

KML

PLANNING COMMITTEE

(20th Meeting)

7th April 2022**PART A (Non-Exempt)**

All members were present with the exception of Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence and Deputies R.E. Huelin of St. Peter and L.B.E. Ash of St. Clement, from whom apologies had been received.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair
 Deputy G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade, Vice Chair
 Connétable M. Troy of St. Clement
 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence
 (present from Minute No. A5 onwards)
 Deputy J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour
 (not present from Minute No. A7 onwards)
 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier
 (present from Minute No. A7 onwards.)
 Deputy S.G. Luce of St. Martin

In attendance -

G. Duffel, Principal Planner
 J. Gladwin, Senior Planner
 L. Davies, Planner
 P. Roberts, Planner
 K. Ambrassa, Trainee Planner
 J. Gibbons, Trainee Planner
 T. Ingle, Principal Historic Environment Officer
 K.M. Larbalestier, Principal Officer, Specialist Secretariat, States Greffe

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

Minutes.	A1. The Minutes of the meetings held on 9th and 10th March 2022, having been previously circulated, were taken as read and were confirmed.
Savoy Hotel, No. 37 Rouge Bouillon, St. Helier: proposed demolition and redevelopment. PP/2021/0796	A2. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an outline application which sought approval for the demolition of the Savoy Hotel, No. 37 Rouge Bouillon, St. Helier and its replacement with 56 apartments. The Committee had visited the application site on 5th April 2022. A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area of the Green Backdrop Zone and that Policies SP1, 4, 5 and 7, PL1, GD1, 2, 5, 6, 8 and 10, NE1, HE1, H1, 2, 3 and 4, TT1, 2 and 4, WER 6 and 7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were of particular relevance.

The Committee noted that the site was located within the Built-Up Area wherein the principle of residential development was acceptable, subject to compliance with the housing standards. In this instance the proposed apartments met the required minimum size standards and sufficient amenity space was provided in the form of courtyard and communal amenity areas, balconies and gardens.

The existing building was not Listed and, in principle, its demolition was acceptable on the basis that its redevelopment for much needed housing in a sustainable location outweighed any sustainability issues arising from demolition. However, the application did not include the required waste management plan or an initial Ecological Assessment to enable an evaluation of the potential impacts of the development proposals on protected species.

The proposed development was not considered to cause unreasonable harm to the character of the area, with the bulk of the visible massing being at the front of the site and viewed within the context of the higher density of Rouge Bouillon. The proposed development dropped down to 3 stories to the rear, with the top floor being set back to reduce its impact onto Roussel Mews. It was considered that this would satisfactorily help to assimilate the development into the street scene to the rear.

The site was located close to, but not directly adjacent to, nearby Listed Buildings, particularly Gloster Terrace, which had a pronounced and positive impact on Rouge Bouillon. The Historic Environment Section had objected to the application on the grounds that it failed to preserve the setting of Gloster Terrace and Listed parts of the fire station. It was considered that the bulk and massing of the proposal, especially on the northern side of the site, would not preserve the setting of the Listed Buildings at Gloster Terrace, contrary to Policies SP4 and HE1. The proposed development would, for the majority of the site, be higher and have a greater mass than the existing building. This increased mass and height and the position of balconies and windows was considered to cause unreasonable harm to neighbouring properties to the north and south. Consequently, the application was recommended for refusal on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies GD1 and GD6, HE1, NE1 and WER1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair asked the case officer about the provision of amenity space and noted that, as well as individual amenity areas such as gardens and balconies, a courtyard and rooftop amenity space (to include a swimming pool) were proposed. As outline approval was sought, no information had been provided which would illustrate any shading to amenity areas. It was confirmed that the mix of accommodation could also change when a detailed application was submitted, if outline permission was granted.

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

The Committee heard from Mr. ■ Wakeling, representing the occupants of Alton Gardens. Mr. Wakeling highlighted ongoing problems with drainage in the Rouge Bouillon area, which were understood to relate to capacity and which necessitated frequent visits from drainage contractors.

