

THE LAND PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT (GUERNSEY) LAW, 2005

AND SECTION 19 OF THE LAND PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT (GENERAL PROVISIONS) ORDINANCE, 2007

NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

PROPOSALS: Convert and extend barn (Use Class 28: Agriculture) to form dwelling (Use Class 1: Dwelling House) and associated works (revised scheme).

LOCATION: Outbuilding at Rue De L'Ardaine, St. Pierre Du Bois.

APPLICANT: Mrs J Rouget

I refer to the application referred to below received as valid on 20/02/2025 regarding the above proposals as described more fully in the application and drawings referred to below.

Date of refusal of permission: 06/08/2025

Drawing Nos: 2119/2 and 3

Application Ref: FULL/2025/0244

Property Ref: F005280000

The Development & Planning Authority has decided to refuse your application under the provisions of section 16 of the Land Planning and Development (Guernsey) Law, 2005 for the following reasons:-

1. The application has not demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Development & Planning Authority that the building is no longer required or capable of being used for its current or last known purpose, as an agricultural building or that the building is or should be recognised as a domestic outbuilding. The scheme is therefore contrary to Policy GP16(A) a. of the Island Development Plan.

2. The existing agricultural barn is limited in size and as such is not capable of conversion to the proposed residential use without the single-storey and dormer extension proposed. The existing building is not of a size and form that would meet the minimum standards set down in the Building (Guernsey) Regulations, 2012 and the practical guidance on those requirements in the associated Guernsey Technical Standards and is contrary to Policy OC1 and paragraph 16.1.6 of the Island Development Plan as the extension and dormer are both necessary to achieve the proposed conversion of this existing building to a residential unit.

OTHER REMARKS:-**Right of appeal against planning decisions**

Your attention is drawn to the provisions of Section 68(1) of the Land Planning and Development (Guernsey) Law 2005, which provides a right of appeal, against a decision to refuse an application for planning permission or outline planning permission to the Planning Tribunal on the merits. An appeal to the Planning Tribunal under section 68 of the Law against this decision must be made before the expiry of the period of six months beginning with the date on which the Authority made this decision.

Copy of representations made

In reaching this decision the Development & Planning Authority took into account any written consultations made under Section 11(1) of the Land Planning and Development (General Provisions) Ordinance, 2007 ('the Ordinance'). A copy of any consultation responses made to the Authority under section 11 will be included with this decision in accordance with section 19 of the Ordinance.

A J ROWLES

Director of Planning
Planning Service



PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

Application No: FULL/2025/0244
Property Ref: F005280000
Valid date: 20/02/2025
Location: Outbuilding at Rue De L'Ardaine St. Pierre Du Bois Guernsey
Proposal: Convert and extend barn (Use Class 28: Agriculture) to form dwelling (Use Class 1: Dwelling House) and associated works (revised scheme).
Applicant: Mrs J Rouget

RECOMMENDATION - Refusal with Reasons:

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The application has not demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Development & Planning Authority that the building is no longer required or capable of being used for its current or last known purpose, as an agricultural building or that the building is or should be recognised as a domestic outbuilding. The scheme is therefore contrary to Policy GP16(A) a. of the Island Development Plan.
 2. The existing agricultural barn is limited in size and as such is not capable of conversion to the proposed residential use without the single-storey and dormer extension proposed. The existing building is not of a size and form that would meet the minimum standards set down in the Building (Guernsey) Regulations, 2012 and the practical guidance on those requirements in the associated Guernsey Technical Standards and is contrary to Policy OC1 and paragraph 16.1.6 of the Island Development Plan as the extension and dormer are both necessary to achieve the proposed conversion of this existing building to a residential unit.
-

OFFICER'S REPORT

Site Description:

The site comprises a single storey granite barn, sometimes referred to as Bonamy, located to the east side of Rue de L'Ardaine, and to the south-east of the junction of that road with Rue de la Pomare and Rue des Paysans a la Pomare. The land immediately to the north of the building is at a higher level and that to the east comprises the remains of a ruined farmhouse, with a stream running across the site. The land rises steeply to the east of the site and falls away to the west on the opposite side of the Rue de L'Ardaine.

The site is located within an Agriculture Priority Area, Outside of the Centres in the Island Development Plan. The barn is a pre-1900 building.

