

**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, rebuild and alter agricultural barn/building to form dwelling and associated works (Protected Building).

**LOCATION:** Calais Farm, Rue De Calais, St. Martin.

**APPLICANT:** Mr & Mrs L Watson

I refer to the application referred to below received as valid on 21/08/2025 regarding the above proposals as described more fully in the application and drawings referred to below.

**Date of refusal of permission:** 10/11/2025

**Drawing Nos:** DWG-001-SK1, SK2

**Application Ref:** FULL/2025/1257

**Property Ref:** J01684B000 + J016890000

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 works proposed to the single storey structure to the north-east of the main building amount to the construction of a new extension. By virtue of the floor area of the proposed extension relative to that of the building to be converted, the proposal would comprise more than a modest extension. The application as submitted is therefore contrary to Policy GP16(A)g (Conversion of Redundant Buildings) of the Island Development Plan.
2. There is insufficient information to fully assess all elements of the proposed alterations on the special interest of the protected building and, in particular, the design of the windows proposed to the south-west elevation of the building would not respect that special interest. The application as submitted is therefore contrary to Policy GP5 (Protected Buildings), GP8 (Design), GP9b (Sustainable Development) and GP16(A)d (Conversion of Redundant Buildings) of the Island Development Plan and would not meet the statutory duty in respect of protected buildings.

3. As the proposed window design does not respect the special interest of the protected building, the application does not achieve a good standard of design which respects the character of the local built environment. The application as submitted is therefore contrary to Policy GP8 a)&c) (Design) of the Island Development Plan.

4. The application as submitted, by virtue of the change of use of the building, floor layout and associated window position, orientation and size, would result in overlooking of neighbouring property and consequently would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenities and enjoyment of that property. The application as submitted is therefore contrary to Policy GP8d) (Design), GP9b) (Sustainable Development) and GP16(A)h) (Conversion of Redundant Buildings) of the Island Development Plan.

#### **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/2025/1257  
**Property Ref:** J01684B000 + J016890000  
**Valid date:** 21/08/2025  
**Location:** Calais Farm Rue De Calais St. Martin Guernsey GY4 6AS  
**Proposal:** Convert, rebuild and alter agricultural barn/building to form dwelling and associated works (Protected Building).  
**Applicant:** Mr & Mrs L Watson

**RECOMMENDATION - Refusal with Reasons:**

---

**REASONS FOR REFUSAL**

1. The works proposed to the single storey structure to the north-east of the main building amount to the construction of a new extension. By virtue of the floor area of the proposed extension relative to that of the building to be converted, the proposal would comprise more than a modest extension. The application as submitted is therefore contrary to Policy GP16(A)g) (Conversion of Redundant Buildings) of the Island Development Plan.
  2. There is insufficient information to fully assess all elements of the proposed alterations on the special interest of the protected building and, in particular, the design of the windows proposed to the south-west elevation of the building would not respect that special interest. The application as submitted is therefore contrary to Policy GP5 (Protected Buildings), GP8 (Design), GP9b) (Sustainable Development) and GP16(A)d) (Conversion of Redundant Buildings) of the Island Development Plan and would not meet the statutory duty in respect of protected buildings.
  3. As the proposed window design does not respect the special interest of the protected building, the application does not achieve a good standard of design which respects the character of the local built environment. The application as submitted is therefore contrary to Policy GP8 a)&c) (Design) of the Island Development Plan.
  4. The application as submitted, by virtue of the change of use of the building, floor layout and associated window position, orientation and size, would result in overlooking of neighbouring property and consequently would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenities and enjoyment of that property. The application as submitted is therefore contrary to Policy GP8d) (Design), GP9b) (Sustainable Development) and GP16(A)h) (Conversion of Redundant Buildings) of the Island Development Plan.
- 