The Committee heard from Ms. ■ Spencer ■ and her agent, Mrs. ■ Steedman. Ms. Spencer advised that her concerns related to the overbearing impact of the development, overlooking and the resultant loss of privacy. She also noted that the proposed external walkways would be set at a higher level and she believed that those using the walkway would be able to look into ■ garden and principal rooms. She was concerned about reliance on a planting scheme to provide screening as she did not believe that plants would thrive on the northern side of the site. The proposed development would be much taller and Ms. Spencer believed that this would be oppressive and would reduce natural light to ■ property and garden. She noted that a hedge was proposed and felt that this would result in a loss of 'openness'. In essence, Ms. Spencer believed that the proposed development would significantly affect ■ enjoyment of ■ property and she added that she too was worried about drainage capacity.

Mrs. Steedman addressed the Committee, acknowledging the need for new homes in the Built-Up Area. However, the impact on neighbouring amenities and the environment also had to be considered. She did not believe that outline permission could be granted in this case as too many questions remained unanswered due to the absence of detail. Further policy tests also had to be considered and Mrs. Steedman referenced Policy GD2 and flood management and drainage policy tests. It appeared that a foul drainage assessment had not been carried out and the Bridging Island Plan suggested that the area was vulnerable to flood risk and that development should be located away from such areas. Mrs. Steedman also considered Policies SP1 and GD1 to be relevant and believed that there would be an impact from the upper windows and the proposed walkway, the extent of which was not clear from the submitted plans. In conclusion, Mrs. Steedman stated that the proposed development would result in an unreasonable loss of sunlight and daylight and would create noise and light pollution. The proposed development relied upon a single line of planting and there was no information on how this would be maintained. The potential for vibration arising from the demolition and construction works should also be considered.

The Committee heard from Ms. ■ Le Poidevin, ■ who asked for additional information in relation to the distance from the boundary with Alton Gardens and asked how residents of Alton Gardens would maintain their properties. She too was concerned about loss of privacy and believed that the scheme did not meet many of the policy tests set out in the recently adopted Bridging Island Plan. She noted that no reference had been made to the per cent for art contribution, which was now a policy requirement. In concluding, Ms. Le Poidevin advised that whilst she was not opposed to the redevelopment of the hotel, the impact on neighbours had to be carefully considered in order to avoid prejudice.

The Committee heard from the applicant, Mr. ■ Lora and his agent, Mr. ■ Hargreaves. Mr. Hargreaves advised that, given the sensitivity of the proposals, the application had been referred to the Jersey Architecture Commission on the advice of the Department and key aspirational exemplars had been identified. Mr. Hargreaves explained that the basement had been designed with full bicycle access from the street and 112 electric charging points would be provided together with recycling facilities. Each unit would have a car parking space and 7 electric car bays would be provided. Future residents would be given a 5 year subscription to an electric car club. The ground floor plans has been reduced and the units facing the street would be 3 storey town houses. 'Soft floor plates' would be used to create flexible accommodation that could be adapted in future to suit the needs of occupants. Roussel Mews would be connected to Rouge Bouillon via a pedestrian access and the scheme provided full disabled access. The trajectory of the sun had been borne in mind when designing the scheme. The top floor of the building would include allotment gardens, a community hall for use by residents, a gymnasium, a sauna and a 25 metre swimming pool. External access from the roof would be provided via a series of walkways. Renewable energy sources would also be included to generate power. The overall aspiration was to provide an excellent development. In concluding, Mr. Hargreaves advised that 'whittling the scheme down' could make it unaffordable and would result in the loss of 'green aspects'. He believed that the proposed development would set a benchmark for future development.

Mr. Lora advised that whilst he understood the concerns of neighbours, every effort had been made to reduce the impact of the development and he believed that the scheme represented an improvement on the existing situation. He added that he was not a developer seeking to 'squeeze every ounce of profit out of the site' but merely

wished to create high quality family housing in a sustainable location.

Deputy G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade suggested that the walkway on the northern side would need to be lit and he too expressed concerns that any vegetation in this location might not thrive. However, Mr. Hargreaves stated that sensor lights could be used and shade loving plants would be selected. The trajectory of the sun had been shown on the submitted drawings and it was believed that mature plants would thrive.

