

**STATES OF JERSEY**

**PLANNING AND BUILDING (JERSEY) LAW 2002 (as amended)**

**APPEAL OF A DECISION UNDER ARTICLE 108**

**REPORT TO THE MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT**

**by Mr Philip Staddon BSc, Dip, MBA, MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed under Article 107**

**APPEAL BY: Clematis Limited**

**AGAINST: Decision of the Department of the Environment to Refuse to Grant Planning Permission for "*OUTLINE APPLICATION: Demolish existing dwellings. Construct 1 No. one bed apartments, 4 No. two bed apartments, 5 No. three bed apartments, 2 No. four bed dwellings and 1 No. three bed dwelling. Alteration to vehicular access onto La Greve d'Azette. Fixed Matters: Scale & Mass, Siting and Means of Access. Reserve Matters: External Appearance & Materials and landscaping. (3d model Available)*"**

**DECISION DATE: 19 April 2018**

**LOCATION: Coast Road Stores, 1-4 Pres de la Mer, 1&2 Sur la Cote, Ceol-Na-Mara, 1-3 Prospect Place & 1-2 Mon Caprice, La Greve d'Azette, St. Clement, JE2 6PX.**

**REFERENCE: PP/2018/0112**

**APPEAL PROCEDURE: Hearing - 3 July 2018**

**SITE VISITS: 3 and 5 July 2018**

**DATE: 3 August 2018**

## **Introduction**

1. This report contains my assessment of the appeal made by Clematis Limited against the decision of the Department of the Environment to refuse to grant Planning permission for a residential redevelopment proposal on a beachside site in St Clement.

## **The site and its surroundings**

2. The site is situated within the Built-up Area and is about a mile to the south-east of St Helier town centre. The site is broadly rectangular in shape and covers some 2057 square metres<sup>1</sup>. It sits between the A4 road, *La Greve d'Azette*, (which forms its north-eastern boundary) and the coast, where a sea wall, with a number of openings (some now blocked), forms its south-western boundary.
3. The site contains a miscellaneous collection of buildings, structures and uses. At the north-western end of the site is the former Coast Road Stores retail unit and an attached two storey cottage. The shop is vacant and I am advised that it has not been in use for over 5 years, its trade having been effectively lost to a new convenience store development nearby.
4. Moving south-eastwards along the site, there is then a set of four small commercial units within a single storey building, which I believe once comprised fisherman's' huts. Only one of the units, a nail bar, appeared to be in use when I visited. Further along, and occupying the central part of the site, are residential properties, nos. 1 and 2 *Sur La Cote*, which are dormer bungalows with garden areas and a pool on the coast side. The south-eastern end of the site comprises a collection of one and two storey dwellings: no. 1 Prospect Place and nos. 1 and 2 *Mon Caprice* fronting the road, with nos. 2 and 3 Prospect Place and a garage block site behind them.
5. The buildings are a mix of architectural ages and styles. The buildings on the roadside are sited tight up to the highway edge, with a very narrow footway separating the face of the buildings from the carriageway.
6. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature, with some interspersed commercial uses. There is a mix of architectural styles and the scale of buildings is typically 2 and 3 storey, although there are some taller buildings in the vicinity.
7. The immediate neighbours at either end of the site are residential properties, comprising *La Maisonette* and *Sea Crest* to the north-west, and *Roche de la Mer* to the south-west (beyond which is a recently cleared site).
8. Opposite the site, on the other side of the road, is *Coastlands Terrace*, which comprises 1930s bay fronted two storey dwellings and a more recent development of taller townhouses with balconies, known as *Clos de Charriere*.