**OFFICER'S REPORT**

**Site Description:**

The application site comprises a two storey stone built barn with pantile roof, built against rising land to the north-east of a private road. The building has been extended with single storey structures to the south-east and north-east. That to the south-east comprises a flat roof garage at ground floor level of primarily concrete and brick construction. That to the north-east is constructed against the rear wall of the barn and comprises a timber frame clad in corrugated fibre board or timber sheeting to the north and south sides and is open to the rear with a monopitch ply deck roof. That structure is set on higher ground, linked to the barn at first floor level. Access to the property is at ground floor level through a door in the north-west gable, which remains substantially intact, or through the structure to the rear via external steps constructed against the north-west gable. Window apertures are present in the south-west elevation, although the windows are absent and these are blocked with either timber panels or brick.

The site includes a small area of land to the north-east and additional land to the south-east. That land is elevated above road level, separated from the road by a stone retaining wall, and slopes up towards the north.

The property is surrounded by residential property in all directions, comprising traditional farmhouses to the north-west, a recently constructed dwelling at an elevated level to the north, an extended early C20th dwelling and a recently constructed dwelling located within a former quarry to the south-east, and a mix of altered dwellings of varying ages across the road to the south, south-west and west.

The property is situated Outside of the Centres as defined in the Island Development Plan. The whole of the building at the application site, including the single storey additions, is protected (PB1567). There are further protected buildings (PB1566 and PB1568) to the north-west and the fountain, water trough, forecourt and associated walls located on the opposite of the road, to the south-west of the application site, comprise a protected monument (PM315). These features are fed by a stream running along the south/west side of the private road.

#### **Relevant History:**

Pre-application advice regarding conversion of the existing building.

#### **Existing Use(s):**

Agricultural Use Class 28

#### **Brief Description of Development:**

Permission is sought to convert the existing barn to form a two bed dwellinghouse, including construction of a single storey flat roof extension to the rear (north-east) of the building and renovation of the garage to the side (south-east). Whilst not referenced on the larger scale plans, the Block Plan and Design and Sustainability Report refer to creation of a patio on the garage roof.

In support of the application the following have been submitted:

- Structural Inspection Report prepared by DLA Consulting Engineers;
- Statement of Significance, including list of works (p16);
- Design and Sustainability Report.

The Structural Report is summarised in the table below:

|                                  |                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Main building</b>             |                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Walls                            | Substantial granite construction                                        | No sign of deterioration, except over rear first floor window where lintel failure has resulted in localised collapse. Does not endanger stability of remainder of wall.                                                                                                                           |
| First floor structure            | Two main cross beams, widely space joists and floor boards.             | Not in good condition, beams deteriorated at ends, size of beams and spacing of joists insufficient to support floor loading – strengthen or replace.                                                                                                                                              |
| Ground floor door                | Arched brick lintel                                                     | No signs of distress.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| South elevation window apertures |                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Ground floor                     | Mixed material – bare ground and large stones                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Roof structure                   | A frames, purlins, rafters and eaves level floor of greenhouse timbers. | Roof timbers generally not significantly deteriorated, however A frame ties not in good condition or of size to accept floor loading. Localised repair required as eaves support and size of rafters may need increasing to allow for insulation. Floor will require strengthening or replacement. |
| <b>Garage</b>                    |                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Walls                            | No signs of settlement or deterioration.                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Roof                             | Steel ‘pans’ with concrete infill.                                      | Signs of extensive rusting – cannot be proved structurally adequate – recommend replacement.                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <b>Rear lean-to</b>              |                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

|                                                                  |  |                                                                          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Formed of timber beams and joists with intermediate timber posts |  | General condition is poor, needs extensive strengthening and renovation. |
| Ply deck over roof structures                                    |  |                                                                          |

To facilitate the conversion the following works are proposed:

#### Main building

- Repoint external walls with lime;
- Installation of windows within existing apertures (south-west elevation);
- Replacement of existing door (north-west elevation);
- External lintels – treat or replace where necessary (Statement of Significance);
- Installation of new external staircase;
- Retain and preserve existing roof or repair and insulate roof, relay with existing pantiles (Statement of Significance);
- Thermally upgrade ground floor walls and floors, including new concrete floor slab;
- Repair, level and renovate existing first floor joists, beams and floorboards (Statement of Significance) or reinstate first floor (note on plan);
- Thermally upgrade parts of first floor walls;
- No reference to attic floor structure, although Structural Inspection Report notes poor condition;
- Install internal partitions and stair.

