

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: Erect stables and associated works to north of site. Erect earthbank, gated field access and create gated vehicle access to north boundary (Revised).

LOCATION: Land at, Rue Des Grandes Rue/Rue Des Hougues Falles, St. Pierre Du Bois.

APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs D Parton

I refer to the application referred to below received as valid on 18/06/2025 regarding the above proposals as described more fully in the application and drawings referred to below.

Date of refusal of permission: 14/01/2026

Drawing Nos: Direct Architectural Solutions: 1465-SK-20A, 21B, 22B, 23C, 24B, (Option A)

Application Ref: FULL/2025/0849

Property Ref: F00600A000

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 site forms part of a large swathe of open and undeveloped agricultural land of the highest quality classification within the Agriculture Priority Area that is relatively flat and well connected to other agricultural land that could clearly positively contribute to commercial agriculture. No evidence has been provided as part of the application to demonstrate that the land cannot 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, and consequently the proposal is contrary to criterion (iii) of Policy OC9 and fails to comply with Policy OC5(A).

2. The erection of the stables and the associated areas of hardstanding as proposed would introduce a new building of substantial scale resulting in the incursion of built development into a wider area of open and otherwise undeveloped agricultural land which would alter and have an unacceptable visual impact on the landscape character

and visual amenity of the area, contrary to IDP policies: OC5(A), Criterion (ii) of policy OC9, GP1 and GP8.

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/2025/0849
Property Ref: F00600A000
Valid date: 18/06/2025
Location: Land at Rue Des Grandes Rue/Rue Des Hougues Falles St.
Pierre Du Bois Guernsey
Proposal: Erect stables and associated works to north of site. Erect
earthbank, gated field access and create gated vehicle access to
north boundary (Revised).
Applicant: Mr & Mrs D Parton

RECOMMENDATION - Refusal with Reasons:

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The site forms part of a large swathe of open and undeveloped agricultural land of the highest quality classification within the Agriculture Priority Area that is relatively flat and well connected to other agricultural land that could clearly positively contribute to commercial agriculture. No evidence has been provided as part of the application to demonstrate that the land cannot 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, and consequently the proposal is contrary to criterion (iii) of Policy OC9 and fails to comply with Policy OC5(A).
 2. The erection of the stables and the associated areas of hardstanding as proposed would introduce a new building of substantial scale resulting in the incursion of built development into a wider area of open and otherwise undeveloped agricultural land which would alter and have an unacceptable visual impact on the landscape character and visual amenity of the area, contrary to IDP policies: OC5(A), Criterion (ii) of policy OC9, GP1 and GP8.
-

OFFICER'S REPORT

Site Description:

The application site comprises an agricultural field situated to the south of Rue des Grandes Rue/Rue des Hougues Falles. Surrounding the site the area comprises agricultural fields to the south and west with residential properties to the north. To the east is a former horticultural building and part of a disused vinery, with an agricultural field beyond.

The site is situated Outside of the Centres and within the Agriculture Priority Area as designated in the Island Development Plan.

Relevant History:

PREA/2024/2100	Erect Stables	Advice given 28/01/2025
PREA/2019/0519	Erect timber stable block.	Advice given 20/03/2019
FULL/2019/0440	Create 5 vehicular accesses to agricultural land (retrospective).	Refused 19/06/2019

Existing Use(s):

Agricultural – Use Class 28

Brief Description of Development:

Planning permission was initially sought to erect a stable building comprising 8 stables a feed store, WC, and a tractor store and a detached building to the north comprising a hay store. Fronting the stables the proposal included the creation of a relatively large area of concrete hardstanding with a new vehicle access point formed towards the northeast corner of the site and a grasscrete vehicle access track.

Following notification that the application was likely to be refused and at the request of the applicant's agent, the application was deferred and revised plans were submitted. As part of the revised scheme the size of the building was reduced and the stable building comprised 8 stables and two much smaller feed stores. The extent of hardstanding was also reduced substantially and the haystore, WC and tractor store were all omitted from the proposal. In the covering letter the applicant's agent requested that the application description be amended to omit reference to the erection of agricultural buildings and for the application to be determined on that basis.

