



Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002

Article 115(5)

## **Report to the Minister for the Environment**

by

**Jonathan G King** BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Judicial Greffe.

## **Appeal**

by

**Dr D Burston & Mrs S Burston**

**Site at Lande a Geon, Le Vieux Beaumont, St Peter JE3 7EA**

Hearing held on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2017 at the Tribunal Offices, Bath Street, St Helier

An accompanied visit to the Appeal site and surroundings was held on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2017.

Department of the Environment Reference: P/2016/0868

## **Land a Geon, Le Vieux Beaumont, St Peter JE3 7EA**

- The appeal is made under Article 108 of the Law against a decision of the Environment Department to refuse planning permission under Article 19.
  - The appeal is made by Dr D Burston & Mrs S Burston.
  - The application Ref P/2016/0868, dated 24<sup>th</sup> June 2016, was refused by notice dated 28<sup>th</sup> October 2016.
  - The development is: demolish existing garage; construct extension to south elevation; 2-storey extension to west elevation; 1- and 2-storey extensions to north elevation, including one staff unit.
- 

### **Summary of Recommendations**

1. I **recommend** that the appeal should be ALLOWED, subject to the conditions set out in the Annex to this report.
- 

### **Introduction**

2. This is an appeal against the refusal of planning permission.

### **The scope of the report**

3. Article 116 of the Law requires the Minister to determine the appeal and in so doing give effect to the recommendation of this report, unless he is satisfied that there are reasons not to do so. The Minister may: (a) allow the appeal in full or in part; (b) refer the appeal back to the Inspector for further consideration of such issues as he may specify; (c) dismiss the appeal; and (d) reverse or vary any part of the decision-maker's decision. If the Minister does not give effect to the recommendation(s) of this report, notice of the decision shall include full reasons.
4. The purpose of this report is to provide the Minister with sufficient information to enable him to determine the appeal. It focuses principally on the matters raised in the appellants' grounds of appeal. However, other matters are also addressed where these are material to the determination, including in relation to the imposition of conditions, and in order to provide wider context.

### **The grounds of appeal**

5. The appellants' grounds of appeal, briefly, are as follows:
  - (1) The Department gave insufficient regard to the site's landscape context.
  - (2) Too much weight has been given to the "sheer extent" of development and not on the design of the proposed extensions

and their siting relative to the existing buildings.

- (3) Too much weight has been given to the "sheer extent" of development and not on the existing occupancy relative to the proposed occupancy.
- (4) Too much weight has been given to the overall development and not to its individual constituent parts.
- (5) Insufficient regard was given to the "reasonable expectations of residents to improve their homes" having regard to the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development without serious harm.
- (6) The proposal supports the principles of sustainable development.
- (7) The proposal promotes a high standard of design.
- (8) The refusal is contrary to another large scale development granted planning permission in the vicinity of the appeal site.

### **Description of proposals**

6. *Lande a Geon* is a substantial late nineteenth century stone-built house standing in extensive landscaped grounds, with access off Le Vieux Beaumont. It has an elevated position on the heights above Beaumont and St Aubin's Bay. To the north, largely screened by intervening vegetation, is a small group of houses; and to the rear (to the north-west), on slightly higher ground, is open farmland. Downslope, beyond the garden area and trees are a number of dwellings also accessed from Le Vieux Beaumont, followed by the residential development of Clos de Bauche, Beaumont, and coastal development.
7. The house has two storeys under a tiled roof, with the main entrance at its eastern end. The front (southern) elevation is dominated by two gables, one of which projects, together with a single-storey flat roofed element, with railings above. At its western end is a 2-storey, flat-roofed part, possibly an extension, though of some age. Adjoining that is a conservatory, also flat-roofed, with railings above. To the rear is a range of detached domestic outbuildings, including stores, garages, and 2 units of staff accommodation.
8. The principal rooms on the ground floor of the house are a lounge, a dining room, a kitchen, a utility room, a snug and a hallway. On the first floor are a master bedroom with ensuite facilities and a dressing room, 4 other bedrooms (2 ensuite) and a bathroom. In the roof is a narrow bedroom, a bathroom and attic space. There is a small basement.
9. The proposed development is in 3 main parts: (a) a T-shaped, double-height extension to the west, projecting from the flat-roofed element;

(b) a new main entrance to the north, comprising a double-height central section with single-storey parts to either side, all fronting a new open "arrival" area where vehicles may approach the house and turn; and (c) a range of buildings enclosing the western and northern sides of the open area, partly single storey and partly 2-storey.

