

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 extension to existing outbuilding to south elevation, remove planting and erect fence on top of boundary wall to west boundary.

LOCATION: Calcifer Cottage, Ville Amphrey, St. Martin.

APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs D & D Ogier-Keltie

I refer to the application referred to below received as valid on 20/08/2025 regarding the above proposals as described more fully in the application and drawings referred to below.

Date of refusal of permission: 23/10/2025

Drawing Nos: Block Plan (date stamped received 28th July 2025), Plan page 1, 2, 3, and 4 (all date stamped received 20th August 2025).

Application Ref: FULL/2025/1210

Property Ref: J014060001

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. Due to the siting, overall height (measured from ground level), and solid design of the proposed fence, located on top of a traditional granite wall, the proposal would introduce a discordant element into the street scene and does not achieve a good standard of design for the purposes of Policy GP8. Consequently, the proposal is considered to have a significant detrimental effect on the character of the area and visual amenity which is sufficient to rebut the flexibility afforded to householders so that reasonable development aspirations can be met (Policy GP13), and would be contrary to Island Development Plan Policies GP8 and GP13.

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/2025/1210
Property Ref: J014060001
Valid date: 20/08/2025
Location: Calcifer Cottage Ville Amphrey St. Martin Guernsey GY4 6DP
Proposal: Erect extension to existing outbuilding to south elevation, remove planting and erect fence on top of boundary wall to west boundary.
Applicant: Mr & Mrs D & D Ogier-Keltie

RECOMMENDATION - Refusal with Reasons:

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. Due to the siting, overall height (measured from ground level), and solid design of the proposed fence, located on top of a traditional granite wall, the proposal would introduce a discordant element into the street scene and does not achieve a good standard of design for the purposes of Policy GP8. Consequently, the proposal is considered to have a significant detrimental effect on the character of the area and visual amenity which is sufficient to rebut the flexibility afforded to householders so that reasonable development aspirations can be met (Policy GP13), and would be contrary to Island Development Plan Policies GP8 and GP13.

OFFICER'S REPORT

Site Description:

The application site, known as Calcifer Cottage consists of a traditional semi-detached dwelling located to the east of Ville Amphrey. The property is served by a private car parking area immediately to the north of the building, with the garden beyond. The property is located Outside of the Centres as defined in the Island Development Plan.

Surrounding the site, the area comprises residential properties to the north, east, south and west. Sausmarez Mill Estate lies to the north of the application site, with the access road serving the estate located immediately behind the outbuilding located to the north of Calcifer Cottage. The neighbouring property to the west is a Protected Building.

The surrounding area fronting onto the main road (Ville Amphrey) typically comprises of roadside boundaries that include walls, earth banks and hedges, creating a relatively traditional and soft-landscaped 'feel' to the fronts of residential properties. This in turn positively contributes to the character and amenity of the surrounding area. Sausmarez Mill Estate however does incorporate low level chain-link fencing to the front of some properties fronting onto Ville Amphrey.

Relevant History:

Reference No	Description	Decision
FULL/2016/2569	Erect flat roof store at rear of dwelling (retrospective).	Granted
FULL/2014/0656	Erect lean to store to rear of dwelling.	Granted
FULL/2010/2142	Replace boundary wall with granite wall	Granted
PRCN/1996/2923	Erect fencing and gates (reconsideration)	Refused
PAPP/1996/2138	Erect fencing and gates	Refused

Existing Use(s):

Residential

Brief Description of Development:

Planning permission is sought to erect an extension to the south of the existing outbuilding, remove hedging and erect a fence on top of the existing wall forming the west boundary of the property.

The application was deferred as concerns were raised with regard to the position of the proposed timber fence positioned along the west boundary of the site and the resultant impact on the character and appearance of the area. It was advised to plant a replacement hedge on the inside of the roadside wall which would in time screen the rear garden from public vantage points along Ville Amphrey.

It was also suggested to extend the granite scalloped wall so that it screens the proposed flat roof store to respect the traditional characteristics of the site and amenity of the locality. Other design options were also proposed.