Relevant History:

FULL/2024/0102 - Convert and extend barn (Use Class 28: Agriculture) to form dwelling (Use Class 1: dwelling house) (revised scheme) – refused

FULL/2022/0553 - Convert and extend barn (single-storey shower room extension and first floor catslide dormer extension) (Use Class 28: Agriculture) to dwelling (Use Class 1: dwellinghouse) – refused

FULL/2019/2578 - Erect single storey extension to east (side) elevation, install dormer and external steps to north (rear) elevation serving dormer and install rooflights to south (front) elevation of barn – refused

FULL/2016/0366 - re-roof existing barn, including installation of new doors, fascias, guttering, the laying of a new concrete floor and the re-pointing of the granite work. The lining of the internal walls and installation of electrics did not require permission.

The application site, along with the barn building, has previously been recognised as agricultural, falling within Agricultural Use Class 28 in the Land Planning and Development (Use Classes) Ordinance, 2017.

Existing Use(s):

28 Agriculture

Brief Description of Development:

The application relates to the change of use of an agricultural building to a unit of residential accommodation incorporating a single-storey mono-pitch roof extension to the east and a catslide dormer to the north elevation. Living accommodation would be provided on the ground floor, with the bathroom accommodated within the proposed extension and a bedroom is proposed at first floor level.

The application has been accompanied by a letter dated 10/02/2025 which sets out:

- The proposed plans have been issued to Building Control as a pre-application enquiry and the following advice was provided: *"Single unit dwellings are acceptable so floor area is acceptable however they must consider how the walls will be insulated and how this may impact the finished floor area of the dwelling. All other considerations under the Building regulations are as follows for change of use, GTS Parts A,B C, E, F, G, H, J, K, L & N."* Therefore, the dwelling floor area is acceptable under Part G of the Guernsey Technical Standards
- Works carried out to the building (reroofing with permission) and other maintenance works that represent exempt development (e.g. replacement doors and internal lining of walls and other internal works) have secured the future of this traditional building that makes a positive contribution to the character of the area

- the walls are already lined, and the 32.2m² floor area issued to Building Control was accurate at 27m² with a 5.2m² extension which is below the 20% threshold applied under Policy GP16(A)
- OC1 relates to the parameters of Policy GP16(A) - modest extension is permitted as a route to a "proposed unit"
- planning history under the lifetime of the IDP states no conflict with Policy OC5(A) as there is no existing farmstead or agricultural holding at the site, and there is no reasonable prospect of such a holding being formed within the Agricultural Priority Area (APA)
- The wider land outside of the site ownership and boundaries rises very steeply to the east and with substantial trees between and falls away to the west quite dramatically, initially to road level and further westwards to much lower lying land and buildings
- The letter also addresses Policy GP1, GP8 and GP16(A) with efficient and effective use of land highlighted, noting the current housing needs and demand for one-bedroom dwellings
- Proposing native soft landscaping, with hardstanding kept to the existing building, parking and retained walls/ruins
- In relation to GP9: Sustainable Development the scheme is confirmed to meet Parts A, B, C, E, F, G, H, J, K, L, M and N of the GTS but also highlights that this is a sustainable conversion reducing waste, excavation and use of materials noting also that the roof profile can be used for photovoltaic technology and that EV charging points can be installed (if required).

The submission concludes that the key issue in this case is whether the building is redundant for its current or last known purposes and notes that additional supporting information has been provided. The submission notes that Use Class 28 makes a clear distinction, *"that the use of the land runs with the building as occupied together with land so used"* and as a result there is not considered to be a conflict with Policy OC5(A) and the agricultural use of land. The 2019 decision recognised the scale of use of the building would be to a domestic level. The previous decision by the DPA in 2024 did not take into account the fact that the original use of the land was as a dwelling. The submission maintains that the original purpose and use of the building was domestic as the site was formerly a dwelling. Key observations from Richard Lloyd sets out:

- The entrances are not particular with agricultural uses – cart or animal access
- The south elevation is more in keeping with a domestic garage or general storage shed rather than an agricultural building (and was possibly its intended purpose)
- The low ceiling height is unlikely to have ever been suitable for horse-drawn carts/carriages, especially as access onto the property is particularly narrow
- There is no loft ventilation or access doors (east or west gable ends) – could indicate that this was never the intended purpose
- There is no evidence of any historic iron monger or feeding facilities normally associated with agricultural animal husbandry – this could signal the lack of agricultural purposing for the building
- Would be more persuaded that originally the land was used as domestic growing or storage and any excess used for domestic level animal keep which could be

supported due to the close proximity of the derelict animal pens (where food mash, waste or excess would have been used as feed/swill)