#### Rear (north-east) lean-to extension

- Replacement of rear extension – whilst the existing fabric is not clear on the submitted plans it appears that there will be wholesale replacement.

#### Side (south-east) garage extension

- Extent of work to side (south-east) elevation unclear;
- Replace garage roof;
- Unclear if garage door to be replaced or retained.

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

|        |                                                                             |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| S1     | Spatial Policy                                                              |
| S4     | Outside of the Centres                                                      |
| OC1    | Housing Outside of the Centres                                              |
| OC5(B) | Agriculture Outside of the Centres – outside the Agriculture Priority Areas |
| GP1    | Landscape Character and Open Land                                           |
| GP5    | Protected Buildings                                                         |
| GP6    | Protected Monuments                                                         |
| GP8    | Design                                                                      |
| GP9    | Sustainable Development                                                     |
| GP15   | Creation and Extension of Curtilage                                         |

|         |                                                 |
|---------|-------------------------------------------------|
| GP16(A) | Conversion of redundant buildings               |
| IP6     | Transport Infrastructure and Support Facilities |
| IP7     | Private and Communal Car Parking                |
| IP9     | Highway Safety, Accessibility and Capacity      |

Supplementary Planning Guidance:  
 Parking Standards and Traffic Impact Assessment  
 Strategy for Nature

### **Representations:**

Two letters of representation received raising the following points:

- Overlooking of adjacent property, from windows (especially taking into account reverse plan), terrace and main access steps;
- There is no mains drainage, where will the cess pit be installed. The garden is small and above road level;
- How will rainwater be addressed to ensure no discharge on to the adjacent private road.

*La Societe Guerneslaise* comment as follows:

In respect of this application, we would like to highlight that buildings of this type can be used by roosting bats. This likelihood can increase when the property is located within a variable landscape with habitats such as farmland or woodland nearby. The Bailiwick Bat Survey has shown that there are bat populations in this particular part of the island.

We would recommend that the existing building, in particular the roofspaces, be inspected for current or recent use by bats by a suitably qualified person prior to any building works. This would reduce the risk of disturbing or destroying animals which are legally protected under the Animal Welfare Ordinance 2012.

We would further recommend that appropriate provision for roosting bats and certain species of nesting birds be incorporated into the development.

We would request that, if this application is considered further, such wildlife considerations are covered by an appropriate planning condition.

If an informative note is used instead, we would request the following wording -

'Your attention is drawn to The Animal Welfare (Guernsey) Ordinance, 2012, the local Strategy for Nature and the need to comply with their legal provisions. The existing building may be used by bats or other wildlife for roosting and nesting. We strongly recommend that the site is inspected by a suitably qualified person prior to any building works. Additional measures should also be taken (including consideration of the timing of the works and provision to support associated wildlife in the long term) to ensure that protected species are not impacted by the works. It is recommended that you

contact La Société Guernesiaise for advice or to arrange a site visit. La Société can be contacted by emailing [info@societe.org.gg](mailto:info@societe.org.gg)

### **Consultations:**

*Agriculture, Countryside and Land Management Services* comment as follows:

I am writing in relation to the application to convert, rebuild and alter a barn a Calais Farm, Rue de Calais. Buildings of this type and construction are known to regularly support breeding birds and roosting bats. This particular barn has the potential to be of additional importance as Lesser Horseshoe Bat (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*) has been recorded in the vicinity. Lesser horseshoe bat is of local and international importance – it is listed on Annex II and IV of the Habitat Directive and is very rare across the Bailiwick of Guernsey. Across all four years of the Bailiwick Bat Survey, it was only recorded from 11 locations.

