

Planning Committee

(17th Meeting)

28th September 2023Part A (Non-Exempt)

All members were present, with the exception of Deputies S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin, Vice Chair, and T.A. Coles of St. Helier South, and Connétables D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence and M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement, from whom apologies had been received.

Connétable P. B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair  
 Connétable R. A. K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen  
 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour  
 Deputy A. F. Curtis of St. Clement  
 Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (not present from item No. A11 onwards)  
 Deputy M. R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North

In attendance -

C. Jones, Senior Planner  
 S. De Gouveia, Planner  
 L. Davies, Planner  
 J. Durbin, Planner  
 J. Gibbins, Planner  
 T. Venter, Planner  
 P. Illangovan, Planner  
 A. Elliott, Trainee Planner  
 M. Popa, Trainee Planner  
 L. Plumley, Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items No. A1 – A10)  
 K. M. Larbalestier, Principal Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe (items No. A11 – A15)

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

<p>Minutes.</p> <p>281 Sur La Cote &amp; 17th Meeting Na Mara, 28.09.2023 La Greve d'Azette, St Clement: proposed demolition and redevelopment.</p>	<p>A1. The Minutes of the meetings held on 7th September 2023, were taken as read and were confirmed.</p> <p>A2. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A6 of 7th September 2023, received a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition of the existing structures known as Sur la Cote and Ceol Na Mara, La Greve d'Azette, St Clement, and the construction of one x 4 bedroom and one x 5 bedroom dwellings, with associated parking and landscaping. New vehicular access onto La Greve D'Azette was also proposed. The Committee had visited the site on 5th September 2023.</p>
<p>P/2022/1465</p>	<p>The Committee recalled that it had been minded to refuse permission for the above application, 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.</p>
<p>The Palms Campsite, La Route de Vinchelez, St. Ouen: proposed installation of camping pods.</p>	<p>The Committee confirmed refusal of the application for the reasons set out in the Department report.</p> <p>A3. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A4 of 7th September 2023, received a report in connexion with an application which proposed the installation of 5 x 2 person camping pods at The Palms Campsite, La Route de Vinchelez, St. Ouen. The Committee had visited the application site on 5th September 2023.</p> <p>The Committee recalled that it had been minded to approve the above application, contrary to the Department's recommendation. For the purpose of formally confirming its decision and setting out the reasons for approval, as detailed within the officer report, the application was re-presented.</p>
<p>P/2023/0148</p>	<p>The Committee confirmed approval of the application for the reasons set out in the Department report and on the basis of the conditions set out therein.</p>
<p>No. 9 Havre des Pas Gardens, St. Helier: proposed extension.</p>	<p>A4. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A10 of 7th September 2023, received a report in connexion with an application which proposed the construction of a single storey extension at No. 9 Havre des Pas Gardens, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 5th September 2023.</p> <p>The Committee recalled that it had been minded to approve the above application, contrary to the Department's recommendation. For the purpose of formally confirming its decision and setting out the reasons for approval, as detailed within the officer report, the application was re-presented.</p>
<p>P/2023/0127</p>	<p>The Committee confirmed approval of the application for the reasons set out in the Department report and on the basis of the condition set out therein.</p>
<p>Portelet Bay Café, La Rue Voisin, St. Brelade: proposed change of use of land for seasonal car parking/ new vehicular access.</p>	<p>A5. The Committee received a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the change of use of an area of land to facilitate seasonal car parking for the Portelet Bay Café, La Rue Voisin, St. Brelade. The Committee had visited the site on 26th September 2023.</p> <p>A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Protected Coastal Area ('PCA') and Policies SP2, SP5, SP6, PL5, NE1 and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant to the application.</p> <p>The Committee was advised that the application related to a small area of publicly owned woodland/scrubland to the south of Fields Nos. 677 and 676b, which was a few minutes' walk from the Café, via a nearby footpath to the beach. It was noted that a small timber bicycle rack had recently been established on the land. The change of use of the land to permit the creation of 2 seasonal car parking spaces was proposed, for the exclusive use of the owners of the Café. The existing vegetation would be removed and replaced with hoggin/hardstanding, together with the formation of a new vehicle access from La Rue Voisin. The Committee was informed that it had been concluded that the proposals would have an adverse impact on the landscape character of the area and that there was no overriding justification</p>
<p>P/2023/0360</p>	

for the formation of a new private car park within the PCA. Consequently, the application was recommended for refusal on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies SP2, SP5, PL5 and NE3 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022.

All representations received in connexion with the application had been included within the Committee's agenda packs.