In the context of Mrs. Steedman's comments regarding Policy GD2, which related to large scale developments, the Chair asked whether this should have been included in the Department's recommended reasons for refusal. The case officer advised that the Department believed that the provision of amenity space was acceptable. He did, however, accept that Ms. Le Poidevin's point regarding the absence of details of a per cent for art contribution was relevant and should have been included as a recommended reason for refusal.

Having considered the application, the Committee recognised the many positive aspects of this innovative scheme but concluded that these were not sufficient to overcome the concerns raised. Therefore, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out above and on the basis that the scheme failed to comply with Policies H1, GD1, GD2 and GD10 and that details of the percent for art contribution had not been submitted. Furthermore, the Committee directed that reference be made to the absence of details of the drainage and foul sewer arrangements and inadequate amenity space.

No. 12 St.
Meloir des
Ondes, Les
Grands Vaux,
St. Saviour:
proposed
demolition and
redevelopment.

A3. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought approval for the demolition of No. 12 St. Meloir des Ondes, Les Grands Vaux, St. Saviour and its replacement with 2 new dwellings. The Committee had visited the application site on 5th April 2022.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area of the Green Backdrop Zone and that Policies SP1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7, PL3, GD1, 2, 5, 6, NE1, H1, 2, 3 and 4, TT1, 2 and 4, WER 6 and 7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were of particular relevance.

P/2021/1658

The Committee noted that the application site comprised a bungalow set on a rectangular plot measuring 430 square metres, bounded by roads to the east and west and dwellings to the north and south. The bungalow was in a poor state of repair and the application proposed its replacement with a pair of semi-detached 3 bedroomed dwellings. The proposal was not considered to be harmful to the landscape and, due to the scale of the development, the upward slope of the land, and the distance between the proposed development and neighbouring dwellings, there would be no loss of light, the scheme would not be overbearing and there would be no material harm to neighbouring amenities. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the Department report.

4 representations had been received in connexion with the application and the Committee had also had sight of a representation submitted after the publication of the agenda.

20th meeting
07.04.2022

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, Mr. ■ Dodd, who advised that, following the refusal of the original application, the scheme had been revised and the height of the dwellings reduced. The style and form of the dwellings was similar to that of neighbouring properties and the scheme exceeded the residential standards. The applicant had worked with Nurture Ecology to identify measures which would secure long term benefits and the Natural Environment Team was satisfied with the level of information provided, contrary to a statement in the Department report. Mr. Dodd outlined the various benefits which would arise from the proposed development, to include access visibility improvements. In terms of the objections which had been received, Mr. Dodd advised that the applicant was willing to consider replacing a 'box room' with a garage, if the Committee felt this was appropriate.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair, decided to grant permission, subject to the imposition of certain conditions detailed within the Department report.

No. 11 Seale
Street, St.
Helier (land to
the south):
proposed
dwelling.

A4. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought approval for the construction of a 2 storey extension to the south of No. 11 Seale Street, St. Helier. The Committee had visited the application site on 5th April 2022.

P/2021/1369

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area of a Regeneration Zone and that Policies SP1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7, PL1, GD1, GD6, NE1, HE1, H1, 2, 3 and 4, TT1, 2 and 4, WER6 and 7 and UI3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were of particular relevance.

This Committee was advised that the application sought approval for the construction of a 2 storey extension to the rear of No. 11 Seale Street to facilitate the creation of a one bedroom flat. The proposed new accommodation would be accessed via an existing shared entrance on Seale Street. The property would take up much of the existing yard area and would incorporate a patio to the front with space for bicycle storage. A new bin store with gated access would also be constructed for use by the existing residents at No. 11 Seale Street.