All bats and their roosts are afforded protection in the Animal Welfare (Guernsey) Ordinance, 2012 and we would recommend that they applicant undertakes appropriate surveys of the building ahead of undertaking any works in order to avoid causing an offence. The States Veterinary Officer and La Societe Guernesiaise Bat Section are both able to provide additional information and guidance on survey requirements and precautions which should be taken to avoid disturbing or harming bats or their roosts.

### **Summary of Issues:**

Whether the proposal would comply with policy, specifically in relation to:

- Impact on the special interest of the protected building;
- The level of the design and impact on the character of the area;
- Extent of extension proposed;
- Impacts on nearby residential property.

### **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).**

### **Policy context and the principle of residential development**

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.

In exceptional circumstances, in relation to housing, the IDP does however recognise the potential opportunity to convert and reuse redundant buildings. 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.

#### Conversion of the existing building

The proposal is addressed against the criteria of Policy GP16(A) below.

*a. It is demonstrated that the building is no longer required or capable of being used for its current or last known purpose;*

Calais Farm, comprising Calais Farm House and Calais Farm Cottage located to the north-west of the application site, the building at the application site, and miscellaneous associated land, formed part of a single ownership until 1974 at which point the ownership was separated, seemingly divided between family members as part of the estate of the former owner. Subsequently the various parts of the site have been similarly transferred through the estate of the owners until in 2024 when all elements appear to have reverted to a single ownership. The building which forms the subject of the current application was then transferred into separate ownership in March 2025.

The building appears on the 1787 Duke of Richmond map. That map shows the surrounding land divided into fields and does not appear to show the quarry which is now found immediately to the rear of the building. The building therefore appears to pre-date the quarrying use and, given the ownership in association with Calais Farm, is likely to have been constructed for use in association with the agricultural activities of that farm. As no change of use has subsequently been sought for the building, notwithstanding some evidence of recent miscellaneous domestic storage, the use of the building would remain agricultural.

The submitted information states that the agricultural operation at Calais Farm has ceased and the building has not been used in association with any such activity for a number of years. It is clear from aerial photograph evidence that the character of the surrounding area has changed since the construction of the building, and the building is now surrounded by residential properties and detached from any working agricultural land. Furthermore, as stated in the submission, the building design is not well suited to modern farming practices and equipment.

In light of the above it is accepted that the building is no longer required or capable of being used for its last known purpose.

*b. The conversion will result in the establishment of either residential, social and community, industrial, storage and distribution, convenience retail in coastal locations in accordance with Policy OC4, visitor accommodation or office use or provide facilities for outdoor formal creation or informal leisure and recreation uses;*

The proposal would result in the establishment of a residential use.

*c. The existing building is of sound and substantial construction and is capable of conversion without extensive alteration or rebuilding;*

Following the approach taken by the Planning Tribunal in relation to an appeal under GP16(A) (Rue Coutance Ref: PAP/008/2019), this criterion must be assessed in two parts. Firstly, whether the building is of sound and substantial construction (in relation to the use originally intended), and secondly, an assessment as to whether the building is capable of conversion without extensive alteration or rebuilding.

In respect of the first point, a Structural Inspection Report has been provided in support of the application. That report notes that the walls of the main structure are of granite masonry of substantial thickness and show no signs of deterioration, barring a localised area of collapse due to the failure of a window lintel. Given the condition of the walls, and the assumed substrate upon which the building sits, the Report is satisfied that the foundations are adequate, provided no major alterations are made to the structural form. In respect of the roof, the report notes that, from a limited visual inspection, the roof structure appears not to have deteriorated significantly and that the ridge line is relatively horizontal, indicating no localised spread of the main frame. Whilst the report notes that the first and attic floors are in poor condition, it is accepted that the structure of the main building can be considered sound and substantial.