As part of the application, letters have been received from the applicant and covering letters from the applicant's agent setting out the background to the application and need for the stable buildings, the contents of which are summarised as follows:

- The applicant owns 8 horses which currently live outside without shelter on the 10 acres of land that they own, previously known as Les Grais Farm;
- They missed out on purchasing the agricultural buildings that once stood on the land which were demolished to make way for new housing;
- They are in need of 8 stables for health and well being of their horses and have approached all of the livery yards and put a notice in the Guernsey Press with no response given;
- The horses have laminitis that periodically requires them to be kept on stable rest to manage it;
- They are kept in mud up to their knees in the winter months;
- They do not need excessive buildings or a sand school just a roof over their heads to protect them;

Agent's letters

- The agent cites a number of previous cases where permission has been granted which it is argued demonstrates there is demand for equestrian related activities/lack of capacity/inadequate facilities at existing commercial stables and that there is provision for built development in the APA which is ancillary to the use of the land and does not undermine the commercial function;
- The agent is claiming that the keeping of horses on agricultural land in order to graze them has long been recognised and accepted by the Authority as being a lawful agricultural use for which planning permission for a change of use is not required;
- That the stabling and the wider agricultural holding will not be used for any non-agricultural equestrian use and cites cases claimed to be similar to the proposal that have been granted planning permission for stabling within the APA;
- It is the applicant's reasonable aspiration to provide stabling on land and to store equipment to manage the land;
- The buildings are proportionate in size and scale to the number of horses which are grazed/kept on the land and represents the minimum needed for welfare requirements and would be used for ancillary purpose to the remaining agricultural land;
- The buildings would not have an unacceptable visual impact;
- The buildings would not harm amenities of neighbours or highway safety.

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

Island Development Plan Policies:

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

OC9: Leisure and Recreation Outside of the Centres

GP1: Landscape Character and Open Land

GP8: Design

GP9: Sustainable Development

IP9: Highway Safety, Accessibility and Capacity

Representations:

With regard to the initial scheme as originally submitted 5 representations were received all objecting to the scheme. The grounds for objection are summarised as follows:

Traffic Concerns:

- Located on a narrow lane and a blind corner the proposed access will be difficult for larger and wider vehicles to negotiate;
- The access as proposed is likely to increase traffic, further complicate manoeuvres and cause a danger to both drivers and pedestrians;
- The additional traffic will create noise and cause harm to neighbours;
- The lower portions of hedges are already being damaged and undermined by large agricultural machinery which will only get worse;
- That consultation be carried out with Traffic and Highways and a traffic impact assessment be undertaken;

Impact on the character of the area

- The buildings make a large complex all fronted by hard standing that is unsuitable for this rural location and constitutes excessive urbanisation;
- A precedent for urbanisation has already occurred as the former agricultural buildings on Les Grais Farm were developed into housing which many neighbours objected to;
- The proposal would have the same effect on the environment as if the land were given over to housing;
- The supporting letter indicates a possible extra commercial agricultural activity in the future over and above the stabling and grazing of horses, which could lead to further and larger buildings being built;
- The hedge is not tall enough to screen the proposed buildings fully;
- The buildings would be a matter of just a few metres from residential property making the corner obliquely opposite;
- The scale of the development is not sympathetic to the character of the surrounding rural area and should not be allowed;
- Large scale development such as this and the extensive pouring of concrete does not fit appropriately within the surroundings or the original purpose and use of the land;
- Concerns are raised with the onward commercial intent of such development, its scale seemingly leaning towards livery or commercialism rather than domestic stabling for personal use;

Other issues

- No details are given as to the species of trees and shrubs that will be planted which should be native;
- Direct consultation should be undertaken with all neighbouring properties surrounding the site and approaching lanes as the site notice was poorly displayed on a lamppost near to the site;
- That further consultation be undertaken with the Parish Constables and Douzaine of St Pierre du Bois regarding the development;
- The land surrounding the site forms part of the Agriculture Priority Area and is typically used for the grazing of animals;
- The size, extent and intent of the proposed development moves far beyond the existing purpose of use and it is questioned whether a change of use application has been received or is being considered;
- The scheme is likely to require floodlighting which will cause a nuisance to neighbours and the area in general;