No persons present wished to speak against the application.

The Committee heard from the applicants' agent, Mr. N. Socrates, of Socrates Architects, who noted that the application site was owned by Jersey Property Holdings ('JPH'). The land was of little commercial value, having originally been acquired for the purpose of road widening which was no longer necessary. Mr. Socrates advised that the proposal would not harm the landscape character of the area as the proposed car parking area would be discreet, screened from nearby dwellings and would not result in significant additional traffic. The ecological impact would be insignificant and could be managed and a landscape plan had been prepared by Nurture Ecology. There had been no objections from statutory consultees and the proposals had widespread public support. Mr. Socrates confirmed that there were no plans to remove any trees from the site. He reminded the Committee of the applicants' proven commitment to providing public services in the local area, which included the provision and maintenance of toilet facilities for the public (including a foul water pump), ensuring that litter was removed from the beach and dealing with health and safety issues that arose on the beach. The proposal complied with Policies SP6 and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. In particular, the continued operation of the Café (which was at risk) would be assured, supporting the local economy and the associated public services provided by the Café would help to improve enjoyment of the PCA. In concluding, Mr. Socrates urged the Committee to recognise the valuable services which were provided by the owners of the Café for the benefit of the public and support the application.

The Committee heard from the applicants, [REDACTED] who owned and operated the Café. [REDACTED] highlighted the inherent difficulties associated with operating a café located at the bottom of a steep path and outlined the history of the car parking arrangements, which had led to the submission of the application. [REDACTED] purchased the Café in 2014, and had been advised that they were precluded from parking in a nearby privately owned car park, which included a public bus stop. They had made arrangements with the owner of an area of land located next to Pumping Station No. 2 to allow them to park there. Unfortunately, the land had recently been acquired by a number of local residents who had decided to gate the area and did not wish to continue the previous arrangement. It was noted that this area was presently unused. [REDACTED] advised that the only public car parking in Portelet Bay was on La Rue Voisin, which was used by both visitors and Café staff, meaning that space was not guaranteed. The application was not intended to be divisive but had simply been made, as recommended by JPH, due to the loss of the previous parking area. The Café was unique in terms of its location and positioning, which led to considerable practical difficulties and limited car parking added to these. [REDACTED] highlighted the public services provided by the Café and asked the Committee to support the application. [REDACTED] confirmed that no trees would be removed as a result of the proposals and that the existing tree canopy would be maintained. He noted that whilst the application site was the nearest possible secure car parking area, it remained a considerable distance from the Café. He too urged the Committee to support the application, which would enable the continued provision of public services associated with the operation of the Café.

The Committee heard from Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade, who referenced gaps in the 2022 Bridging Island Plan in terms of supporting the visitor economy. She was of the view that it was in the public interest to extend support to the visitor economy in this case and consequently she fully supported the applicants.

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

- the pumping station located at the Café was privately owned by the applicants;
- the new owners of the land previously used by [REDACTED] for car parking had refused to continue with the previous arrangement, despite mediation and the involvement of States members;
- the Café employed approximately 30 staff, including 5/6 full time employees, 4 of whom travelled to work by bus. The remainder were seasonal staff, including many young people and students who travelled either by bicycle, bus or car and parked on Rue Voisin but often encountered difficulty parking, making them late for work;
- the Café operated seasonally for 6 months of the year (from March to October) and was open from 9.00 a.m. to 10.00 p.m.; and
- it was understood that tankers accessed pumping station No. 2 through a nearby private residential development as access to the site was challenging for such vehicles.

The Committee, with the exception of Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North, was persuaded by the economic benefit and public interest arguments that had been made and agreed to grant permission. In doing so, members referenced Policies SP6, NE3 and PL5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan, together with a similar application which recently been approved by the Department under delegated powers and which related to the extension of a public car park at Plémont Bay (P/2023/0531 refers). The Committee requested that conditions be attached to the permit requiring the submission of a detailed landscaping plan, a disuse and disrepair condition and a restriction on the use of the car park to the months of March through to October (inclusive) by the operators of the Café.

As the Committee's decision was contrary to the Department recommendation, it was noted that the application would be re-presented at the next scheduled meeting for formal decision confirmation and approval of any conditions which were to be attached to the permit.

2 La Bicherie,  
Augres Farm,  
La Rue du  
Moulin de Bas,  
Trinity:  
proposed  
outdoor  
bathing area.

A6. The Committee received a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the creation of an outdoor bathing area within a former pigsty to the south-west of the property known as 2 La Bicherie, Augres Farm, La Rue du Moulin de Bas, Trinity. The Committee had visited the site on 26th September 2023.