In respect of the garage extension to the side (south-east) of the main building, the Report states that, while the walls are of significant thickness and show no signs of settlement or deterioration, there are signs of extensive rusting of the steel 'pans' within the concrete flat roof and it cannot be proved that the roof is structurally adequate. This element of the building could not therefore be considered of sound and substantial construction. This element however comprises a later add on to the building and is not integral to the ongoing use of the building. The condition of this element would not therefore affect the conclusion above that the main structure can be considered of sound and substantial construction.

In respect of the lean-to structure located to the rear (north-east) of the main building, the submitted Structural Inspection report states "*the general condition of the structure is poor and will need extensive strengthening and renovation*". Reviewing the structure on site it is apparent that there is no rear wall, that parts of the roof are missing and the side walls are constructed of temporary materials and, in the north corner, are bowing. This element of the building could not therefore be considered of sound and substantial construction either, however, as for the garage extension, this structure is peripheral to

the primary use of the building and would not affect the conclusion above that the main structure can be considered of sound and substantial construction.

On balance therefore the main building is considered to be of sound and substantial construction and would meet the requirements of the first part of this criterion.

In relation to the second part, the floor space of the existing main building is c50.3sqm. The building as it stands would therefore exceed the size requirements of the Guernsey Technical Standards to form a dwellinghouse and would therefore, in principle, be capable of conversion for such use.

The works proposed to facilitate the conversion are set out in the Brief Description of Development above. There are some discrepancies within the submitted material regarding the exact nature of the works proposed, and this would need to be remedied were the application to be approved. However, for the purposes of this report, where there is discrepancy the greater intervention is assumed.

In determining the previously cited appeal, and taking into account paragraph 19.17.7 of the IDP, the Tribunal concluded that work necessary to bring the building fabric up to current Building Regulation standards in terms of freedom from damp and thermal and sound insulation, together with the installation of internal partitions, are known to be a common feature of schemes involving the conversion of buildings and therefore such works were considered to be neutral in terms of their impact on the objectives of Policy GP16(A). The remaining works proposed to the main building, as itemised above, are not considered to amount to extensive alteration or rebuilding.

In respect of the works proposed to the garage extension, in the assessment of the conversion of the Hayloft under application ref FULL/2021/0031 and L'Echelle Gate House under FULL/2024/0652, the Authority determined that works to an attached side extension, which would not be used for habitable accommodation but to provide storage, would not be considered as part of the alterations required for the conversion of the main building. In light of these decisions, providing that the garage element of the current proposal is retained for the garaging of vehicles/cycles and ancillary domestic storage and not used for habitable purposes (an issue which can be controlled by planning condition), the works which are proposed to that element of the building would not be considered as part of the alterations to be assessed under Policy GP16(A)c). Therefore, whilst the extent of works proposed to the side (south-east) wall of the garage extension are unclear from the submitted information, that is not pertinent to the consideration of the proposal under this criterion.

As set out above, the structure to the rear (north-east) of the barn is not considered of sound and substantial construction. Taking this into account, and the extent of works proposed to that structure, the proposal amounts to the replacement of the existing structure and would therefore have to be considered as the construction of a new extension under g) below and would also be excluded from consideration of the proposed alterations under this criterion.

Taking into account the above, the proposal would comply with Policy GP16(A)(c).

*d. The proposal would have no adverse impacts on the special interest of a protected building and that such interest is appropriately and proportionately preserved and, where possible, enhanced;*

This policy reflects the requirements of Policies GP5 (Protected Buildings), GP8 (Design and GP9b) (Sustainable Development), both in respect of the alterations to the existing building but also the setting of the adjacent protected buildings, and Policy GP6 (Protected Monuments), in respect of the adjacent protected monument. The statutory duties in respect of protected buildings set out in Section 34 of the Law and in respect of protected monuments set out in Section 30 of the Law would also apply.