10. Part (a) would accommodate a double-height library with a small mezzanine snug, forming a third, largely glazed gable to the front. There would also be a replacement kitchen on the ground floor; and upstairs, a new bedroom and ensuite. Part (b) would comprise a new double height entrance lobby, incorporating what is presently a utility room, circulation space and bathrooms, flanked on the ground floor by a new cloakroom, utility and "dog room". Part (c) would maintain the same floor levels of the existing house, requiring it to be cut into the slope behind. On the ground floor it would include garaging for 4 cars, a store, 2 stables and a store for garden machinery. Above the stables would be a single staff accommodation unit. Finally, the existing conservatory would also be enlarged beyond the front wall of the house to create a sun room.
11. Of the existing house, on the ground floor, the lounge / drawing room, the study, and entrance lobby / hallway would be retained broadly unaltered, with the dining room enlarged within the existing space and the reduced kitchen space becoming a utility. The conservatory / sun room would expand into the snug, from where access to the new kitchen would be gained. On the first floor, the accommodation would be slightly remodelled to accommodate the double-height entrance hall and new stairs, but would retain the 5 bedrooms and ensuites. I understand that the attic rooms would remain unchanged. The existing range of outbuildings would be demolished.
12. The scale of the development would be substantial. At the Hearing both parties agreed a schedule of areas for the existing and proposed buildings, by reference to footprint and floor area. It was calculated that the existing footprint of the house is 326.3 square metres (sqm) (a) and the outbuildings 126.7sqm (b). The footprint of the proposed domestic extensions was calculated as 314.2sqm (c) and that of the ancillary accommodation as 338.6sqm (d). The overall footprint would increase from 453sqm (a+b) to 979.1sqm (a+c+d) or approximately 116%. Excluding the ancillary accommodation (b) & (d), the footprint of the house would increase from 326.3sqm to 640.5sqm (a+c), or by approximately 96%.
13. The existing house has a floor area of 675.8sqm. The extension floor area would be an additional 313.7sqm, or an increase of about 46.5%. The present outbuildings have a floor area of 168.3sqm. The "ancillary accommodation" would by comparison have a floor area of 340.9sqm or just over double.

### **The reason for refusal**

14. The single reason for refusal is:

*The proposals would, by virtue of their prominent siting, at the top of the escarpment; the excessive scale and massing and the sheer extent of development, facilitate a potential significant increase in residential occupancy and cannot reasonably be considered as a modest and proportionate ancillary building(s). In turn the proposed development fails to respond appropriately to the design, scale, form, massing and proportions of the existing building or its landscape context. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy NE 7 of the Adopted Island Plan (Revised 2014) which seeks to limit occupancy in the Green Zone; to ensure the design of development is appropriate to its context; to protect landscape character and to support the principles of sustainable development, and Policies GD 1 and GD 7 of the Adopted Island Plan (Revised 2014) which, in part, seek to promote a high standard of design.*

## **Main Issues**

15. From my assessment of the papers submitted by the appellant and the Department, and from what was given in evidence during the Hearing and seen and noted during the site visit, I consider that there is one main issue in this case:

*The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the locality.*

## **Reasons**

### *Planning policy*

16. The Island Plan was adopted 2011 and revised in 2014. It shows the site in the Green Zone where, under Policy NE 7 there is a general presumption against all forms of development. However, a number of exemptions may be permissible. Amongst these is the extension of a dwelling, but only where its design is appropriate relative to existing buildings and its context; where it does not facilitate significant increased occupancy and where it would not seriously harm landscape character. Also exempt in certain circumstances is the development of an ancillary building and/or structure.
17. The supporting text adds that the key test of acceptability of development under the policy is the capacity of the site and its context to accommodate development without serious harm to landscape character. The Plan acknowledges that there is a need to provide for the reasonable expectations of residents to improve their homes and businesses to undertake economic activity and provide employment, having regard to those considerations. The acceptability of an extension to a dwelling will additionally be determined by its scale and design. Each case should be assessed on its merits and in particular, regard had to the sensitivity of the site, relative to the capacity of the landscape character area to accept change. The purpose will be a material consideration and should not facilitate a

significant increase in occupancy. Intensification of domestic use would place more pressure on a fragile environment, limited infrastructure and services and be likely to increase trip generation. The cumulative enlargement of existing dwellings, and associated increase in resident population and activity, can undermine an area's character as much as new homes: a site's planning history will, therefore, be a material consideration.