---

<sup>1</sup> As stated on application drawing number 1689/01/RevB

## **Planning history**

9. There have been two previous applications in recent years, which have sought Outline Planning permission for redevelopment of the site for residential schemes.
10. The first was application reference PP/2016/1851. It sought Outline planning permission for a scheme described as: *Demolish existing dwellings. Construct 1 no. two bed and 3 no. four bed townhouses, 1 no. two bed and 5 no. three bed apartments and 1 no. three bed dwelling. Fixed matters: Means of access, siting, scale and mass. Reserved matters: External appearance, materials and landscape.* This application was withdrawn in March 2017.
11. The second was application reference PP/2017/1269. This sought Outline planning permission for a scheme described as: *Demolish existing dwellings. Construct 1 no. two bed and 3 no. four bed townhouses, 1 no. two bed and 5 no. three bed apartments and 1 no. three bed dwellings. Alteration to vehicular accesses onto La Greve d'Azette. Fixed matters: Means of access, siting, scale and mass. Reserved matters: External appearance, materials and landscape.* This application was refused in January 2018 for the following two reasons:
  1. *The proposed development, by virtue of its size, height, position on the site and its relationship with the neighbouring property of La Maisonette, results in an unacceptable overbearing impact, harmful to the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring property of La Maisonette, contrary to Policies GD1 and GD7 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (Revised 2014)*
  2. *The proposed development, by virtue of its size, height, position on the site and its relationship with the neighbouring property of La Maisonette, would unreasonably affect the level of sunlight to the occupiers of the neighbouring property of La Maisonette, contrary to Policies GD1 and GD7 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (Revised 2014)*
12. The minutes of the Committee meeting make clear that the objection was focused on 'unit No. 2' which, in that scheme, was a three storey townhouse.

## **Planning application PP/2018/0112**

13. The application was lodged in February 2018. In essence, it comprises a revised scheme which sought to overcome the reasons for refusal in respect of PP/2017/1269.
14. It sought Outline Planning permission for a redevelopment comprising 10 apartments (ranging from 1 to 3 bedrooms), 2 townhouses and 1 'corner house'. Fixed matters, for which approval was sought, were scale and mass, siting and means of access. Reserved matters, for later consideration, were external appearance and materials and landscaping.
15. The scheme would involve the demolition of all buildings currently occupying the site and the redevelopment in a series of blocks, with gaps

between giving glimpses through to the coast. The buildings would have principal frontages to the road and to the coast.

16. The development would be largely three storey, but the proposed buildings at either end of the site would be limited to two storeys. This reduced scale at the north-western end of the site sought to overcome the reasons for refusal under PP/2017/1269.
17. Parking and storage is proposed underground, with vehicular access being gained from a single point, in the vicinity of the existing access between no. 1 *Prospect Place* and no.2 *Mon Caprice*.
18. The scheme is set further back from the street than the existing buildings, and an extended 1.8 metre wide footway, and inset bus shelter, form part of the proposals. Defined amenity spaces for residents are proposed on the road side and beach side of the buildings.
19. Whilst detailed design and materials are 'reserved' for subsequent consideration, the drawings indicate the intention to employ a modern but uncomplicated architectural style.
20. The application was considered by the Planning Committee at its 15 March 2018 meeting. The officer report recommended that Outline Planning permission should be granted, subject to a schedule of 12 Planning conditions and to a Planning obligations agreement. The Committee did not agree with this recommendation and resolved to refuse the application.
21. At the April 2018 meeting, the Committee confirmed its decision and the following reason for refusal:
  1. *The proposed development, by virtue of its size, height, position on the site and its relationship with the neighbouring property of La Maisonette, results in an unacceptable overbearing impact, harmful to the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring property of La Maisonette, contrary to Policies GD1 and GD7 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (Revised 2014)*
22. This appeal is lodged against that refusal decision.

### **The Appellant's grounds of appeal**

23. The Appellant states six grounds of appeal which are:

Ground 1 – Insufficient weight has been given to the existing situation.

Ground 2 – In regard to Policy GD 1, the proposal would not cause an unreasonable overbearing impact on the neighbouring property, La Maisonette.

Ground 3 – Insufficient regard had been given to the policy test set by Policy GD 1, namely the test of unreasonableness.

Ground 4 – In regard to Policy GD 1, insufficient weight had been given to the prevailing character, pattern and density of development in the area

and, therefore, the expectations of what neighbours might expect have been misapplied.

Ground 5 – Insufficient weight had been given to the policies SP 1, SP 2, SP 3, SP4, SP 6, GD 3, BE 4 and H 6 which set a presumption in favour of high density residential development within the town of St Helier.

Ground 6 – Insufficient weight had been given to Article 2 (Purposes) of the law which requires comprehensive and orderly development.