The design and scale of the scheme was considered appropriate in this context and the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the character of adjoining historic buildings. However, it was vital that the standard of residential accommodation was sufficient to provide adequate amenity and the proposal was considered to be deficient in this regard, failing to provide the levels of aspect and light to internal rooms to make them sufficiently habitable. The views out would be towards a solid wall and it was likely that the rooms would be permanently in shade. As such the habitability of the flat would be compromised. Moreover, whilst it was appreciated that the rear yard was of limited benefit at present, the proposed development would remove an accessible external area for the existing flats and failed to provide any benefit, save for an enclosed bin store. It was considered regrettable that the applicant had not taken the opportunity to improve the environment and the quality of living accommodation for all occupiers through, for instance, bicycle parking. The adopted approach was considered to be reflective of an ill-considered design, primarily focused on 'squeezing in' development, rather than creating something of high quality, as required by the Island Plan. Consequently, the application was recommended for refusal on the grounds that it was contrary to Policy H1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan.

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

The Committee heard from Mr. ■ Kinnaird of JS Livingston Architectural Services, representing the applicant. Mr. Kinnaird advised that the rear yard was not associated with No. 11 Seale Street and was under separate ownership (this was not apparent from the location plan). No objections had been received from the occupants of No. 11 Seale Street, which comprised 5 separate units of accommodation. The proposed development would exceed the minimum standards by 10 per cent and the scheme was considered to comply with the relevant policy context. The proposed development would make the most efficient use of this infill site and was compared with recently approved developments at Duhamel Place and Duhamel Lane, St. Helier.

Having considered the application, the Committee decided to refuse permission for the reasons set out above.

Off the Rails
Café, Railway
Walk, La
Petite Route
des Mielles, St.
Brelade:
construction of
extension/store
(RETRO-
SPECTIVE)
P/2021/1471

A5. The Committee considered a report in connexion with an application which sought retrospective approval for the construction of an extension to the north, east and west elevations of the premises known as Off the Rails Café, Railway Walk, La Petite Route des Mielles, St. Brelade. The Committee had visited the application site on 5th April 2022.

Deputies G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade, Vice Chair and J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour did not participate.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Built-Up Area and that Policies GD1 and GD6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were of particular relevance.

This Committee was advised that the application sought approval retrospectively for the construction of a covered seating area to the west and east elevation. It was noted that permission had been granted under application reference P/2010/0211 for the operation of the premises as a food kiosk with external seating area.

The Committee noted that the proposal was considered appropriate with sufficient mitigation within the noise management plan to satisfy the requirements of the Environmental Health Section. Moreover, the proposal was not considered to unreasonably affect neighbouring properties and the application was considered to accord with the relevant policy context. The café was of a modest size and the extensions had been designed to integrate well with the existing structure and surrounding natural environment. Consequently, the application was recommended for approval.

18 individual letters of objection had been received in connexion with the application, together with a further letter of objection on behalf of 14 households. The Parish of St. Brelade had also objected to the application for a number of reasons and a further late representation from the Parish was tabled at the meeting. Among other things, the Parish was concerned that the café relied entirely upon the toilet facilities within the Elephant Park and it had been confirmed that these facilities would no longer be available for use by patrons of the café. The use of the facilities was particularly problematic outside of the opening hours of the park and the Parish could find no evidence of the applicant having been formally permitted to use the toilet facilities. The applicant had advised that if agreement could not be reached with the Parish in relation to the use of the toilet facilities, an application would be submitted for the provision of dedicated toilet facilities. 32 letters of support for the application had also been received.

Deputy S.G. Luce of St. Martin noted discrepancies between the submitted drawings and the photographic images of what currently existed on site. Therefore, it was not

20th meeting
07.04.2022

clear what the Committee was being asked to consider. The case officer advised that it appeared that the drawings were incorrect. Consequently, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the application pending the receipt of revised drawings which reflected the true nature of the works which had been carried out. In response to a question from a member of the public who wished to know whether parking issues would be addressed, the Chair advised that all such matters would be considered when the application was re-presented.

Terre Bonne,
La Rue es
Philippe,
Grouville:
proposed new
boundary
walls/
installation of
gates.
P/2021/1471

A6. 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 retrospective approval for the construction of a granite boundary wall with piers at the property known as Terre Bonne, La Rue es Philippe, Grouville. It was also proposed to install gates to the existing vehicular access to the west of the site. The Committee had visited the application site on 5th April 2022.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and that Terre Bonne was a Grade 3 Listed Building. Policies SP1, 2, 3 and 5, GD1, GD6 and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were of particular relevance.