18. Policy GD 1 says that development proposals will not be permitted unless a number of general criteria are met. Amongst other things, it should not seriously harm the Island's natural environment, including not having an unreasonable effect on the Green Zone; it should be of a high quality of design, in accordance with Policies SP 7 and GD 7, such that it maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the Island.
19. Policy GD 7 similarly seeks high quality design in all development that respects, conserves and contributes positively to the diversity and distinctiveness of the built context. It should respond appropriately to a number of criteria, of which the following are particularly relevant: scale, form, massing, orientation, siting, density and inward and outward views, as well as the relationship to existing buildings, settlement form and character, topography, landscape features and the wider landscape setting. Policy SP 7 addresses similar matters.

#### *Application of Policy NE 7*

20. Policy NE 7 identifies 3 types of residential development that may be considered as exceptions to the general presumption against all forms of development in the Green Zone: (1) the extension to a dwelling; (2) the development of an ancillary building and /or structure; and (3) redevelopment, which is not relevant to this case.
21. In its reason for refusal, amongst other things, the Department says that the proposed development would "*facilitate a potential significant increase in residential occupancy*", and that it "*cannot reasonably be regarded as a modest and proportionate ancillary building(s)*". The first phrase relates clearly to criterion (b) of exception 1; and the second phrase relates to criterion (a) of exception 2. It would appear that the Department is testing the proposed development by reference to both exceptions. I have therefore considered whether this is appropriate.
22. I am in no doubt that parts (a) and (b) of the extensions (as I describe above), together with the enlargement of the conservatory / sun room should be regarded as extensions and therefore should be subject to the provisions of exception 1. The policy does not limit the use to which an extension may put.
23. Part (c) of the extensions, to my mind comprises ancillary accommodation, in the sense that it would be auxiliary or secondary

to the main accommodation. However, as it would be directly and physically attached to parts (a) and (b) (and marginally to the fabric of the existing house too), I see no reason why it too should not be regarded as an "extension of a dwelling" in the same way as the remainder. It is an integral part of the other extensions, and therefore logically subject to the provisions of exception 1. I do not consider it to be an "ancillary building or structure" as envisaged under the exception 2. It is clear from the wording of the supporting text that to fall within that category it should be a separate building.

24. I conclude that, in treating the proposed extensions as comprising both an extension and the development of an ancillary building, the Department has misapplied Policy NE 7. The whole of the development should be treated as extensions under the provisions of exception 1.

#### *Landscape character*

25. A Countryside Character Appraisal (CCA) has been used to inform the definition of the countryside planning zones in the Island Plan, and is used to inform decisions about the impact of development on the character of the Island's landscape. It divides the Island into 8 broad Countryside Character Types, which in turn are subdivided. The appeal site lies within the Escarpment (C2 South Coast), but is backed by E "Interior Agricultural Land" and is also close to D "Enclosed Valleys". The CCA describes the Escarpment as having wide visual importance, forming the backdrop view from the coastal plains; and that importance is more significant than any of its individual environmental features. It says that its character is very vulnerable and is threatened by inappropriate development, particularly where this breaches the ridgeline.
26. I am satisfied that all of the extensions to the rear of the house (parts (b) and (c) would not be readily visible in the landscape because they would either be obscured by the house, trees, the lie of the land or intervening development. Much would also be cut into rising land. This has generally been agreed by the parties. It is therefore only the part (a) extensions and the sun room which would have the potential to be seen, and thereby affect the character of the area.
27. The applicant has carried out a Visual Impact Appraisal, which identified 22 public locations in the surrounding area, mostly roads, from which the visual impact of the development could be assessed. The Department does not dispute the choice of locations and does not suggest any others. At the Hearing, officers agreed that although the existing house may be seen from a number of the viewpoints – generally partially and/or at some distance – the only ones of any real significance are A (*Ruelle es Ruaux*) and C (*Beaumont Hill*), both from the South / South East. The officers also acknowledged that a number of the photographs submitted tended to exaggerate the visibility or prominence of the house, owing to the use of a telephoto

lens.