Connétable P. B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair and Deputies A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity, and A. F. Curtis of St. Clement did not participate in the determination of this application.

P/2023/0457

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the Green Zone and a Water Pollution Safeguard Area and that the property was a Grade 2 Listed Building. Policies GD1, GD6, NE1, NE3, H9 and HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant to the application.

The Committee noted that, whilst the proposals were of a minor and uncontentious nature, the application had been submitted by a States Member so it fell to the Committee to determine the application in accordance with agreed procedures.

It was noted that the creation of the proposed outdoor bathing area including an associated awning and privacy screens, all of which were considered appropriate in scale and nature and would not result in unreasonable harm to neighbouring amenities. The design was of a high quality and was not considered detrimental to the wider setting of the site or the character of the surrounding area. The proposal was minor and reversible and was supported by the Historic Environment Team, following the submission of amended plans which indicated that the awning would not be attached to existing quoins and that it would be neutral in colour. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval.

All representations received in connexion with the application had been included within the Committee's agenda packs.

No persons present wished to address the Committee in connexion with the application.

Having considered the application, the Committee decided to grant permission.

High Beech,  
La Vallette, St.  
Lawrence:  
proposed  
demolition and  
construction of  
new dwelling.

A7. The Committee received a report in connexion with an application which sought permission for the demolition of a 4 bedroom property known as High Beech, La Vallette, St. Lawrence, and the construction of a new 4 bedroom dwelling. The Committee had visited the site on 26th September 2023.

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

P/2023/0250

A site plan, drawings and a 3 dimensional model were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Backdrop Zone and Built-Up Area ('BUA') boundary. Policies SP1, SP2, SP4, SP5, H1, H2, H3, PL3, GD1, GD5, GD6, GD8, TT2, TT4 and WER1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant to the application. Attention was also drawn to Supplementary Planning Guidance ('SPG') relating to Density Standards (2023), SPG3 – parking guidelines (1988), SPG6 – a minimum specification for new housing developments (2009) and draft SPG in respect of residential space standards and residential parking standards (both 2023).

The Committee was advised that the application site was within a sustainable location in a largely residential area and currently comprised a 4 bedroom dwelling with tiered gardens to the rear, east and west of the site, balconies to the south elevation, and car parking to the south of the site. The existing dwelling was in poor condition with fundamental structural issues. Stabilisation works and a reoriented 4 bedroom dwelling with a similar footprint to the existing dwelling was proposed. The new dwelling would feature balconies/terraces to the south elevation, car parking to the south of the site and gardens to the east, west and north. The proposed development would make a positive contribution to the mix of available dwellings within the BUA and the scale and design were considered acceptable. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of the conditions detailed within the Department report.

All representations received in connexion with the application had been included within the Committee's agenda packs.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] representing the owners of a neighbouring property known as Smeraldo. [REDACTED] expressed concern at the general lack of detail in respect of the disposal of surface water and retained planting. He was also concerned about the significant disruption to neighbouring

properties during the construction period, if permission was granted. The charm and character of La Vallette, which was a small development of 7 properties, would be altered by what he described as the fortressing of High Beech into the surrounding valley, distancing it from the other properties, contrary to Policy SP7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. He stated that the proposed design was inappropriate in this context. With regard to Policy GD5, [REDACTED] noted that the application did not address the removal of excavated material from the site and, similarly, there was no reference to replacement planting on the southern boundary. In addition, until [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] had raised concerns regarding the safety implications of the proposed excavation and reprofiling of the existing slopes, no consideration appeared to have been given to the appointment of a Health and Safety Project Coordinator. He believed that the proposals were financially motivated and that the case for demolition had not been made. He suggested that refurbishment of the existing dwelling, which had been left to deteriorate, would be preferable and less disruptive. Given the housing crisis in the Island, [REDACTED] was critical of the deterioration of existing properties. He concluded by stating that access to the site was severely restricted and this would present challenges for construction vehicles. He urged the Committee to refuse the application.

[REDACTED] the owner of a top floor flat located at Smeraldo, addressed the Committee. He expressed similar concerns regarding the waste management plan and number of vehicle movements to facilitate the construction of the new dwelling.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED] and his agents, [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] of MS Planning, [REDACTED] stated that High Beech had been owned by his family for several generations and its position and panoramic views were highly prized. It had been evident when he purchased High Beech from a family member that the property would require full refurbishment, but serious structural issues had subsequently been identified and he had sought professional advice on the best approach.