In response, the applicant has requested that the application be determined as submitted. Additional information has been submitted by the applicant to seek to justify the design proposed and that it would not materially affect the character and appearance of the area.

It is also noted by the applicant that the former owner had erected fencing on top of the granite wall, although it was removed in order to receive an Immunity Certificate. A photograph taken by the Estate Agent showed a small section of fencing near the scalloped granite wall. The applicant notes that it extended across the wall and provided more privacy than the hedging does now.

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

Island Development Plan Policies –

GP8 Design

GP13 Householder Development

IP9 Highway Safety, Accessibility and Capacity

Representations:

None.

Consultations:

None.

Summary of Issues:

- Whether the design of the fence is acceptable.
- Whether the development would impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- Whether the proposal would affect highway safety and traffic management.

Assessment against:

- 1 - Purposes of the law.**
- 2 - Relevant policies of any Plan, Subject Plan or Local Planning Brief.**
- 3 - General material considerations set out in the General Provisions Ordinance.**
- 4 - Additional considerations (for protected trees, monuments, buildings and/or SSS's).**

All material considerations as set out in the Land Planning and Development (Guernsey) Law, 2005 and the Land Planning and Development (General Provisions) Ordinance, 2007 have been taken into account in the assessment of this application.

Policy GP13 (Householder Development) states that proposals for the alteration and/or extension of residential properties within the residential curtilage, will be supported where there are no significant adverse effects on the amenities of neighbouring properties; the design, scale, mass and form would not detract from the open character of open locations; and they do not affect the special interest of Conservation Areas, Areas of Biodiversity Importance, protected buildings or protected monuments.

In this instance GP8 (Design) is also relevant. The preceding text to Policy GP8 refers to the need to consider the material planning considerations as specified in Part IV, Section 13 of the Land Planning and Development (General Provisions) Ordinance 2007. These include the appropriateness of the development in relation to its surroundings in terms of its design, layout, scale, siting and the materials to be used, as well as its likely effect on the character and amenity of the locality in question and its likely effect on the reasonable enjoyment of neighbouring properties.

Removal of landscaping and installation of fencing:

Several plants are sited inside of the granite wall which forms part of the west boundary of the site. These plants collectively form a hedge, the removal of which requires planning permission. The removal of the hedge may be acceptable under the provisions

of GP8 and GP13, subject to the replacement boundary treatment adopting a good standard of design which respects the character and appearance of its surroundings.

Whilst it is recognised that in less sensitive areas, the individual choice of the property owner is balanced against public interest, the design of the replacement fence along the west boundary is not considered to respect the character and appearance of the area, when considering its overall height above ground level, solid design, and position.

The visual impact of the development would be exacerbated by siting the fence on top of a traditional granite wall, and therefore the fence would be highly prominent in the immediate vicinity.

Consequently, the introduction of the fencing is not considered to respect most boundary treatments in the surrounding area and would have a significant detrimental effect on the character of the area and visual amenity which is sufficient to rebut the flexibility afforded to householders so that reasonable development aspirations can be met (Policy GP13). If approved, the proposal is also likely to set an undesirable precedent in the surrounding area.

Proposed extension:

The proposed extension to the outbuilding, serving as an E-Bike Store, would be sited inside of the existing west boundary wall. The extension would project above the proposed fence as shown on the elevation drawings. Whilst it would be desirable to extend the scalloped section of granite wall to screen the proposed extension, a smooth rendered wall set inside the boundary wall could also be an acceptable solution.

Protected building:

The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the setting of the Protected Building to the west of the application site.

Sightlines:

The position, height and form of the existing granite wall impedes sightlines from the access towards oncoming traffic from the north of the site. The proposed fence would not make this situation significantly worse.

Neighbour amenity

The development will not affect the amenities of neighbouring residents.

Conclusion

Overall, due to the proposed fencing, the proposal is not supported in its current form and it is recommended that the application be refused.

Date: 21/10/2025