28. From point A, the roof of the house, together with most of the upper storey of its front elevation and oblique views of its western end, may be seen against a background of trees, with the skyline barely broken. The lower parts are mostly obscured by foreground trees. I would estimate that a proportion of the proposed part (a) extensions would be visible against the sky in a more open gap immediately to the west of the house, but the greater part, including the new gable, would be hidden by trees.
29. From Point C, much of the front of the house may be seen against the skyline, albeit at some distance and over the rooftops of Beaumont. Although some of the proposed part (a) extensions would be visible at the western end, mostly this would be limited to the roof. Foreground trees would again hide the remainder. The extended sunroom would be partly visible from both viewpoints, but as it would be seen against the backdrop of the house, it would have little greater impact than the present conservatory.
30. The CCA correctly identifies the value and the vulnerability of the Escarpment to development that would harm its landscape character. Its green slopes form a very attractive backdrop to the coast. But it is not wholly undeveloped. There are many buildings set within the green matrix, and these are an integral part of its character. Some are more prominent or intrusive than others. The appeal property is not amongst the most prominent, partly because it sits comfortably within its own extensively-planted grounds that provide substantial screening and separation from other buildings; and partly because it is constructed of local materials and to a traditional design. As it stands, it is visible in the landscape from a limited number of locations, but the views are partial and not close. In my opinion it is part of the landscape rather than being an intrusion into it.
31. The extensions would increase the visibility of the house inasmuch as more built development would be exposed in the landscape. But, other than the sun room, the new elements would be set further back than the present front elevations, and their outline broken by trees, except where the skyline would be breached. In my judgment, they would not form a major or even significant component of the landscape. Rather, having regard to the use of matching materials and a sympathetic architectural style, I believe they would be seen as integral to the existing house, which has been part of the landscape for a considerable time. The extended house would be large, but it would not be seen in its entirety, so that its scale would not be readily apparent in the landscape.
32. Insofar as the extensions would harm the landscape character, I conclude that the degree of harm would be fairly small. Critically, from the point of view of applying Policy NE 7 it would not seriously harm it. With respect to Policy GD 1, its effect on the Green Zone would not be unreasonable, in my view.



## *Design*

33. The part (a) extension would have a roof-line slightly lower than that of the existing house, but would maintain the eaves line. It would be set back somewhat from the existing façade, thereby avoiding the appearance of dominating it. A third gable, also slightly lower, but the same width as the existing gables would create a degree of symmetry to the elevation. The walling and roofing materials would match those of the house, though the new gable would be almost wholly glazed. This would distinguish it from the existing gables, particularly at first floor levels. Nonetheless, I believe it would pay appropriate regard to their vertical emphasis and traditional styling. The 2-storey section linking the gable to the existing house would have a similar arrangement of windows and first-floor railings to that which lies between the existing gables, again helping to integrate the old and the new. The existing 2-storey flat-roofed element at the western end of the house would be raised by one storey to ridge height to create the appearance of a tower, complete with low crenellations. It would perhaps be a little grandiose, but it serves the purpose of linking the old and new parts of the building, and is in keeping with a large late nineteenth century house.
34. The front elevation, presently a little over 26.5 metres in length, including the set-back projections at each end, would be extended by just under 15 metres, or around 57%. It would be substantial in scale, but the extensions would not be excessive or dominating, in my view. It would in large measure maintain symmetry and the architectural style of the house, including through the use of traditional, matching materials and detailing.
35. To the rear, the 2-storey element of the part (b) extension would maintain the eaves line of the back of the existing house, but would have a lower ridge line for the gable. The result would be a lower and much broader gable feature compared to the others; and its bulk would be emphasised by the relative lack of windows. However, the introduction of a round-headed main doorway and upper window would be consistent with an upper gable window to the rear of the part (a) extension and reflect the use of arched doorways for the garages, stores and stables in the ancillary accommodation that would be arranged around the "arrival" space. Those part (c) elements would be subservient in height and scale to the main house and reflect their purposes, much in the style of stabling and carriage accommodation commonly found at large houses before the twentieth century.
36. Overall, I find the design of the extensions to be generally sensitive to the style and age of the existing house; and care has been taken to ensure that, though large, they would not dominate it. I conclude that the criteria of Policy GD 7 have been appropriately addressed and that the design is appropriate relative to the existing building by reference to the relevant test in Policy NE 7. I have already considered its broader landscape context. I am equally satisfied that

the immediate context provided by the extensive grounds and local natural screening is also appropriate to a house of substantial scale.