- The building in its current form is well below current agricultural best practice regulations – governed through UK/EU directives for animal husbandry or storage of machinery or agricultural related materials
- The unsuitability for modern agricultural purposes is compounded by the lack of cross ventilation, safe working spaces and escape routes (working with animals/storage of combustible materials)

The conclusion of the report is “reticent in believing this building was originally constructed for a specific agricultural use, or that it is suitable for conversion into a building appropriate for any modern agricultural purposes. This, in my opinion, makes it incompatible with modern equipment and methods, and would hinder operational efficiency and productivity”.

The submission is also accompanied by a Structural Report by Plan B with a site inspection undertaken in January 2025 which notes that the foundations have not been investigated but as the building has existed since the 17th Century they are assumed to be more than satisfactory. The report sets out that timbers, roof and walls are of sound construction and in fair/good condition and with repointing work noted. The north wall significantly retains the land and this land retention is considered original, with the wall having demonstrated its structural adequacy for a significant period of time.

Relevant Policies of any Plan, Subject Plan or Local Planning Brief:

Island Development Plan:

OC1: Housing Development Outside of the Centres

OC5(A): Agriculture Outside of the Centres – within the Agriculture Priority Areas

GP1: Landscape Character and Open Land

GP8: Design

GP9: Sustainable Development

GP15: Creation and Extension of Curtilage

GP16(A): Conversion of Redundant Buildings

Representations:

Two letters of representation have been submitted objecting to the application and raising the following points:

- The building is an agricultural building of note and was used as such over 30 years ago and neighbours have, in the past, sought to buy or rent the building for agricultural reasons
- The building is on agricultural land and not part of any domestic curtilage
- The barn would be useful for those growing in this area – other similar sized barns are used by small holders in the immediate area
- There have been no substantial changes to planning policies that may influence a change from previous refusals of planning permission

- The building is small and must be substantially smaller than the 35 sqm required by planning for conversion to habitable accommodation
- There are no services - water, electric, or waste to the plot
- Concerns exist regarding overlooking and loss of privacy
- The applicant has given the incorrect road name
- The site notice has not been displayed
- The 'ruin' has not been used as a dwelling since before WWII
- Any development would require the long closure of Rue de L'Ardaine

La Societe Guernesiaise – commented on a previous application raising queries about Policy GP16(A), whether the building is of sound and substantial construction capable of conversion without extensive alteration or rebuilding and the impact of the development on the character and openness of the landscape. La Societe also highlighted the use of buildings such as this by roosting bats.

Consultations:

States Archaeologist - Commented on the 2019 application associated with this building: As a building of historic interest I would be grateful if the developers could alert me or my colleagues if they uncover any features of possible archaeological interest, for example during the excavation of footings trenches.

Summary of Issues:

The key issues in this case relate to the principle of the proposed development, whether the building is redundant for its current or last known purpose, the change of use of agricultural land to domestic garden and the living environment of future occupiers.

Assessment against:

1 - Purposes of the law.

The objectives set out in Section 1(2) of The Land Planning and Development (Guernsey) Law, 2005, 'the Law', have been considered and this report forms part of the assessment, with policy issues set out in Section 2 below.

2 - Relevant policies of any Plan, Subject Plan or Local Planning Brief.

Policy context

The Spatial Policy of the Island Development Plan (IDP), expressed through Policy S1 (Spatial Policy), is to, "concentrate the majority of new development in the Main Centres and the Main Centre Outer Areas to maintain the vitality of these areas...and to allow for development Outside of the Centres in identified specific circumstances, in accordance with the Strategic Land Use Plan (SLUP)".

The approach to development set out within the SLUP and the Spatial Policy of the IDP is reinforced through Policy S4 (Outside of the Centres) and the introduction to Part 3 of

the IDP Policies for Outside of the Centres which, whilst acknowledging that the Plan makes provision for certain types of development Outside of the Centres, states that proposals for new housing will not generally be supported Outside of the Centres. The Spatial Policy also helps to protect the countryside from unacceptable forms of development in order to avoid unnecessary urbanisation of the Island's undeveloped areas (IDP paragraphs 15.1.4 and 15.1.11).