[REDACTED] noted that the application site was in the BUA where residential development was encouraged and that the proposals accorded with Policies SP1, SP2, PL3, GD5 and GD8 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The existing dwelling was beyond economic repair and refurbishing it would also require a significant amount of demolition work. [REDACTED] stated that concerns regarding the impact of the proposed works were not material planning considerations, and he advised that a Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plan would be submitted, in line with the suggested conditions detailed within the Department report. In addition, the Place and Spatial Planning Team, Strategic Policy, Planning and Performance Department supported the proposals, which included renewable energy sources and modern methods of construction, resulting in a contemporary, sustainable dwelling. In concluding, he urged the Committee to approve the application.

Having considered the application, the Committee decided to grant permission, subject to the imposition of the conditions outlined in the Department report. In addition, members requested that a condition be added stipulating permitted hours of work on the site (from 7.30 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. on weekdays and 8.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. on Saturdays).

Greystones, La  
Rue Coentyn,  
St. Ouen:  
proposed  
installation of

A8. The Committee received 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 proposed the installation of 2 portacabins to the north of the property known as Greystones, La Rue Coentyn, St. Ouen. The Committee had visited the site on 26th September 2023.

temporary staff  
accommodation  
(RFR).

Connétable R. A. K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen did not participate in the determination of this application.

MS/2022/1485

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and included a Grade 3 Listed Building. Policies SP1 – SP4, SP7, PL5, GD1, GD6, H1, H2, H4, H9, H10, ERE1, NE1, NE3, HE1, ME1, TT1, TT2, TT4, WER6, WER7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to Supplementary Planning Guidance ('SPG') 3 – parking guidelines (1988), SPG6 – a minimum specification for new housing developments (2009) and the draft SPG for new housing developments (2023).

The site comprised a range of existing buildings and a dwelling. The buildings were used in connexion with an equestrian business and livery for a maximum of 16 horses was available. The site shared a vehicular access with the main dwelling and equestrian facilities, along a track adjacent to the southern boundary of the site.

The Committee was advised that the application sought permission for the installation of 2 moveable structures on the site for use as self-contained staff accommodation. It was understood that 2 employees who lived elsewhere on the Island would live in the portacabins from January to August. The units would have a footprint of 6.7 metres by 2.7 metres and would be finished with a flat roof. An open plan living area, a separate bedroom and bathroom were shown on the submitted drawings. A combined detailed Planning Design and Historic Impact Statement had been submitted in connexion with the application.

The Committee noted that the application had been refused on the grounds that the need for the proposed structures in the countryside had not been sufficiently demonstrated and that the portacabins would not provide satisfactory living accommodation. The proposal would also be harmful to the setting of the adjoining Listed Building and insufficient information had been provided in relation to biodiversity enhancements, foul and surface water drainage and the provision of an adequate water supply for future occupants. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

All representations received in connexion with the application had been included within the Committee's agenda packs.

No persons present wished to speak against the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of J. Design, who outlined the rationale for the request, noting the paucity of temporary staff accommodation in the Island. The portacabins were required in order to provide high quality temporary accommodation for horse trainers during the racing season. [REDACTED] highlighted the history and importance of horse racing to the local sporting community and noted that a lack of suitable accommodation had led to the applicant turning business away during the 2023 season, which had a financial impact. The sport received no Government funding and temporary accommodation was desperately needed to ensure the continued viability of the business. [REDACTED] stated that responses from the applicant and statutory consultees had not been taken into account and the reasons for refusal were questioned on this basis.

[REDACTED], addressed the Committee. He expressed support for the proposals, noting that temporary accommodation was required onsite for experienced competition and training riders.

The yard in question had accommodated 9 horses during the 2023 season but with additional staff, the number of horses could have increased to 12 or 13. He outlined the longstanding history of horse racing in Jersey and the importance of maintaining and supporting this tradition. [REDACTED] referenced Policies SP4, SP6, ERE2 and H10 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan in support of the application and urged the Committee to overturn the refusal.

The Committee heard from the applicant's wife, [REDACTED] who outlined the nature of her husband's business ([REDACTED]). The business had struggled to recruit staff for the 2023 season due to a lack of accommodation. Specialised 'work riders' (experienced riders capable of riding up to 35 miles per hour on the track) were required and they usually worked from 5.00 a.m. to 10.00 a.m.. [REDACTED] explained that whilst outgoings had increased dramatically due to rising costs, the business had been unable to increase capacity and take on more horses to ensure its long-term viability, due to a lack of suitable staff accommodation. She outlined recent positive developments, including a pipeline of local talent supported by the business and urged the Committee to approve the application.