The Committee noted that Terre Bonne and adjacent properties already benefitted from an access to the south of Field No. 52, which led directly to the dwellings. It was proposed to use an existing agricultural field access track to provide additional direct vehicle access to Terre Bonne. During a site visit, it had been noted that a portion of the bank which separated the neighbouring field and the domestic curtilage of Terre Bonne had been removed to facilitate this new access. Aerial imaging suggested that the farm access, which was the subject of the application, had been extended between 1997 and 2003, from the field to the property. The Department had no record of permission having been granted for the formation of a domestic driveway. Members were advised that the proposed boundary wall, piers and timber gate were considered to be more in keeping within an established domestic driveway and not the simple farm track which the application related to. The proposed new entrance, which would include curved granite walls, pillars, gates and cobbles, would create a formal and domesticated entrance within this rural setting. The proposal would erode the landscape character and would result in the domestication of the countryside. Whilst the standard of design of the proposed entrance walls, pillars and gates was good, the principle remained unacceptable given that the track was outside of the domestic curtilage of the property on an agricultural field. Good design was not a sufficient justification for setting aside policy presumptions. The proposal would result in an overly large, formal domestic entrance in the Green Zone, which was considered harmful to the landscape character. In light of the above, the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policy NE3 of the 2022 Island Plan and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

2 letters of objection and 2 letters of support had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee heard from Mr. ■■■ Smith, the applicant's agent. Mr. Smith stated that the southern driveway was in shared ownership and the applicant was concerned that future use of the same could be 'frustrated'. Mr. Smith cited evidence in the form of a 1935 ordinance survey map and letters from the previous owner and his nephew, both of whom were Jersey Advocates, which confirmed that the driveway had been used by Terre Bonne for many years. Mr. Smith understood that planning permission was not required for the proposed cobbled entrance, the granite gate posts

or the timber gate. With regard to the granite wall, there was evidence of a granite wall having previously existed and the former owner was understood to have re-used the granite from this wall elsewhere on site.

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

Field No. 574,
La Rue
Maillefer, St.
Ouen:
demolition of
roadside wall
(RETRO-
SPECTIVE).

A7. The Committee considered a report in connexion with a request for the reconsideration of a retrospective application which had been refused by the Department under delegated powers and which sought approval for the demolition of a roadside wall and the construction of a bank and a kerb on Le Chemin de l'Eglise, St. Ouen. The Committee had visited the application site on 5th April 2022.

Deputies G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade, Vice Chair and K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence did not participate in the determination of this application.

P/2021/1207

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and that Policies SP1 – SP5, GD1, GD6 and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were of particular relevance.

This Committee noted that Field No. 574 was located on La Rue Maillefer. It was recalled that there was a general presumption against all forms of development in the Green Zone. Permissible exceptions included small scale development which was well designed and sited, incidental to the primary use of land and buildings and did not cause serious harm to landscape character. The Department did not consider the proposed works to be adequate or satisfactory in this context. Granite roadside walls were a typical feature in Jersey and formed part of the character of the countryside. The replacement of roadside granite walls with kerbing eroded the unique appearance of rural settings and the quality and distinctiveness of the Island's countryside. Consequently, the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policy NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

8 letters of objection had been received in connexion with the application.

The Committee received the applicant, Mr. ■ Le Brocq and his agent, Mr. ■ Elliott. Mr. Elliott advised that the road was heavily used by large vehicles and a trench which ran alongside the granite wall had become depressed and this had created a water trap, which had ultimately eroded the pointing in the granite wall. The applicant had written to the highway authority requesting that action be taken to address this issue but no response had been received. At the beginning of 2021, sections of the wall had fallen into the road, creating a hazard and the applicant had been contacted by the Parish of St. Ouen and instructed to close off the carriageway. Thereafter, he had consulted the Department and had been advised that he could carry out emergency works if the wall was considered dangerous. These works had resulted in the removal of the wall and the highway authority had requested that a kerb be constructed to prevent vehicles driving off the road. Mr. Elliott stated that if the wall had been replaced without addressing the root causes, the applicant would have continued to face the constant maintenance issue.