Following deferral of the application (at the request of the applicant's agent), and following the receipt of revised plans, the representors were renotified and a new site notice advising the public was displayed. Three representations were received objecting to the revised plans. The grounds for objection are summarised as follows:

Impact on the character of the area

- This site and the surroundings are agricultural fields with no buildings or other structures, 4 horses have recently been kept on the land but this has doubled to 8;
- The size of the building is significant in a field that is open and contains no buildings;
- No buildings should be allowed at all in a rural location such as this and these will alter the visual impact of the open countryside area and significantly alter the character of the agricultural land and the locality;
- Once completed there would be nothing to prevent the size of the development increasing by incremental future planning applications;
- The site could in the future be used as a livery, boarding stables, riding schools and the like rather than for personal use causing harm to the area;
- The proposal is for a sizeable development in an agricultural setting and the building and hardstanding will have a significant footprint on the area;
- The change of use is another example of a Guernsey field lost to and destroyed due to hardstanding and buildings;
- The fields at present are untidy with manure scattered around;
- Although not applied for there is mention of plans to build more structures on the land to shelter horses in the future;
- One of the purposes of the Law is to protect and enhance the natural beauty of open spaces there are no other buildings on this side of the road and the position of the stables do not fit this purpose;

Other issues

- It is understood that horses are being kept on behalf of others but this has not been confirmed;
- The number of horses is being used to justify the size of stabling facility required but the need for such a size has been created by the applicant's own actions in the first place;
- If more horses come onto the land, further development will be required;
- The tree and hedge planting should be native to Guernsey and further information should be requested;
- The sites access is at the end of a very narrow single track, which is poorly maintained. The extra movement of vehicles and horse boxes and the like will impact the lane;
- The buildings would be better suited to the south away from neighbouring properties and access could be formed from Les Quanteraine which is better suited.

Consultations:

States' Archaeologist

By letter dated 4th July 2025 stated the following:

"There are records of a dolmen destroyed in the mid-nineteenth century in one of the fields off the Rue des Hougues Falles – the precise location is not known – and a few

other findspots of prehistoric material in the vicinity of this site. I would therefore like to request that the developers contact us if anything of archaeological interest is uncovered."

States' Veterinary Officer

By email dated 24th June 2025 stated the following:

"Thank you for the opportunity to commenting on the application to erect stables at Rue Des Grandes Rue/Rue Des Hougues Falles St. Pierre Du Bois.

The stable block is of a standard construction and meets the advice provided by the British Horse Society on stable safety (<https://www.bhs.org.uk/horse-care-and-welfare/health-care-management/stable-safety/>).

The inclusion of a hard flat surface at the centre of the stable block is welcomed. This provides an ideal surface to assess whether a horse is lame or sound and a surface upon which a farrier to set themselves up to work shoeing horses. Separation of stores where combustible materials are kept is also very sensible which is why I prefer Plan A to Plan B. I would be careful about planting trees and hedges too close to the stables because of fire risks but also because they will reduce ventilation, block gutters, and encourage midges. A few horses are allergic to midge bites and midges are also a vector disease in horses. For example, African horse sickness virus and West Nile virus are transmitted to horses through midge bites and with climate warming these once distant diseases are becoming more of a threat. The overhang of the roof over the stable doors will help keep the horses' beds dry and reduce wasted bedding. Skips are ideal to accumulate waste bedding and faeces but there may be a need to cover them to avoid attracting. Thinking about substrate in narrow passageways such as the gate between fields is welcome to avoid puddles, mud, and yet more flies.

Walking to the paddock with a horse through the corridor formed between the stables could be challenging. Horses within the adjacent stables could attempt to bite the horse as it's being walked through. This could cause it to panic in a confined space with the person leading the horse. If the stables weren't squeezed into the corner the horse could be walked around the back of the stables to the paddock and this would eliminate the need for a corridor.