In relation to residential development the IDP makes provision for all necessary housing land within the Centres and does not allow for new build housing Outside of the Centres (with the exception of those developments permitted through Policy OC1: Housing Outside of the Centres). This approach follows the strategic requirement to focus housing within the Centres. The exception to allow for conversion of buildings Outside of the Centres to residential use is not therefore required or intended to make a contribution to housing land supply or to drive the creation of more dwellings Outside of the Centres.

Policy GP16(A) forms an exception to the above, allowing for conversions of redundant and structurally sound buildings to one of a number of specified uses, including residential such as in this case (which complies with criterion b. of GP16(A)), which ordinarily would not be permissible Outside of the Centres, on the basis that this would comprise a sustainable and efficient use of resources and would enable reuse of buildings which, given that they remain structurally sound, are unlikely to be demolished and would otherwise remain unused but part of the surrounding landscape.

The balance in terms of housing provision outside of the centres is however to protect the physical environment and to ensure that the spatial strategy of the Plan is not undermined. To this end, any proposal to create housing must comply with a series of rigorous tests, summarised in Policy OC1 (Housing Outside the Centres) and encapsulated in Policy GP16(A) (Conversion of redundant buildings) in the IDP.

It is important to note that the individual policies or paragraphs of the IDP Written Statement should not be read in isolation or out of context and the IDP should be read as a whole including all relevant policies, preceding text, Annexes and the Proposals Map as well as reference to any relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance published by the Authority (IDP paragraph 1.4.14). All proposals are expected to be consistent with the Plan Objectives relevant to the specific proposals. As such, in considering proposals for potentially redundant buildings located Outside of the Centres, IDP Policy GP16 should not be read in isolation.

Policy OC5(A) makes provision for development not related to a farmstead/existing agricultural holding where all other relevant policies are satisfied.

Conversion of the building

a) No longer required or capable of being used for its current or last known purpose

Whether the building is no longer required for its current or last known use requires a broader and more objective assessment than simply whether the building is no longer required at a specific point in time due to the particular personal circumstances of the

current owners/occupiers or simply requiring the owner of the building to confirm that they no longer require it for the purpose for which it was intended. If the requirement for, usefulness of, or capability to continue to be used of a building (IDP paragraph 19.17.4) is not assessed objectively, then this could lead to a situation where a useful and useable building is converted to an alternative use only to be followed by a subsequent application to erect an additional building to reinstate the function it previously served.

As per the previous applications for this site, the issue in this case is not whether the land contributes to the commercial function of the APA but whether the building could be put to an agricultural use. In the 2019 decision the DPA concluded “that the building cannot make any commercial contribution to an APA” and this conclusion remains unchanged, this means the site is not part of an existing agricultural holding and there is no reasonable prospect of one being formed. Nonetheless, it does not automatically follow that this means a building is redundant for its last known or current purpose, as an agricultural building for the purposes of Policy GP16(A) a. In those previous cases it was set out that a building can still serve a useful agricultural purpose without being part of a commercial agricultural holding.

The 2016 application to undertake works to the roof, guttering and interior of the building (internal works and electrics do not require planning permission) was accompanied by supporting information setting out how and why the building was useful for agricultural purposes.

The current application has been accompanied by additional information that does query whether the building was originally built for agricultural purposes given that historically, a dwelling existed on the site but does not provide additional, historic plans, photographs or details, to show the layout of the site when in domestic use or how the building may/has been altered over time. Whether in domestic or agricultural use the layout of buildings/ruins is such that there was a functional relationship between the building and the use of the land. In the Hougues Magues appeal the Tribunal noted that the policy requires an assessment of the current or last known purpose of the building rather than the use as originally approved. So, when the residential use ceased here so would the domestic use of the building. Ultimately, insufficient evidence has been provided with this application to demonstrate that the building was an ancillary domestic structure. Although the application could have been deferred to seek further information on this point given that the scheme fails in other regards this would have put the applicant to additional expense which is unreasonable and not justified.

Any potential residential use was therefore abandoned meaning that the land and building are, for planning purposes, agricultural. The supporting information does, however, make it clear that the use of the building for agricultural purposes in the past would have been limited, and on a more domestic scale in terms of storage associated with small scale animal keeping/husbandry on the site. It is also apparent that the building would not serve the majority of modern agricultural needs e.g. accommodation size for housing animals, lack of ventilation for certain types of agricultural storage and having regard to the restricted site access. As per the supporting information that accompanied the 2016 application therefore, the building could, most likely, be used for

small scale land management equipment/tools and the submission does not satisfactorily demonstrate that it could not serve that purpose (e.g. for hay and implement storage).