24. These grounds are supported by detailed submissions but, in essence, the Appellant contends that the proposal accords fully with the Island Plan, that it will deliver significant improvements to the public realm and highway safety, and it will not unreasonably harm the amenities of existing properties. The Appellant also draws attention to the fact that the reasons for refusal of PP/2017/1269 were founded on specific concerns about the impact of a three storey block, which had now been addressed in the current scheme, by reducing the scale to two storeys.

### **The Department's response**

25. The Department explained, on behalf of the Committee, that it was quite entitled to reach different conclusions on the issue of impact on the neighbouring property.
26. It drew attention to the views of the Connétable of St. Mary, who recognised that the development site was within the Built-up Area, wherein there existed a need to maximise the use of space, but felt that developments that were in such close proximity needed to be reasonable and some compromise was required.
27. Whilst the Connétable accepted that the overlooking issues in relation to *Roche de la Mer* could be overcome through conditions, she did not feel that "the enclosed, oppressive and overbearing impact of the blank fascia of the proposed development" on *La Maisonette* was acceptable. The Department explained that the Committee concurred with that view and considered that the overbearing impact on *La Maisonette* and its amenities were of sufficient impact that they would pose serious harm under Policy GD 1.

### **The views of other interested parties**

28. The resident of *La Maisonette* submitted that he had lived at his property for over 17 years and that his home was directly west of the proposed development. He drew attention to the unanimous rejection of the proposals (on 2 occasions) due to the detrimental impact the development would have on his property.
29. He also pointed out that a reference in the March 2018 committee minutes to an adjacent 'open space' was misleading and pointed out that, what there is to the east, is a large expanse of blue skies and sunlight, which is the reason for his objection to this development, due to its overbearing nature, particularly in terms of its effect on his enclosed amenity space.

30. I have also taken into consideration the representations made by others, at the application stage.

### **The main issues and the Inspector's assessment**

#### *The Principle*

31. Support for the broad principle of redeveloping and regenerating this site for a greater number of dwelling units is common ground between the principal parties. The site is within the defined Built-up Area and, as such, finds support from the Island Plan's high level strategic Planning principles, which promote a sustainable pattern of development.
32. It supports the spatial strategy set out in Policy SP 1 of seeking to concentrate new development within the Island's built-up area. It also supports the Policy SP 2, SP 3 and SP 6 objectives of using land as efficiently and effectively as possible, directing new development to the most sustainable locations, and reducing dependence on the car.
33. Support is also found in Policy GD 3 which, in support of the spatial strategy, seeks to ensure that *'the highest reasonable density is achieved for all developments, commensurate with good design, adequate amenity space and parking...and without unreasonable impact on adjoining properties.'* Policy H 6 also makes a positive presumption, that housing development proposals within the Built-up Area will be permitted, provided that they accord with the standards for housing as set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance.

#### *Policy GD 1(1a) considerations*

34. Notwithstanding the above 'in principle' support, a recent Royal Court judgment<sup>2</sup> has drawn attention to the need to undertake, and record, consideration under Policy GD 1 (1a). This states a presumption that a proposal *'will not replace a building that is capable of being repaired or refurbished'*. The judgment accepts that Policy GD 2, which effectively prohibited demolition reliant proposals, was deleted and refers to GD 1 (1a) as setting only a "light presumption", which must be balanced with other policies and objectives.
35. There are clearly a number of buildings on the application site that could, hypothetically at least, be repaired or refurbished. However, the Appellant has submitted uncontested expert evidence which confirms that a refurbishment scheme would not be economically viable and would result in a loss of over £1 million.
36. Furthermore, there is consensus between the principal parties that the existing built form is generally in poor condition, inefficient in its use of land and vulnerable to storm surge. Redevelopment will allow more efficient use of the site; increased housing density; better quality housing; improved insulation and energy efficiency; reduced flood risk; enhanced appearance and public realm improvements and transport improvements, including a

---

<sup>2</sup> Therin v Minister for Planning and Warwick – Royal Court (Samedi Division) [2018]JRC098

bus shelter and widened footway. All of these factors weigh in the proposal's favour and outweigh any GD1 (1a) tension, in my assessment.