There are some notable absences which I am surprised about. Where is "tack" being stored? Where are horse vehicles and trailers going to be parked? Finally, many yards will have washing and drying room for horse rugs. It is better to design these facilities in from the start to avoid additions of things like caravans and containers to overcome the lack of facilities and storage."

By email dated 01st August 2025 raised further comments and stated:

"I recently visited Miss Keeley Parton at her land on Rue Des Grandes Rue/Rue Des Hougues Falles in St. Pierre Du Bois, where she keeps eight horses. Currently, four of her horses are exhibiting mild to moderate symptoms of laminitis, likely triggered by grazing

on lush, fresh grass following a period of heavy rainfall. Laminitis involves inflammation of the tissues connecting the hoof to the underlying bones, causing pain comparable to a hammer hit thumb.

Miss Parton has temporarily contained the affected horses within small paddocks surrounded by electric fencing, with the ground covered in wood shavings to support the hooves and inhibit grass growth. However, there is a risk that hungry horses may attempt to breach the fences, which could lead to further flare-ups.

A more reliable solution would be to relocate the affected horses to rented stabling with secure, level enclosures fitted with rubber mats. This would provide a safer environment for recovery, although it would increase her workload and costs until the horses recover. Miss Parton is willing to consider this option but has requested I reach out to you for guidance on the likely timeline for a decision regarding her planning application."

Office of Environmental Health and Pollution Regulation (OEHPR)

By letter dated 6th August 2025 stated the following:

"I have reviewed the proposed plans for the erection of stable/agricultural storage buildings, new vehicular access, and associated works at the above site. I can confirm that I do not wish to raise any objections to the proposals.

I would however like to advise the applicant that should planning consent be granted, they should contact the Waste Regulation Officer of this department for advice on manure storage and management once operational. Please do not hesitate to contact me at the above address should you require any additional information regarding this matter."

Revised Plans

Following the receipt of revised plans the OEHPR and the States' Vet were reconsulted and raised the following comments on the application:

OEHPR

By letter dated 22nd October 2025 stated the following:

"I have reviewed the proposed plans to erect stables to the north-east corner of the above site, and to erect an earthbank, gated field access and create a gated vehicle access to the north boundary.

"I understand from the application documentation that the horses to be housed in the proposed stables are owned by the applicant, and that there is no equine related commercial activity planned at the site. It is therefore assumed that this application will not result in the site becoming a commercial enterprise, however I am not clear on whether the Development and Planning Authority agree with this assessment.

Further, I note that the stables are planned to be built at the corner of the site that is closest to residential properties. I note from the plans that skips are to be sited in the far north-east corner of the site. It is not confirmed what the skips will be used for, however some thought about where manure will be stored should be given by the applicant, to minimise any issues with flies and odour.

I do not wish to recommend any conditions; however, with the abovementioned issues in mind, I would offer the applicant the following advice and ask that this is attached as an informative to any consent given for the application:

- **Informative**

If the site were to become classed as commercial, the applicant should contact this department for advice on the storage of manure waste, as a Waste Management Exemption would be required to be applied for and issued by this office.

Additionally, the applicant should note that if the site is given planning class for a commercial use, we have powers to investigate odour from commercial sites, to assess whether a statutory nuisance is occurring, so the siting and management of the manure pile is an important factor to consider.

I refer the applicant to the 'Code of Good Agricultural Practice for farmers, growers and land managers', provided by the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs, available at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/268691/pb13558-cogap-131223.pdf. Whilst this is a comprehensive document there are aspects relating to manure management that may be of use.

I would be grateful if these issues are considered during the determination of this application."

States' Veterinary Officer

By email dated 27/10/2025 stated the following:

"I have visited the site and from my perspective I am content that the updated proposed stables meet the necessary welfare standards."