### *Occupancy*

37. The second criterion of Policy NE 7 in essence says that a domestic extension should not facilitate significant increased occupancy. The supporting text differs slightly in that it says that the purpose of the extension should not do so. In my judgment both should be considered together, as the purpose of an extension is critical to a judgment as to whether it may facilitate increased occupancy. The appellant does not indicate any intention to increase occupancy; and this is acknowledged by the Department.
38. I believe that great care and common sense should be applied to putting into effect this part of the policy. In principle, just about any extension of sufficient size could in theory be converted to living accommodation that would permit more people to live in a house. But if the policy were to be approached in that way it could amount to an effective embargo on very nearly all extensions. That would not be right, not least because the supporting text to the policy explicitly recognises that it would be unreasonable to resist all forms of development to improve people's homes; and acknowledges the need to provide for the reasonable expectations of residents. Reasonable expectations will doubtless commonly involve the provision of additional rooms or floorspace that would have the theoretical potential to be converted to a bedroom, thereby facilitating increased occupancy.
39. In this case the extensions would be very substantial. However, in my opinion, not all would facilitate increased occupancy. The ancillary accommodation, for example the garages, stores and stables, while in theory capable of being converted to bedrooms, are not intended for that purpose and not suitable for human occupation without considerable modification. I do not believe that they would facilitate increased occupancy in the true sense of making it easy or easier, having regard to their stated purpose which, in line with the Island Plan, is explicitly a material consideration.
40. The extensions to the living accommodation would undoubtedly provide significantly improved living space for the occupiers. However, while these would create a house which would be more spacious, more comfortable, more convenient and indeed more luxurious, in my opinion little of the increased floorspace would directly facilitate increased occupancy. As it stands, the house presently has 5 bedrooms on the first floor, together with the accommodation in the attic. It is not unreasonable in the present day that such a house should have a large kitchen / eating area where the occupiers of that many bedrooms may congregate and eat informally in addition to having a formal dining room. Similarly, a professional man such as the appellant might reasonably wish to have a sizeable

library in addition to a study. I also find it reasonable that a house of such a kind might have an impressive entrance hall and other minor facilities which, though not essential, would generally add to comfort and convenience.

41. As with the ancillary accommodation, the additional floorspace thus created could conceivably be converted to bedrooms thereby facilitating increased occupancy. But that could be achieved only by carrying out large-scale consequential alterations to the house that would be wholly at odds with the stated purpose of the extension(s). Indeed, the double-height library and entrance lobby, which would take up a very significant amount of floorspace, would be wholly unsuitable for conversion. Even if it could be done, the resultant internal layout of the house would be quite impractical.
42. Having regard to the purpose of the proposed extensions, it is only the additional bedroom that would clearly facilitate increased occupancy. However, one must also take into account that one unit of staff accommodation would be lost as part of the overall proposals, practically further limiting the scale of the potential increase. In view of the foregoing, and notwithstanding the theoretical potential for the conversion of floorspace to bedrooms, I do not regard the likely scale of increase as being significant with respect to the wording of the third criterion of Policy NE 7.
43. The policy rationale for seeking to restrict increased occupancy of dwellings in the Green Zone is to check pressure on a fragile environment and on limited infrastructure and services and to constrain trip generation. But it follows that, if the extension(s) would not lead to a significant increase in occupancy, then any consequences that would flow from that scale of increase would be equally insignificant.
44. In reaching this conclusion I have been aware of an appeal decision (ref P/2015/1837), relating to the extension of a dwelling elsewhere in the Green Zone which has been brought to my attention by the Department. The Inspector in that case concluded that the increase in accommodation resulting from the conversion of a 3-bedroom / 1-bathroom bungalow to a 4 bedroom / 3-bathroom two-storey house would facilitate a significant increase in occupancy, contrary to Policy NE 7. In so doing, he took account of the fact that the overall floorspace would be over doubled and that in theory a playroom and a garage could be converted for sleeping, thereby potentially doubling the occupancy. He acknowledged that the applicant did not indicate any intention to increase the level of occupancy to that extent but, nonetheless, emphasised the importance of the test of "facilitation".
45. Although the 2 cases have some things in common, I believe that they may be distinguished in 2 main ways. First, the earlier appeal was dismissed not solely because of the potential for impact on the Green Zone. The Inspector in recommending that permission should not be granted also concluded that the development would have created an