*Policy E1 – loss of employment land*

37. There are four small commercial units within the site, along with the long vacant shop premises. Policy E 1 presumes against development which results in the loss of land for employment purposes, unless one of four specified criteria is met.
38. Criterion 1 states that: '*it is demonstrated that the site is inappropriate for any employment use to continue*'. A marketing report, submitted by the Applicant, confirms that no commercial occupiers have been identified and that the units are generally poor and unattractive to prospective occupiers. However, the presence of the nail bar use suggests that there is at least some limited demand and that the Criterion cannot be fully met.
39. Criteria 2 and 4 do not apply in this case. Criterion 3 states that: '*the overall benefit to the community of the proposal outweighs any adverse effect on employment opportunities and the range of available employment land and premises*'. There are undoubtedly some public benefits arising from the scheme, including the broader regeneration of the site, greater flood resilience and improved footway and bus shelter provisions. These factors weigh in favour of the proposal.
40. Overall, I assess that there is a slight tension with the strict wording of Policy E 1 but, due to the marketing evidence and the wider Planning benefits that will arise, I do not consider that this should weigh notably against the scheme in the Planning balance.

*Residential amenity implications*

41. The main concern of the Planning committee, and the focus of the refusal reason, relates to specific amenity impacts on one identified property, *La Maisonette*.
42. Before exploring those issues, I can confirm that I have assessed the relationships of the proposed scheme with the other neighbouring properties, including *Seacrest*, *Coastlands Terrace*, *Clos de Charriere* and *Roche de la Mer* (including its approved extensions and alterations). I consider all of these relationships to be acceptable and reasonable in amenity terms, subject to certain safeguarding Planning conditions.
43. With regard to the potential impacts on *La Maisonette*, it is important to begin by assessing the existing situation and the reasonable amenity expectations it currently enjoys. The house is a traditional two storey dwelling, with painted rendered walls and hipped slated roofs. It is sited close to the road, behind a small front garden area. Its principal windows are in the front and rear elevations, the side (south-east) elevation being blank.
44. Behind the main house there is an 'L' shaped single storey extension which encloses the only amenity space enjoyed by the property. Whilst it is only a

few metres in width and length, it is clearly an important and well used facility for the occupants, with outdoor seating, hanging baskets and planting. This courtyard area is enclosed on all sides by neighbouring development. When standing in the courtyard, the dormer bungalow *Seacrest* dominates the view to the rear (towards the coast). When looking north-west from the courtyard, the taller *Brise de Mer* apartments are visible. The top floor apartment's projecting balcony (on the block nearest to the road) is quite intrusive, as it allows views directly down into *La Maisonette's* courtyard.

45. The standing view from the courtyard towards the appeal site is in an east to south arc. It includes single storey and two storey elements of the 'cottage' behind Coast Road Stores, rising above the courtyard boundary wall. The two storey element includes a first floor clear glazed window. A chimney structure is also visible. Above these features are the open skies.
46. The appeal proposal would replace these visible built features with a two storey building, which would house Apartment 7 (ground floor) and Apartment 9 (first floor). The side wall would have a height of just under 7 metres<sup>3</sup> and the mono-pitch roof would rise at a shallow angle (away from *La Maisonette*). The spatial separation between the proposed side elevation and the side wall of *La Maisonette* would vary between 5.3 – 5.6 metres. The side wall would be just over 9 metres in depth, projecting about 2.5 metres beyond the rear elevation of *La Maisonette* i.e. it would terminate opposite the enclosed courtyard. There would then be a setback of 1.7 metres to the rear wing, which would be angled away (from *La Maisonette*); the rear wing would extend about 6 metres at ground floor and 2.5 metres at first floor.
47. The key policy test is set out in the Island Plan's general development control Policy GD 1. Under GD 1 (3) a proposal must not 'unreasonably harm' the amenities of neighbouring uses, including the living conditions for nearby residents. The policy goes on to explain that these considerations will include privacy (a) and the level of light (b), along with some other factors which are not relevant in this case.
48. With regard to privacy, I do not consider that there are any undue impacts. Indeed, I consider that there is a small net benefit to *La Maisonette*, as the existing clear glazed first floor window which looks towards the courtyard will be lost. The new block, whilst a little closer, will only include an obscure glazed bathroom window at first floor level (a ground floor window will be screened by the existing boundary wall).
49. 'Light' is not defined in Policy GD 1, but can be reasonably assumed to incorporate both sunlight / shadowing and daylight.
50. With regard to sunlight, the Applicant has modelled sun paths and these demonstrate that the shadowing impacts of the proposal on *La Maisonette* and its courtyard will be very limited. I do not consider these effects to be significant or unreasonable, in the site specific circumstances. Indeed, one

---

<sup>3</sup> Scaled measurement from Drawing No. 1689/22/ Rev E



of the attractions of this small courtyard as a sun trap, with views of the sky overhead, will not be unduly undermined or diminished by the presence of the proposed development.