[REDACTED], addressed the Committee. She added her support to the proposals, noting that whilst the sport was currently in a good position, businesses needed to be able to employ (and house) suitable staff. There was currently a choice and variety of trainers in the Island and the Committee's support would help to maintain this. Horse racing was a popular sport in the Island and attracted thousands of spectators each year. Reference was made to the plight of the Jersey Reds, who had recently ceased trading due to financial difficulties. In concluding, [REDACTED] urged the Committee to reconsider the Department's decision and support the 2024 horse racing season by approving the application.

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

The Olde House, La Rue du Croquet, St. Brelade: proposed demolition and replacement of kitchen extension and terrace (RFR).

P/2022/1702

A9. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A8 of 7th September 2023, received a report in connexion with an application which proposed the demolition of an existing ground floor extension at the property known as The Olde House, La Rue du Croquet, St. Brelade and its replacement with a larger extension with a terrace above. The Committee had visited the site on 5th and 26th September 2023.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area and Inland Flooding Low Risk area and that The Olde House was a Grade 4 Listed Building. Policies GD1, GD6, HE1 and SP4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee recalled that the application had been considered at the meeting held on 7th September 2023, and that members had been minded to grant permission, contrary to the Department's recommendation. Consequently, the application had been due to be re-presented for formal decision confirmation and to set out the specific reasons for approval. However, due to the fact that an interested party had not been advised that the application was due to be considered by the Committee and had not been afforded the opportunity of addressing members, it had been agreed that the application should be re-presented.

All representations received in connexion with the application had been included within the Committee's agenda packs.

The Committee heard from [REDACTED] the [REDACTED]



House, a neighbouring property. [REDACTED] stated that the proposals would result in a serious loss of privacy to Burlington House, which would be overlooked to an even greater extent than was presently the case. In addition, she expressed concerns regarding a proposed privacy screen, which would obstruct a fire escape route for the residents of Burlington House and another nearby property. It would also make it impossible for scaffolding to be erected to the rear of Burlington House if necessary. In order for the proposed privacy screen to fulfil its stated function, it would have to be so high that light levels in the living areas at Burlington House would be significantly reduced.

[REDACTED] highlighted the loss of privacy that would result from the proposals and noted that the erection of the proposed privacy screen would in any case be precluded by access rights specified in the deeds to Burlington House. He noted that a fire risk assessment had been undertaken, which confirmed that the aforementioned fire escape route was required due to the topography of the site. [REDACTED] expressed disappointment at the lack of communication by the applicants in relation to concerns about privacy and overlooking.

[REDACTED] of MAC Architecture addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicants, who were unable to attend. He advised that The Olde House and Burlington House were in close proximity and that the replacement terrace would be further away. He was unable to speak to the legalities surrounding the erection of the proposed privacy screen but noted that current building regulations did not support the use of a 1.5 metre high wall as a means of escape, with refuge in the garden of the property being considered a more suitable option.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Connétables P. B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair, and K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour, was persuaded that the proposals would unreasonably affect the level of privacy to surrounding properties and endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out above.

No. 4  
Abbotsmount,  
St. Helier:  
proposed  
construction of  
extensions to  
form ancillary  
accommodation  
(RFR).

P/2023/0145

A10. The Committee received 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 proposed the construction of 2 extensions to the south and east elevations of the property known as No. 4 Abbotsmount, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the site on 26th September 2023.

Deputy M. R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North did not participate in the determination of this application.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was in the Built-Up Area ('BUA') of the Green Backdrop Zone. Policies SP2, GD1, GD6, GD8, H1, H2, TT2, TT4, WER6 and WER7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant to the application. Attention was also drawn to Supplementary Planning Guidance ('SPG') – Planning Obligation Agreements (2017), – Density Standards (2023), SPG3 – parking guidelines (1988), SPG6 – a minimum specification for new housing developments (2009), and draft SPG in respect of residential space standards and residential parking standards (both 2023).

The Committee noted that permission was sought for the construction of a single storey rear addition to the south elevation (which would extend 2.4 metres beyond the rear elevation of the existing garage and would be 5.4 metres wide and 3.3 metres high), and a first floor addition to the east elevation, above the footprint of the existing garage (which would measure 2.8 metres at the apex and 2.7 metres at the eaves, with the flat roof being 2.9 metres high). The proposals would create ancillary

accommodation, in conjunction with the conversion of the existing garage into habitable accommodation and incidental changes to fenestration and internal alterations were also proposed. Whilst the proposed change of use and external alterations had not been included in the application description, they were considered to form part of the proposed development.