Again, in the Hougue Magues appeal the matter of the decline of the agricultural industry was noted but also evidence provided relating to 17 (at the time) permissions that had been granted for agricultural development since 2017 and included field shelters, agricultural buildings, sheds or stores, including for egg propagation and storage of pig feed, hay, implements, cattle, machinery, bees, poultry, and fruit and vegetables. Class 4 of the Land Planning and Development (Exemptions) Ordinance, 2007 (Agricultural development) was also noted in relation to facilitating the use of land for horticultural and agricultural purposes for both the farming industry and individuals using land for independent growing. So, although modest in size and notwithstanding the advice contained in the application submission, it remains the case that, to quote the Tribunal “*notwithstanding the underlying decline in the agricultural and horticultural sectors, there may well be some unmet demand for agricultural buildings, which the appeal building could go some way to satisfying*”. It remains the case therefore, that the building could be used for storage of agricultural implements/small machinery, feed or hay and the scheme has not demonstrated that the building is redundant for agricultural purposes.

g) modest extension

Paragraph 19.17.8. of the IDP states:

Proposals to convert an existing building may be accompanied by a modest extension provided that the extension is not of such scale that it forms a significant part of the new unit, in effect creating a new building contrary to this policy.

As set out elsewhere in this report, the overarching policy direction is to enable reuse of existing buildings which would otherwise remain redundant, but are of a form which means they are unlikely to be demolished, for an appropriate use (i.e. one for which the existing built form and location are suited). Whilst modest extension can be allowed as part of a proposal, the direction is not to allow such extension to enable the use of a building where it would not otherwise be possible or for which it would not be suited, or capable. Following this direction, the policy states that the existing building must be capable of conversion without extensive alteration or rebuilding, and consequently that building must be of a size, without extension, to serve the intended use as it stands. This means that for residential purposes the existing building must be of a size and form that can provide an adequate living environment and at least meet the minimum space requirements for that use which will be assessed having regard to the Guernsey Technical Standards (GTS). Paragraph 16.1.6 of the IDP states:

The relevant requirements of the Building (Guernsey) Regulations, 2012 and the practical guidance on those requirements in the associated Guernsey Technical Standards will be taken into account in determining whether a proposed unit offers an adequate standard of accommodation.

This means that the building, prior to any extension (dormer or single-storey extension as proposed here) would need to be at least 30sqm measured internally.

Although the planning agent asserts that the proposals would meet the Building Regulations for a dwellinghouse (one person occupancy based on Part G of the GTS) this has been assessed (by the agent and Building Control) based on the proposed extended floor area and not the existing.

Attention is drawn to a recent appeal at Courtil des Couleurs (PAP-009-2024) where the decision to refuse permission to convert, extend and alter a former horticultural building to create a dwelling was allowed. This appeal decision refers to relevant floor space standards and that the Authority relies on the Building (Guernsey) Regulations, 2012 for the minimum sizes for dwellings and flats. The decision sets out that “proposals that meet these requirements and can also demonstrate a satisfactory layout and arrangement are deemed to provide a satisfactory minimum standard of living accommodation”.

The appeal decision also addresses the matter of modest extensions and the reason for refusal where the existing building by itself is not large enough to meet the minimum internal space standards for a single-person, one bedroom dwelling. However, the Tribunal refer to the provision of Policy GP16(A) to allow for modest extensions which, in their view, could enable conversions to be achieved. However, the Authority has applied since its introduction in 2016, the approach that the building must be capable of meeting the current Building Regulations without extension. In this case, the building, with a combined existing ground and first floor area of less than 30 sqm would not meet the minimum requirements for the creation of a one-person dwelling.

Other matters

Given the identified conflict with OC1 and GP16(A), other matters that would ordinarily be relevant to the determination of this application have not been the subject of a full and detailed assessment. For completeness’ sake however, those matters that would be relevant are set out below, although it should be noted that the fact they do not form the basis for any additional reasons for refusal does not mean that this application is acceptable in those respects.

The onus is on the applicant to demonstrate that a building is of sound and substantial construction (GP16(A) c.) and this latest application has been accompanied by a Structural Survey confirming that the building is capable of conversion to residential use. Furthermore, the visual inspection of the exterior of the building in connection with the previous application along with a view, from outside, of the first floor structure, suggests that the building is in generally good condition. The scheme therefore complies with criterion c. of Policy GP16(A) in relation to the building be of sound and substantial construction. The matter of whether the building requires extensive alteration for the purposes of criteria c. is addressed elsewhere in this report.