51. I do not consider that there are any undue impacts in terms of daylight, as the amount of light entering *La Maisonette* will not materially worsen, in my assessment.
52. The Department's reason for refusal does not actually refer to any of the above factors (privacy, sunlight or daylight) but focuses on the alleged 'overbearing' impact, arising from the mass and proximity of the proposal. 'Overbearing' impacts, whilst not a specifically listed GD 1 factor, are not excluded either, as the policy's amenity protection remit is widely scoped.
53. The assessment of what is overbearing is, to an extent at least, subjective but the key test is whether that physical imposition (of the proposal) crosses the 'unreasonable' threshold. I do recognise that the existing amenity space of *La Maisonette* is limited in size and compromised by existing surrounding development, most notably the *Brise de Mer* apartments and, to a lesser extent, *Seacrest*. Whilst that can be seen to heighten its importance to the occupiers, it does not preclude change on the adjacent application site.
54. In my assessment, the impact of the development on *La Maisonette* is very limited and not unreasonable. The adjacent new building would be of similar domestic proportions and height, without overlooking impacts and with very limited shadowing effects. Whilst the new building will be a little closer than the existing two storey cottage, it is still set a comfortable distance off the boundary. When viewed from the courtyard the building profile and view of the sky will alter, but that change would not be overbearing or unreasonable, in my view.
55. Overall, I consider that the proposal meets the requirements of Policy GD 1 in terms of satisfying the test that it will not unreasonably harm existing residential amenities.

#### *Other Matters*

56. The site falls within the Shoreline Zone and I am satisfied that the scheme, through the introduction of gaps and glimpsed views through the blocks, accords with the objectives of Policy BE 4.

#### **Planning Conditions and Planning Obligation Agreement requirements**

57. Should the Minister be minded to allow this appeal, the Planning conditions set out in the officer report are recommended, subject to the correction of some typographical errors and the deletion of two unnecessary conditions. These deal with a range of Planning requirements including construction management, ecology, privacy protection and highways matters. I have appended a revised schedule of suggested conditions to this report.

58. Similarly, a proposed Planning Obligations Agreement should be entered to deal with highway related matters as set out in the officer report. These include the ceding of the widened footway to the Department for Infrastructure and financial contributions to the eastern cycleway and maintenance of the bus shelter. I understand that these provisions are all acceptable to the Applicant / Appellant.

### **Conclusions and Recommendation**

59. I assess that the proposal is acceptable in principle and supports the broad thrust of strategic policies of the Island Plan, which seeks to direct new development to the defined Built-up area, make efficient use of land, promote higher densities, reduce dependence on the car and encourage high quality design. There is some tension with Policy E 1 in terms of the loss of the small employment units, but the demonstrated limited demand and appeal of these units lessens the weight of this tension and it is outweighed by wider Planning benefits that will arise from the scheme. It has also been demonstrated that a scheme to renovate the existing buildings would not be economically viable and would not deliver the same regeneration and other public benefits.
60. In terms of impacts on the existing amenities of neighbouring residential properties, I assess that there would be no undue loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight and that the scale and disposition of the proposed buildings is acceptable. Inevitably, neighbours will experience some change but the effects are not unduly adverse or unreasonable.
61. For these reasons, I recommend that the Minister **ALLOWS** this appeal and grants Planning permission for the application PP/2018/0112, subject to the Planning Conditions and Planning Obligations Agreement requirements set out in the Appendix to this report.

*P. Staddon*

**Mr Philip Staddon BSc, Dip, MBA, MRTPI**

## **APPENDIX to Inspector's Report - PP/2018/0112**

Recommended Planning obligations and conditions in the event that the Minister allows this appeal.