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the basis that the proposed development was not considered ancillary to the host building; the scale and bulk of the proposed extensions was considered visually overbearing and disproportionate in relation to the host dwelling, resulting in an adverse visual impact on the character of the property and surrounding area. The proposals were indicative of overdevelopment and were substandard in terms of internal and external space standards. Insufficient provision had been made for safe and secure bicycle parking and refuse storage and servicing. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

All representations received in connexion with the application had been included within the Committee's agenda packs.

No persons present wished to speak against the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, [REDACTED] of CAD Studio. He noted that the application had been assessed on that the basis that a separate, self-contained dwelling was proposed, which was not the case. The scheme proposed ancillary accommodation connected by means of a door to the rest of the property. [REDACTED] noted that permission would be required should the applicants wish to extinguish this opening, albeit that there was no intention to do so. Amenity space was sufficient on the basis that ancillary accommodation was proposed, with 70 square metres to the rear. With regard to the provision of secure bicycle parking spaces, [REDACTED] advised that a storage shed could be erected for this purpose in accordance with permitted development rights under the General Development Order. He added that whilst details of refuse storage and servicing had not been provided, there was an existing provision and additional storage could be accommodated. In relation to concerns about the scale and bulk of the proposed extensions, [REDACTED] disputed these and noted that the topography of the area would preclude a 'terracing' effect. Reference was made to neighbouring properties which had been extended in a similar manner. The proposals complied with the standards for internal storage when considered as ancillary accommodation. [REDACTED] concluded by stating that the applicants wished to accommodate a multi-generational living arrangement and would accept a condition specifying that the accommodation was ancillary and requiring its re-integration into the main dwelling when it was no longer required for this purpose.

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

No. 2 White Sands, Rue du Maupertuis, St. Clement: proposed extension (RFR).

P/2023/0363

A11. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of an application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which proposed the construction of a ground floor extension to the south-east elevation of No. 2 White Sands, Rue du Maupertuis, St. Clement. The Committee had visited the site on 26th September 2023.

Deputy A. Curtis of St. Clement 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 Built-Up Area and was on the Eastern Cycle Route. Policies GD1, GD6 and WER2 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. Attention was also drawn to Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) No. 3 – parking standards (1988) and the draft SPG parking guidelines (2023).

The Committee was advised that the application sought permission for the construction of a ground floor extension to the south-east elevation of the property. The proposed extension would extend approximately 5 metres beyond the rear elevation of the building and would be 2.6 metres wide and 2.8 metres high. The extension would be inset with a window to the east elevation. Private amenity space would be maintained with over 60 square metres available at the front of the house.

The Committee noted that the application had been refused on the grounds that the scale and design of the proposed extension were considered to be inappropriate and likely to result in unreasonable harm to the living conditions of the adjoining property to the west. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

The Committee heard from the applicants, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] advised that one of the neighbouring properties (No. one) had replaced a large hedge with a shed and the other (No. 3) would be unaffected by the proposal. The aim of the application was to provide family friendly living space.

The case officer advised that the Department had not been made aware of the hedge which had been removed on the neighbouring property.

Having considered the application, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission. In doing so, members commented on the lack of detail on the submitted drawings.

On a related matter, the Committee noted that the dormers which had been installed at the property pre-dated the applicants' ownership.

Flag House, La  
Rue de  
l'Étocquet, St.  
Ouen:  
proposed  
demolition of  
extension/con-  
struction of  
new extension  
(RFR).

P/2022/1251

A12. 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 proposed the demolition of a lean-to extension at the property known as Flag House, La Rue de l'Étocquet, St. Ouen and its replacement with a new 2 storey extension to the north elevation of the property. The Committee had visited the site on 26th September 2023.

Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen 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 that Flag House was a Grade 4 Listed Building. Policies GD1, GD6, NE3, H9, HE1, HE2 and SP4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee was advised that the application had been refused on the grounds of the design, scale, excessive depth, location and proximity of the proposed development to the adjoining dwelling. The proposed development was considered to have an overbearing impact and would cause overshadowing, which was detrimental to the amenity of the neighbouring dwelling known as L'Étocquet House (to the east), contrary to Policy GD1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. The proposed development would also disproportionately increase the size of the principal dwelling, which was considered inappropriate in the Green Zone, contrary to Policy

H9. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

One letter of representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicants' agent, [REDACTED] who advised that the applicants had been unable to attend the meeting as they had received late notice of the public hearing and had prior commitments. However, she had been asked by the applicants to highlight the fact that the existing dwelling had 3 floors and not 2 so the percentage increase detailed in the Department report was believed to be incorrect. A one and a half storey extension was proposed and this would result in a 36.5 per cent increase in footprint. [REDACTED] confirmed that the existing gross floor area was 230 square metres and the proposed extension would be 84 square metres. The scheme would not result in unreasonable harm to neighbouring amenities and would improve privacy. Both the subject property and the neighbouring property (for which [REDACTED] had been the architect) faced north so there was very little sunlight, even in the summer. The scheme had been revised to take account of the comments received from the Historic Environment Team ('HET'), with materials having been amended and a glazed gable replaced with a solid rendered gable. Deputy A. Curtis of St. Clement expressed surprise at the fact that the scheme was supported by HET.

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

Les Escaliers,  
La Rue de  
Fremont, St.  
John: proposed  
repair/insulat-  
ion of  
roof/dormers  
(RFR).

P/2022/1251

A13. 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 proposed the repair and insulation of the roof at the property known as Les Escaliers, La Rue de Fremont, St. John. It was also proposed to install 2 new dormers to the eastern roof slope, alter a rooflight and undertake associated external alterations. The Committee had visited the site on 26th September 2023.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Protected Coastal Area and that Les Escaliers was a Grade 3 Listed Building. Policies GD1, GD6, NE3, HE1 and SP4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant.

The Committee noted the planning history of the site, which included the refusal of a previous application (reference P/2021/1848) for a similar scheme. The only noticeable difference between the previous and proposed applications was the decorative Victorian style bargeboards on the proposed dormers. However, these alterations were not considered sufficient to demonstrate that the proposed development was sympathetic to the Listed Building. The design, form, position and arrangement of the proposed dormers was considered to have a detrimental impact on the historic building and would conflict with its simple vernacular form. It was noted that the Historic Environment Team had objected to the proposal on the basis that it did not overcome concerns in relation to the impact on the Listed Building. Consequently, the application had been refused on the basis that it was contrary to Policies GD6, HE1 and SP4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED] and his agent, [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] advised that the property had been owned by 4 generations of his family. He stated that the proposed dormers would improve the internal space and allow increased light into the rooms. He pointed to a number of properties in the immediate vicinity which were Listed and also had dormers.

██████████ addressed the Committee, addressing the reasons for refusal. He stated that this was an 18th century property with a 19th century appearance and that the style of the dormers would not have a significant or detrimental impact on the cottage. Moreover, it was believed that the dormers would improve and enhance the appearance of the property and the style of the dormers mirrored that of the roof. In response to a question from a member, ██████████ confirmed that whilst the original cottage had been constructed in the 17th century, it was obvious that the roof had been constructed in the late 19th century. In concluding, ██████████ stated that he failed to see how the application could be considered contrary to Policy GD6 when a number of properties in the vicinity benefitted from similar arrangements.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Connétables R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen and K.C Lewis of St. Saviour, concluded that the benefit which would arise from the installation of the dormers would not outweigh the heritage concerns. Consequently, the application was refused for the reasons set out above.

La Mare  
Vineyards, La  
Rue de la  
Hougue  
Mauger, St.  
Mary: use of  
overflow  
parking  
(RETRO-  
SPECTIVE)  
(RFR).

P/2022/1251

A14. 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 to regularise the use of Field No. 254A, La Rue du Camp Durell as an overflow car park for La Mare Vineyards, La Rue de la Hougue Mauger, St. Mary. The Committee had visited the site on 26th September 2023.

Deputy A. Curtis of St. Clement did not participate in the determination of this application on the basis that he was the proprietor of La Côte Distillery.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Protected Coastal Area and that Policies GD1, GD6, NE3, PL5, ERE1 and WER5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. The Committee's attention was also drawn to the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (JILSCA).

