. Mr. Cannon also advised the Committee of the joy he and his daughter had initially experienced when they had been advised that the application had been approved. However, their joy had turned to dismay when they were subsequently advised that the decision had been incorrectly communicated due to an administrative error and the application had, in fact, been refused. He had then sought the assistance of Mr. Stein in appealing against the decision. Mr. Cannon concluded by stating that he only wished to do

17th Meeting
19.09.19

what had been done at the neighbouring property. The proposed unit would be the same size.

The Committee heard from Miss Cannon, who advised that the submitted scheme presented her with an excellent opportunity to have her own accommodation – something which would otherwise be unachievable and beyond her financial means.

The Committee heard from Deputy R. Labey of St. Helier, representing the applicants. Deputy Labey expressed support for the scheme and stated that theirs was a genuine case. He asked the Committee to focus on the degree of harm which would be caused by the proposed development. He pointed out that there had been no objection from the neighbouring occupant and an almost identical development had been approved next door. Deputy Labey did not believe that the proposed development would be harmful to Croydon Lane, which he described as a rear service area for 2 rows of houses. The lane comprised a ‘mish-mash’ of buildings. He believed that the decision to refuse the application was entirely based on the objection of the Historic Environment Section and whilst the Planning Committee supported the vast majority of the recommendations made by that section, in this particular case the Deputy felt that the case made was marginal. At the rear of the property the part of the Listing which was pertinent was the window on the first floor and the roof dormer, and these would not be altered. Although they would be obscured to a degree by the proposed development, they would remain intact and the rear was only accessible via the principal dwelling. Deputy Labey concluded by stating that he did not believe that the scheme would result in any harm to this Grade 3 Listed Building and he felt sure that the primary reason for the Listing was the architectural features on the Cleveland road façade.

The case officer advised that the extent of the listing went up to the edge of the step in the courtyard area and included the service wing to the rear. He drew the Committee’s attention to reasons for refusal Nos. 2 and 3, which referred to, among other things, the over-development of the site and the lack of car parking or amenity space. Reason for refusal No. 1 referred to the impact on the setting of the Listed Building. In essence, the application had been refused for 3 specific reasons, as set out in the officer report. In terms of the development at No. 38 Cleveland Road, this had involved the conversion of an existing building and the sites were distinct in that No. 36 was a narrower, more constrained plot which meant that the perceived impact of development was more apparent.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Deputy G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade (who supported the scheme and felt that the historic interest of the property related solely to the Cleveland Road elevation) endorsed the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

Villa Rose, Le
Chemin du
Moulin, St.
Ouen:
proposed
extension and
remodelling
(RFR).

A10. The Committee 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 a 2 storey extension to the north elevation and a first floor extension with balcony to the south elevation of the property known as Villa Rose, Le Chemin du Moulin, St. Ouen. It was also proposed to replace the roof, install decking to the south elevation and a gate to the south of site. The Committee had visited the site on 17th September 2019.

P/2019/0460

Deputies S.M. Wickenden of St. Helier and R.E. Huelin of St. Peter did not participate in the determination of this application.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Coastal National Park and that Policies SP4, SP7, GD1, GD7, NE1, NE2 and NE6 of the 2011 Island Plan were of particular relevance.

The Committee was advised that, at first glance, the redevelopment of the property appeared to maintain the original dimensions and walls of the existing dwelling. However, on closer examination the addition of large elements of floor to ceiling glazing, changes to positions of external windows and doors and widespread change to the construction of the property indicated that the proposed works went beyond an extension. In fact, very little of the original walls would remain as a result of this proposal. The works were certainly not subservient to the existing building as required for extensions in the Coastal National Park (CNP) and would completely remodel the house.

Policy NE6 set out the permissible exceptions to the presumption against development when considering the demolition and redevelopment of a property within the CNP. These exceptions were deliberately restrictive in order to protect the sensitive nature of the CNP and the proposals failed to meet these requirements. Consequently, the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policy NE6 of the 2011 Island Plan. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

The Committee received Mr. R. Godel, representing the applicant. Mr. Godel stated that Policy NE6 did not appear to make provision for the substantial remodelling of existing dwellings so the application had been treated as if the scheme proposed the complete redevelopment of the property. The Island Plan defined redevelopment as the demolition and replacement of a building. The scheme proposed a combination of extending the property and remodelling it. There would be no increase in height. Mr. Godel referred to the approval of an application at an adjacent property known as La Cabine in 2016, where he believed the circumstances had been very similar to that of the submitted scheme. Whilst he accepted that the Department had initially refused the application for La Cabine and it had subsequently been overturned by the Committee on appeal, there had been no reference in the officer assessment sheet to the scheme being treated as the redevelopment of the property (demolition and replacement). It had, instead, been assessed as an extension of the existing property. Mr. Godel argued that the application under consideration should be treated in the same way. Furthermore, La Cabine was in a much more prominent location. Mr. Godel believed that the policy context acknowledged that the remodelling of a property in itself would not be harmful to the landscape. With regard to the submitted scheme, the materials would help the property to blend in with the landscape in a more successful manner than the existing dwelling, which was suburban in character and did not relate to the landscape. Whilst the footprint would increase, the dwelling would sit more comfortably in the landscape and would be set well back. The scheme included significant proposals to improve planting and habitat.

The Committee heard from Mr. T. Job, also of Godel Architects, who used the submitted drawings to illustrate how much of the original building would be retained. He also discussed the colour palette of the materials which would be used to soften the appearance of the building. The case officer expressed the view that it appeared that some structural walls would have to be removed to facilitate the proposed development and the Director, Development Control stated that the scheme went beyond the extension of the property and the works could not be considered subservient to the existing building.

The Committee discussed the application and noted the views of Deputies R. Labey of St. Helier, Chairman and G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade, Vice Chairman, who felt that the proposed development would have a lesser visual impact. The Committee, with the exception of Deputies Labey and Truscott, endorsed the officer recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out above.