### **Planning Obligations**

- £17,750 pre-commencement towards the Eastern Cycle Route.
- All maintenance and upkeep, including the land upon which it sits, of the bus shelter to the front of the application site.
- Ceding the proposed widened footway to the front of the site to the Department for Infrastructure.
- Provision of the street lights to the front of the site.

### **Planning Conditions**

GRANT Outline planning permission, subject to conditions and reasons set out below, the submission of appropriate reserved matters and also subject to the completion of the planning obligation agreement referred to above.

#### Conditions

1. Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, a Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Department of the Environment. The Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plan shall be thereafter implemented in full until the completion of the development and any variations agreed in writing by the Department prior to such work commencing. The Plan shall secure an implementation programme of mitigation measures to minimise the adverse effects of the proposal on the environment, and shall include but not be limited to:

A. A demonstration of compliance with best practice in controlling, monitoring, recording and reporting on any emissions to the environment (such as noise and vibration, air, land and water pollution);

B. Details of a publicised complaints procedure, including office hours and out of hours contact numbers;

C. Details of any proposed crushing/ sorting of waste material on site;

D. Specified hours of working.

2. Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, an Ecological Assessment of the site must be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Department of the Environment. The Ecological Assessment

shall be undertaken by a suitably qualified person and to a methodology to be first agreed in writing by the Department of the Environment. All mitigation measures shall be carried out in full and in accordance with the recommendations of the Ecological Assessment.

3. No part of the development hereby approved shall be brought into first use/occupied until the electric car charging ducting has been wholly constructed. The ducting for the electric car charging points shall thereafter be retained and maintained as such.

4. No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until the proposed window to the bathroom at first floor level in the north-west elevation of Apartment 9 is fitted with obscure glass. Once implemented, the obscure glazing shall be maintained as such thereafter.

5. The flat roof area at first floor level to the rear of Apartment 9 of the development hereby approved shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

6. No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until the balconies to the south elevation of Apartments 4 and 6 at first floor and second floor level are fitted with an obscure privacy screen along the length of the eastern side, to a design, siting and height to be agreed in writing by the Department of the Environment. Once constructed, the screen shall be maintained as such thereafter.

7. Prior to the commencement of development, details of the siting and design of a store room for the corner dwelling to the south-east of the application site shall be submitted to and approval by the Department of the Environment. The store room shall thereafter be retained solely for the use of the corner dwelling.

8. No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until the vehicular manoeuvring area and respective car parking spaces have been laid out, surfaced and drained as indicated on the approved plans. The car parking spaces shall thereafter be retained solely for the use of occupants of the development and shall not be sub-let for any other purpose.

9. Prior to the development being brought into first use, visibility splays shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved plans. The visibility splays shall then be maintained thereafter and no visual obstruction of any kind over the height of 600mm shall be erected within them.

10. No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until the cycle parking facilities as indicated on the approved plan have been wholly constructed in accordance with the approved plans. The facilities shall thereafter be retained solely for the use of occupants of the development and maintained as such.

## Reasons

1. To ensure the development does not have an adverse impact on public health or the wider environment, in accordance with Policies GD 1, GD 6 and WM 1 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (Revised 2014).
2. To ensure the protection of all protected species in accordance with Policies NE 1, NE 2 and NE 4 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (Revised 2014).
3. In the interests of promoting sustainable patterns of development, in accordance with Policies TT 9 and SP 6 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (Revised 2014).
4. To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupants of the adjoining properties in accordance with Policy GD 1 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (Revised 2014).
5. To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupants of the adjoining properties in accordance with Policy GD 1 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (Revised 2014).
6. To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupants of the adjoining properties in accordance with Policy GD 1 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (Revised 2014).
7. In the interests of providing suitable storage for residents of the development, in accordance with Policies GD 1 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (Revised 2014).
8. To ensure that the development provides adequate provision for off-street parking and manoeuvring for users of the site, in the interests of highway safety and the general amenities of the area, in accordance with Policy GD 1 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (Revised 2014).
9. In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy GD 1 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (Revised 2014).
10. In the interests of promoting sustainable patterns of development, in accordance with Policies TT 9 and SP 6 of the Adopted Island Plan 2011 (Revised 2014).