Summary of Issues:

The main issues in deciding this application are:

1. Whether the principle of equestrian use on agricultural land within the Agriculture Priority Area is acceptable;
2. The design of the scheme and its impact on the landscape character and visual amenity of the surrounding area;
3. Impact on the amenities of nearby residential properties;
4. Whether the proposal would negatively impact on highway safety.

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.

Whether the principle of equestrian use on agricultural land within the Agriculture Priority Area is acceptable

The Island Development Plan recognises that agriculture plays a relatively small part in Guernsey's economy but is valuable for its land management function protecting and enhancing the countryside and providing visual access to open space.

The Strategic Land Use Plan requires a balance to be made between the protection of land for agriculture for the industry's current and future needs and recognising the role it plays in countryside management with ensuring land is available to meet other legitimate development requirements. The Island Development Plan has therefore identified large areas of contiguous agricultural land, and other areas well related to established agricultural operations, which represent Guernsey's most valuable agricultural land. These have been identified as Agriculture Priority Areas (APA's).

Whilst the policy approach is to generally support development for agricultural purposes in the Agriculture Priority Areas, these areas have been broadly drawn and include areas of land and sites which are not currently used for agricultural purposes and could not be expected to contribute positively to commercial agriculture in the future. The Agriculture Priority Areas are not intended to safeguard the land for agricultural use if it is not appropriate or is not required for that use or where the inclusion of an area of land into a larger land parcel for agricultural purposes would have a negative environmental impact. The Island Development Plan policies therefore allow for other forms of development within the identified Agriculture Priority Areas provided that they accord with all the other relevant policies of the Island Development Plan (paragraph 17.3.9).

In order to protect Guernsey's best agricultural land, where appropriate, proposals for development which would result in the loss of an existing farmstead or agricultural holding in the APA will only be supported where it is demonstrated that the farmstead, or land is no longer required for agricultural purposes and any proposed new use accords with the other relevant policies of the Island Development Plan (Policy OC5(A)).

The applicant's agent has suggested that the grazing of horses on the land does not amount to a change of use and that the stables and the wider agricultural holding will not be used for non-agricultural purpose and on this basis the principle of the development falls to be considered solely under Policy OC5(A). However, while the use of the land for the grazing of horses alone would not amount to a change of use, the

surrounding land as outlined in red (and hatched in blue) on the application drawings will be used in association and ancillary to the use of the stables for the keeping of horses. Unless the horses are being kept to physically work on the farm (ploughing, pulling of machinery etc) then they (the horses) are regarded as a non-agricultural leisure use.

Paragraph 18.1.2 of the IDP (which forms the preceding text to policy OC9) defines Outdoor Formal Recreation to include *“equestrian related activities”* and would be engaged and states that:

“Development to provide new facilities for outdoor formal recreation or informal leisure and recreation, or to extend, alter or redevelop existing facilities, will be supported providing that:

- i. any ancillary built development is proportionate to the nature and scale of the formal outdoor recreation or informal leisure and recreation use; and,*
- ii. the visual impacts of ancillary built development can be mitigated to respect the character of the locality; and,*
- iii. the site does not fall within an Agriculture Priority Area (APA), or where it does fall within an Agriculture Priority Area the land cannot positively contribute to commercial agricultural use or cannot practically be used as such without adverse environmental impacts”.*

With regard to Policy OC9 parts i), the revised stable block and associated area of hardstanding has been reduced from that originally proposed and the hay and tractor stores have been omitted from the scheme. Taking the comments received from the States Veterinary Officer, the proposal meets the relevant animal welfare standards and is considered to be of an appropriate size and scale for the purpose intended, to stable the applicants 8 horses. The scheme therefore complies with criterion (i) of policy OC9.

With regard to criterion (ii) although landscaping and methods to mitigate the visual impact of the proposal are included, for the reasons contained within *“The design of the scheme and its impact on the landscape character and visual amenity of the surrounding area”* section of this report below, this scheme does not comply with this criterion of the policy.