unduly dominant and overbearing built form that would have resulted in an unreasonable impact on the residential amenities of an adjacent property, and would have failed to preserve or enhance the setting of a potential Listed Building. Consequently, his conclusion with respect to the potential for increased occupancy was only a contributory factor to his overall recommendation. In contrast, I have found no other significant harm in the present case. Second, following discussions at the Hearing and agreement between the parties, I am recommending that a condition should be imposed which would prevent the extensive new ancillary accommodation (garages, stables, stores etc.) being converted to or used as bedrooms.

46. I have therefore considered the present appeal on its individual merits.

### *Scale*

47. Throughout this report I have acknowledged the scale of the proposed development. It is something of considerable concern to the Department, which used the expression "*excessive scale and massing and sheer extent of the development*" in its reason for refusal. But by concentrating on the size of the development I believe that the Department is over-emphasising that aspect at the risk of mis-applying the policy. The supporting text to Policy NE 7 says that, amongst other things, the acceptability of an extension to a dwelling will be determined by its scale. However, the criteria of the relevant part of Policy NE 7 do not refer to size or scale. Rather they relate to the impact of the development: the degree of harm to landscape character; the appropriateness of the design; and the significance of the increased occupancy. It may be quite possible that in some cases the impact of the development will derive directly from its scale. It is clearly material. But the one does not necessarily follow from the other. In this case, by reference to the tests in the policy, I have concluded (a) that any harm to landscape character would not be "serious"; (b) that the design is "appropriate" to the existing buildings and its context; and (c) that "significant" increased occupancy would not be facilitated. In my view, despite the scale of the development, both the terms and intent of the policy would be satisfied.

### *Conditions*

48. In the event that my recommendation to allow the appeal is accepted, any permission granted should be subject to conditions designed to ensure that the development is carried out appropriately. Planning conditions were discussed at the Hearing on a without prejudice basis; and a number of conditions were agreed in principle. These are attached in the Annex to this report.
49. In brief: Conditions 1 and 2 relate to the timescale for commencement and compliance with the approved plans. These are standard conditions required in the interests of certainty. Condition 3

requires approval of the external building materials. It is particularly important in this case in the interests of architectural consistency that they should match those of the existing house. Condition 4 requires the house to be connected to the mains sewers, in the interests of sustainability. Condition 5 limits the occupation of the staff accommodation to staff and dependents; and No 6 seeks to prevent the new ancillary accommodation being used as bedrooms or principal rooms, both in order to limit the potential for the development to give rise to significant increased occupancy, contrary to the provisions of Policy NE 7.

### *Overall Conclusion*

50. For the reasons given above, I **recommend** that the appeal should be **allowed**, and planning permission granted subject to the conditions set out in the Annex to this report.

*Jonathan G King*

**Inspector**

### **ANNEX**

#### **CONDITIONS THAT MAY BE IMPOSED ON THE PLANNING PERMISSION IN THE EVENT THAT THE APPEAL IS ALLOWED**

1. The development shall commence within five years of the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved plans.
3. Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted, samples of the materials to be used for the external walls and roof of the extensions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Department of the Environment. The walls shall be faced with granite to match the walls of the existing house in all respects, including colour, size of blocks, and the colour and style of pointing. The roof covering shall match that of the existing house.
4. Prior to the first occupation of the extensions hereby permitted, the dwelling shall be connected to mains drainage.
5. No person shall occupy that part of the extensions shown on the approved plans for staff accommodation other than staff employed at the house, together with dependents, and only for the duration of the employment.

6. Notwithstanding the relevant provisions of the Planning and Building (General Development) (Jersey) Order 2006 or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, no part of the extensions hereby permitted shown on the approved plans as ancillary accommodation, including the garages, store, stables, garden machinery store and dog room, shall be converted for use as bedrooms or otherwise occupied as principal rooms of the house, without the prior approval in writing of the Department of the Environment.

**--ooOoo--**