The scheme does not relate to a Protected Building therefore Policy GP16(A) d. is not applicable.

The extension, as per previous applications, is of itself 'modest' in size (GP16(A) g.) and would be of appropriate form, design and materials and would be discreetly located away from the roadside when having regard to the fact that the building is visible in views along the Rue de la Pomare, Rue des Paysans a La Pomare and Rue de L'Ardaine.

The proposed dormer to the north roofslope would not have significant visual impacts, particularly taking into account the change in levels to that side of the building and the design and appearance of the proposed alterations would meet the aims of Policy GP8.

The proposals would not have an adverse impact on this building of character and its impact on the character and appearance of the area and nor would the proposals have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and openness of the landscape (GP16A(A) e. and f.). There are no immediate residential neighbours and the development would not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity (GP16(A) h and GP9 b.).

The scheme considers the health and well-being of future occupiers by providing accommodation with adequate natural light and ventilation along with access to external amenity space, proposed to be screened from the lane by a proposed hedge. Although the garden may be visible from the lane it is a road only lightly trafficked and the additional landscaping could be managed by condition to offer privacy for future occupants and the scheme addresses Policy GP8 d. but also considers the Strategy for Nature Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Although the converted and extended building would meet the current Building Regulations the development would just meet the Regulations and not exceed them. The Authority encourages development that strives to meet the DCLG Internal Space Standards which, for a single person/one bedroom unit would be 37 sqm so the existing building, even as extended would fall short of this.

The scheme incorporates information relating to sustainable development, including how charging points and photovoltaics could be incorporated (not shown on the application drawings). The information provided demonstrates how the scheme can address the requirements of Policy GP9 and if the scheme was considered acceptable in all other respects a condition could be imposed requiring details of and the installation of panels and a charging point to meet the aims of Policy GP9.

Policy IP9 requires consideration to be given to the existing public road network's ability to cope with any increased demand as a result of the development and the access requirements of people of all levels of mobility and health. Given the scale of the existing building and likely number of associated vehicle movements if it were used for agricultural purposes, and that a single one-bedroom dwelling is proposed, it is unlikely that there would be any significant adverse impact on the existing road network, or that acceptable access could not be provided. The scheme does not include specific provision for cycle parking although, the site is sufficient in size to accommodate this. If the scheme were otherwise acceptable the matter may be controlled by planning condition to secure compliance with IP6.

Should the building be converted to a dwelling an area of domestic garden would be appropriate to ensure that the property is served by an area of external amenity space. The area proposed to be incorporated as domestic garden would be generous for the one bedroom, single occupancy unit proposed. The land shown in the application submission to be used as garden is within the APA. It is limited in size and not readily accessible for agricultural purposes given the tight vehicular access to the site. Whilst a new access could be formed into the site the land is elevated above road level making this difficult to accommodate. The land cannot therefore, positively contribute to the commercial agricultural use of an Agriculture Priority Area or cannot practicably be used for commercial agriculture within an Agriculture Priority Area without unacceptable adverse environmental impacts. The change of use does not require any established boundary features to be removed, would not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the landscape character nor on the amenities of surrounding residents in accordance with Policy GP15.

The site is not located within an Area of Biodiversity Importance and a new bank and hedge is proposed which could demonstrate environmental benefits in respect of biodiversity should planning permission be granted. This is necessary to address the requirements of the States' Strategy for Nature, 2020, which has been adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance. Subject to appropriate conditions relating to the construction of the bank and further details of hedge planting this would represent a proportionate approach to environmental benefits on site to address the Strategy for Nature SPG.

3 - General material considerations set out in the General Provisions Ordinance.

In addition to the consideration of policy issues, Section 13 of the Land Planning and Development (General Provisions) Ordinance, 2007 identifies other material planning considerations which could be relevant. These include; the appropriateness of the development in relation to its surroundings in terms of design, layout, scale, siting and materials; the likely effect on the character and amenity of the locality; any possible fall-back position by way of extant planning permissions or exempt development; the likely effect on the reasonable enjoyment of neighbouring properties. These issues where relevant are considered above.

4 - Additional considerations (for protected trees, monuments, buildings and/or SSS's).

The proposal would have no adverse impact on protected trees, buildings or sites.

Date: 06/08/2025