Turning to criterion (iii) it is clear from a visit to the site and from aerial imagery that the site forms part of a large swathe of open and undeveloped agricultural land within the APA that is relatively flat and well connected to other agricultural land that could clearly positively contribute to commercial agriculture. The onus is on the applicant/applicant's agent to demonstrate compliance with this criterion. However, as part of the application no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that *“the land cannot 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”* and consequently the proposal is contrary to criterion (iii) of Policy OC9 and fails to comply with Policy OC5(A). Furthermore, as identified on the Guernsey Agricultural Land Classification Plan, the application site (outlined and hatched in red on drawing ref: 1465-SV-01 Rev A) and a large part of the remaining land to the south and west/northwest (hatched in blue on

the same drawing) is classified as “Grade 1 Excellent” the best land available for farming in Guernsey, with all other land (the land to the southwest/west) Classified as “Good Grade 3(a)”. The proposed buildings and the segregation of the land with the post and rail fencing as proposed into separate parcels will impact the commercial function and viability of this valuable land for agricultural purpose.

Whilst the applicant’s agent has cited cases that are claimed to be similar to the proposal that have granted planning permission for stables within the APA, it is difficult to safely draw conclusions that what applies in one case will apply in the same way in another and that no two situations will be precisely the same, each case must therefore be considered on its own merits against the planning policies in place at the time. This has been accepted by the Planning Tribunal in an appeal judgement (Ref: PAP/011/2023) where it was stated that *“it is not the case that one decision should always be taken as setting a firm or binding precedent for another, even if the circumstances may appear to be similar. First, it is rare for any two applications to be identical. Second, many decisions require the exercise of judgement, and judgements can vary legitimately. Third, errors can be made and clearly a decision made in error should not form any kind of precedent.”*

The design of the scheme and its impact on the landscape character and visual amenity of the surrounding area

Policy GP1 sets out that development will be supported where it respects the relevant landscape character type within which it is set, where development does not result in the unacceptable loss of any specific distinctive features that contribute to the wider landscape character and local distinctiveness of the area, and takes advantage where practicable of opportunities to improve visual and physical access to open and undeveloped land.

Policy GP8 indicates, inter alia, that new development will be supported where it is demonstrated that it has been designed to a good standard of architectural design and it respects the character of the local built environment.

The site is within the Western Plateau landscape character as identified within the Annex of the IDP which notes that *“the Western Plateau is generally less affected by mid-to-late twentieth century development. The landscape consists of a series of broad erosion platforms stepping gradually down to the west and is much dissected by the deeply cut valleys. Open fields, divided by low earth banks, are interspersed with established farmsteads surrounded by mature trees. The open farmland on higher ground provides views out to the Western Bays and across the sub-zones from one church spire to the next”*.

In deferring the application (at the request of the applicant’s agent) concerns were raised that the scale of the development proposed and the associated area of hardstanding would alter and undermine the distinctive open undeveloped rural landscape, resulting in an incursion of built development which would constitute an unnecessary loss of open land and have a detrimental effect on the landscape character

of the area. Similar concerns were raised as a ground for objection from the representations received.

The revised plans show that the stables and associated area of hardstanding have been repositioned and reduced from that originally proposed and the hay and tractor stores have been omitted from the scheme. It is also worth noting that the scheme has been designed with shallow pitched roofs and proposes the use of materials that would be of rural character. However, whilst the existing boundary screening to a degree will help to screen the development from viewpoints along the roadside and the proposed earthbanks from viewpoints to the south, the erection of the stables and the associated areas of hardstanding as proposed would introduce a new building of substantial scale resulting in the incursion of built development into a wider area of open and otherwise undeveloped agricultural land which would alter and have an unacceptable visual impact on the landscape character and visual amenity of the area, contrary to IDP policies: OC5(A), Criterion (ii) of policy OC9, GP1 and GP8.

The existing access to all the fields owned by the applicant is situated on a sharp bend along Rue Des Hougues Falles to the northwest of the field proposed for the stables. The proposal includes the creation of an additional vehicle access point to be formed in the north east corner of the site. In addition to the considerations of policies GP1 and GP8 referred to above, Policy IP9 requires the Authority to seek to ensure, wherever possible, that the enhancement of vehicle access points into a site do not result in adverse impacts on the landscape character or distinctive natural or built features that contribute positively to the character of the wider area.