The Committee noted that retrospective permission was sought for the use of the above field for overflow car parking between 1st April and 23 December. The application had been refused on the basis that the proposal would constitute the inappropriate use of agricultural land and would result in the loss of the same, contrary to Policy ERE1 of the Bridging Island Plan 2022. Furthermore, the application failed to demonstrate that the proposal was appropriate and sympathetic to the character of the site and the wider area, contrary to Policies GD6, PL5, and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and the JILSCA. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

4 representations had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the agent, ██████████ and ██████████ representing the applicant company. ██████████ addressed the Committee, setting out the history and success of La Mare Vineyards, its core objectives, the products sold, employee numbers, the revenue generated and the company's 'green credentials', to include future proposals in this regard. In concluding, ██████████ advised that refusal of the application would result in significant risk to the business. In response to a question from a member regarding aerial photographs from 2019 which appeared to indicate the underuse of the main car parking area and the overuse of the overflow car park, ██████████ advised that the overflow car park was used between 30 – 40 times each year and that vehicles were often left there overnight

following events held on site. The overflow car park was only opened when the main car park was full.

██████████ addressed the Committee, advising that the field had been used for overflow car parking for many years (at least 47), which negated enforcement action under Article 40 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002. The occasional use of the field for overflow car parking supported the existing business and was not related to expansion plans. There were a range of uses on the site, to include the tourism offering, conferences, meetings, weddings and other events. ██████████ referenced the Common Strategic Policy, which had been approved by the previous administration, which she believed supported proposals of this nature. She went on to state that it was not clear whether the land used for overflow car parking was, in fact, a field. ██████████ continued, referring the Committee to Policies ERE1, ERE2, SP2 and SP6. She also noted that there had been no objection to the application from the Land Controls and Agricultural Development Section. The landscape impact would be minimal as the field had not been resurfaced and the use was infrequent, as evidenced by the condition of the grass. ██████████ urged the Committee to approve the application and suggested that the following conditions be attached to the permit: the overflow car park was for the sole use of visitors to La Mare Vineyards during the period shown on the application (between 1st April and 23 December), Permitted Development rights were removed and a landscaping scheme would be prepared for approval to augment boundaries. With reference to concerns regarding noise associated with large corporate events, ██████████ explained that such events were now held indoors in a sound proofed venue. In response to a question from the Chair, she confirmed that no operational development was proposed and that any future changes would require planning consent.

In response to ██████████ comments regarding the status of the land, it was confirmed that it was an agricultural field with a designated field number.

The Committee discussed the application and some reservations were expressed and it was agreed that it would have been useful to understand the capacity of the main car parking area. However, the Committee was persuaded by the case which had been made by the applicant's agent and agreed to grant permission, subject to the conditions suggested above and on the basis of an additional condition which would require the restoration of the land to its natural state if the business ceased to operate.

Having recognised that its decision was contrary to the Department's recommendation, the Committee noted that the application would be re-presented at the next scheduled meeting for formal decision confirmation and the approval of conditions.

La Longue  
Vue, La Rue  
du Val de la  
Mare du Sud,  
St. Peter:  
raising of  
height of car  
park (RETRO-  
SPECTIVE)  
(RFR).

P/2023/0352

A15. 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 to regularise certain works which had been undertaken to raise the height of land on which a car park had been created at the property known as La Longue Vue, La Rue du Val de la Mare du Sud, St. Peter. The Committee had visited the site on 26th September 2023.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Protected Coastal Area, the Coastal National Park and Airport Public Safety Zone 2. The application site was also situated in close proximity to a Grade 3 Listed Building. Policies GD1, GD6, NE3, PL5, HE1, SP4, WER11 and WER5 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were relevant. The Committee's attention was also drawn to the Jersey Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character

Assessment (JILSCA).

The Committee noted that a grassy bank had been replaced with hard surfaces and a new stone wall. Whilst some efforts had been made to soften the appearance through planting and materials, the works were considered to be inappropriate in this context and failed to preserve the established character of the area and the setting of the nearby Listed Building. Consequently, the proposal failed to meet the strict tests of the JILSCA and was contrary to Policies HE1, GD6, NE3, PL5 and SP4 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal of the application.

One representation had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from the applicant, [REDACTED] and his agent, [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] advised that the area in question had been used for car parking for at least 12 years and, in this particular case, permission for operational development was sought. [REDACTED]. However, the area had become particularly treacherous due to water run off and the applicant had undertaken works to address the problem using high quality natural materials which were sympathetic to the environment. The application was supported by neighbours and was in accordance with Policies GD6, TT1 and TT4. In [REDACTED] professional opinion, refusal would be [REDACTED], whereas approval would future proof the home.

The applicant addressed the Committee outlining the problems which had arisen as a result of water run-off from Jersey Airport, which resulted in localised flooding. The applicant had been unaware of the need to seek consent for the works and was anxious to avoid enforcement action.

Having considered the application, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out above. In doing so, the Committee suggested that the applicant seek the advice of the Department with a view to identifying a remedy which did not contravene the policies of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.