Having considered the application, the Committee expressed sympathy for the position the applicant found himself in. However, members also recognised the impact of the removal of the wall and endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out above.

20th meeting
07.04.2022

Chestnut Farm,
La Rue des
Buttes, St.
Mary:
proposed
alteration of
vehicular
access.

A8. 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 approval for the domestic use and alteration of an existing agricultural use from Chestnut Farm, La Rue des Buttes, St. Mary. The Committee had visited the application site on 5th April 2022.

Deputies S.G. Luce of St. Martin and K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence did not participate in the determination of this application.

P/2021/0584

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and that Policies SP1 – SP5 and SP7, PL3, PL5, GD1, GD6, NE1, 2 and 3, ERE1, HE1, H9, TT1, 2 and 4 and WER6 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were of particular relevance.

This Committee noted that it was proposed to resurface and widen an existing agricultural field access track in order to provide additional and direct vehicle access to a residential dwelling, which was part of a larger Grade 3 Listed Building group. The track was situated within the Green Zone, wherein there was a general presumption against all forms of development, including the change of use of land to extend a domestic curtilage. Such works resulted in the incremental loss and erosion of landscape character and the domestication of the countryside. The proposed introduction of a gravelled path separated from the adjoining agricultural field by formal hedge planting would have a demonstrable and erosive impact on landscape character, whilst also resulting in the loss of agricultural land. Consequently, the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies PL5, ERE1, NE3 and H9 of the 2022 Island Plan. It was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

The Committee heard from the applicant's agent, Mr. ■ Stein of MS Planning, who advised that the existing 3 properties at Chestnut Farm relied upon a sub-standard access with inadequate visibility splays. The applicant's property did not benefit from a designated car parking space and he relied upon the goodwill of a family member who allowed him to park on land in her ownership. On occasion the applicant had to reverse out on to main road and this was considered extremely hazardous. Advice had been sought from the highway authority and a preference had been expressed for the use of the existing western agricultural access track. Dual agricultural and domestic use was not uncommon and a low key design approach had been adopted to retain the agricultural appearance of the track. There had been no objections from the highway authority or the Historic Environment Team and Mr. Stein believed that the application could be approved on highway safety grounds.

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

Broughton
Lodge Farm,
La Verte Rue,
St. Mary:
proposed
extension of
stables.

A9. 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 approval for the extension of the stables at Broughton Lodge Farm, La Verte Rue, St. Mary. The Committee had visited the application site on 5th April 2022.

Deputies S.G. Luce of St. Martin and K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence did not participate in the determination of this application.

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and that Policies PL5, NE3 and ERE7 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were of particular relevance.

The Committee was advised that consent was sought for the extension of an existing stable at its south-east elevation. Whilst the Department understood the rationale behind the proposal, given the fact that it was neither modest, proportionate (when compared with existing buildings) and was not well sited or designed, the Department was of the view that the proposal did not meet the above requisite policy tests. Moreover, the prominent roadside location of the extension meant that the proposal would result in serious harm to the landscape character. Consequently, the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies PL5 and NE3 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal. On a related matter, it was noted that comments from the Rural Economy Team had been sought on several occasions but had not been forthcoming.

The Committee heard from the applicants, Mr. and Mrs. ■ Barette and their agent, Mr. ■ Osmand. Mr. Osmand advised that the proposed extension was required to house a large and expensive horse box and for hay storage. Both the horse box and the hay were stored outside at present and were adversely affected by weather conditions. The large horse box was necessary to the operation of Mr. Barette's business and the height of the proposed extension had been kept to the minimum height required for its storage. This was the only available location on the application site on which the extension could be constructed and Mr. Osmand stated that it was a purely functional building. There had been no objections from the highway authority or the Historic Environment Team. He concluded by suggesting that, if permission was granted, the Committee could attach a condition to the permit which required screening on the roadside.