The proposed access will be more practically located and better placed to serve the stable building than the existing vehicle access and will also require a lesser extent of hard surfacing to provide a suitable access track. The width of the proposed access point has been kept to a minimum (4.0m) and although the proposal will result in the loss of existing hedging, shrubbery and trees, a large section of roadside boundary will remain unaltered and will continue to provide a suitable boundary feature. Considering the narrow width of the lane, the width of the access is reasonable and is similar to the width of accesses on neighbouring properties. The design of the access respects the character and appearance of the area and this aspect of the proposal alone would have no significant adverse effects on the landscape character of the area, in accordance with Policies IP9, GP1 and GP8.

Impact on the amenities of nearby residential properties

Policy GP8 requires *inter alia* that proposals for new development will be expected to consider the health and well-being of the occupiers and neighbours of the development.

Although under the revised scheme the stable block will be situated circa 2m closer than the previous scheme, a separation distance of circa 14m will remain between the nearest neighbouring residential property 'Thornway' which is situated to the northeast of the site on the opposite side of Rue Des Grandes Rues. At this distance the proposal would not overshadow or cause a detriment to the privacy of the neighbouring properties.

Although concerns have been raised from representors regarding the potential commercial use of this site, the applicant and the applicant's agent have confirmed that the proposal will be used solely for the use of the applicant's own horses. The applicants own 8 horses and the size and scale of the proposal as revised is appropriate and in the event that permission is granted the use could be controlled by condition to ensure that it remains for personal use only and not in connection with a commercial livery/stables. OEHPR has requested that consideration is given to the location of manure storage at the site and that the skips located towards the northeast boundary are not used for such purpose. Although the applicant's agent refers to the storage of manure at the east end of the stables on the initial scheme as submitted, this has not been confirmed on the revised scheme and confirmation of the location could be required by condition.

Considering the above any harm on residential amenity resulting from the proposal would not be so substantial to warrant the refusal of permission.

Whether the proposal would negatively impact on highway safety.

The comments from the objectors relating to highway safety and the need for a Traffic Impact Assessment have been noted. However as set out in the Traffic Engineering Guidelines for Guernsey, Rue des Grandes Rue/Rue Des Hougues Falles are both classified as Neighbourhood and Country Roads, where the functional emphasis is primarily one of access to individual properties and provision for vulnerable road users. Due to the low traffic flows along Neighbourhood and Country Roads, the control of road frontage activities is not as important and a greatly relaxed regime of traffic management is permissible. In this case, it is not anticipated that the additional vehicle movements resulting from the proposal would warrant the need for a Traffic Impact Assessment or cause significant harm to highway safety or capacity in the surrounding area. The scheme therefore complies with Policy IP9 in this respect.

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 likely effect of the development on the natural beauty and landscape quality of the locality in question; 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; the likely effect of the development on roads and other infrastructure, traffic and essential services; 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).

There are protected building located along Route Des Sages to the south of the site however these do not abut the site boundary, and are sufficiently removed to prevent

any adverse impacts on their setting. The proposal would therefore not harm any protected trees, buildings, monuments or SSS's.

Conclusion

It is recommended that the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. The site forms part of a large swathe of open and undeveloped agricultural land of the highest quality classification within the Agriculture Priority Area that is relatively flat and well connected to other agricultural land that could clearly positively contribute to commercial agriculture. No evidence has been provided as part of the application to demonstrate that the land cannot 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, and consequently the proposal is contrary to criterion (iii) of Policy OC9 and fails to comply with Policy OC5(A).
2. The erection of the stables and the associated areas of hardstanding as proposed would introduce a new building of substantial scale resulting in the incursion of built development into a wider area of open and otherwise undeveloped agricultural land which would alter and have an unacceptable visual impact on the landscape character and visual amenity of the area, contrary to IDP policies: OC5(A), Criterion (ii) of policy OC9, GP1 and GP8.

Date: 22/12/2025