Mr. and Mrs. Barette confirmed that the condition of the vehicle was deteriorating due the fact that it was not under cover and the height of the proposed extension was dictated by the need to accommodate this large vehicle. The vehicle was essential to the business and the applicants wished to maintain it in the best condition possible.

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

Les
Huriaux/Field
No 889B, La
Rue de la
Devisé, St.
Ouen:
proposed
installation of
solar panels.

A10. 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 approval for the installation of 24 solar panels to the north of field No. 889B, La Rue de la Devisé, St. Ouen. The Committee had visited the application site on 5th April 2022.

Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence did not participate in the determination of this application.

P/2021/1633

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and that Les Huriaux was a Listed Building. Policies ME7 and HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were of particular relevance.

The Committee was advised that Les Huriaux was a historic farmhouse with 16th century origins. The use of the field was restricted to agriculture/horticulture and the proposed solar panels did not correspond with the primary use. Moreover, the submitted information was insufficient to demonstrate that the solar panels would not have a detrimental visual impact on the Listed host dwelling. Consequently, the application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policies ME7 and

20th meeting
07.04.2022

HE1 of the 2022 Island Plan and it was recommended that the Committee maintain refusal.

The Committee heard from Ms. T. Ingle, Principal Historic Environment Officer, who set out the requirements of Policy HE1 and highlighted the need to consider the relationship between the field and the host dwelling and the potential impact of the proposal on the setting of the Listed Building. Ms. Ingle accepted that a low key approach had been adopted and that the solar panels would be positioned a long way away from the Listed Building. However, based upon the submitted information, it was impossible to make a proper assessment of the impact.

The Committee heard from the applicant, Mr. ■ Taylor, who confirmed that the location plan accurately illustrated the extent of the land in his ownership. He advised that the solar panels were to be located on a 'granite outcrop' and he argued that the field was not agriculturally viable.

Having considered the application, the Committee, with the exception of Deputy S.G. Luce of St. Martin, endorsed the recommendation to refuse permission for the reasons set out above. In doing so members noted that, despite its agricultural classification, the appearance of the field was domestic, which the Committee considered unacceptable and it concluded that this was a compliance issue.

Rockmount
View Farm, La
Vielle
Charriere,
Trinity:
proposed sub-
division of
dwelling.

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 sought approval for the sub-division of the existing 5 bedroom dwelling known as Rockmount View Farm, La Vielle Charriere, Trinity to provide one 2 bedroom and one 3 bedroom dwelling. The Committee had visited the application site on 5th April 2022.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity, Chair and Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence did not participate in the determination of this application. Deputy G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade chaired the meeting for the duration of this item.

P/2021/1628

A site plan and drawings were displayed. The Committee noted that the application site was situated in the Green Zone and that Policies ME7 and HE1 of the 2022 Bridging Island Plan were of particular relevance.

The Committee was advised that Rockmount View Farm was a substantial detached residential property in rural Trinity. The proposed works primarily involved internal alterations, with minimal external changes. The application had been refused on the grounds that it was contrary to the Green Zone Policy, as set out in the 2011 Island Plan. However, the States Assembly had subsequently adopted the 2022 Bridging Island Plan and the policy context had changed with the sub-division of buildings outside the defined Built-Up Area now being permissible under Policy SP2. Policy PL5 also supported the development of new homes in limited circumstances and this included the conversion, extension and/or sub-division of existing buildings. Policy H9 also referenced support for proposals for new residential development outside of the Built-Up Area where it involved the sub-division of an existing dwelling. Consequently, the proposed development was now acceptable within the revised policy context and the application was recommended for approval.

Whilst the applicants and their agent were present, the Committee noted that they had no further matters to raise over and above the information provided by the case officer. It was confirmed that a tight tank would be installed on the application site.

Having considered the application, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to

901
20th meeting
07.04.2022

grant permission and noted that the application would be re-presented at the next scheduled meeting for formal decision confirmation, albeit that the Committee's decision aligned with the Department's revised recommendation for approval.