In principle, the reuse of the existing building is a reasonable aspiration of the property owner and would outweigh any negative impacts on the special interest of that building in respect of the majority of the proposed works. In terms of the reinstatement of windows within the existing apertures to the south-west elevation of the building however, whilst such work could be supported in principle, the proposed single-pane casements would not respect the special interest of the building and would introduce detractors to that building, contrary to the requirements of Policy GP5 and would not therefore meet the statutory duty in respect of protected buildings.

In addition, there is insufficient information to allow assessment of some elements of the proposals, and, before an application could be considered for approval, clarification would be required in respect of the following:

- Any works required to create level access to the ground floor, e.g. any changes to ground level or height of door;
- Details of the mounting of the gutters (ideally these would be mounted on brackets to maintain the character of the protected building);
- Replacement of lintels should be shown on the plans, and materials of replacements specified;
- Details of how the lining of the underside of the roof would be achieved (ideally retaining the exposure of existing timbers of value where possible);
- Details of the replacement of the first floor and attic floor structures, in particular noting the treatment of any retained historic beams within the first floor ceiling and specifying replacement materials (if replacement is required);
- Lining of internal walls – The details set out in the Statement of Significance differ from those shown on the drawing;
- No walls/fences are shown to the garden area to the south-east, given the notable changes in level confirmation of any such requirement would be required;
- Clarification of the extent, nature and approach to “remedial repairs” to the roadside wall;
- Confirmation if the proposal includes a terrace over the garage and, if so, details of any protective barriers required.

In light of the above, the proposal as submitted is not found to preserve the special interest of the protected building at the application site and does not therefore meet

the requirements of Policy GP5, GP16(A)d) or the statutory duty in respect of protected buildings.

In terms of the surrounding protected buildings and monument, the proposals would fundamentally retain the envelope of the historic building and would generally enable the building to continue to be understood as part of the surrounding historic landscape. As set out above however the proposed windows are found to detract from the special interest of the building and, given those windows are prominently located on the roadside elevation of the building and visible in context with the nearby protected structures, it can only be found that that element of the proposals would also have a level of impact on the special interest of those surrounding protected structures.

*e. The proposals would have no unacceptable impacts on the contribution a building of character makes to the character and appearance of the area;*

This criterion reflects the requirements of Policy GP8, which require a development to achieve a good standard of design which makes an efficient and effective use of land and respects the character of the local built environment, whilst providing soft and hard landscaping where this reinforces local character and mitigates the impacts of the development.

In this case, the existing building is a historic structure of traditional agrarian character and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area, contemporary with and complementary to the group of protected buildings to the north-west. The proposals would fundamentally retain the envelope of the historic building and would generally respect the character of the surrounding built environment. As set out above however, due primarily to the proposed window design, the details of the proposal are found to detract from the special interest of the protected building. The windows in question are located prominently on the roadside elevation of the building and any detractor to that elevation of the building must be considered as a detriment to the wider character of this historic hamlet. It can only therefore be concluded that the application, as submitted, fails to achieve a good standard of design which respects the character of the local built environment, contrary to Policy GP8a)& c) and the relevant material considerations of the Law.

Proposed areas of hard surfacing are not excessive, however specifications would be required to ensure an appropriate finish which respects the special interest of the protected building.

The provision of soft landscaping is addressed below.

*f. the conversion and any ancillary development associated with it can be implemented without having any unacceptable adverse impacts on the character and openness of the landscape;*

The proposal would require a change of use of the immediately surrounding land to enable its use for domestic purposes and would also fall to be considered under Policies OC5(B) (Agriculture Outside of the Centres – outside of the Agriculture Priority Areas),

GP15 (Creation and extension of curtilage) and GP1 (Landscape Character and Open Land).

Policy OC5(B) supports the change of use of agricultural land where the proposed new use accords with the other relevant policies of the Plan.

Policy GP15 states that a proposal to create or extend curtilage will be supported where:

- a. it would not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the landscape character; and,
- b. it would not have an unacceptable impact on the biodiversity interest of an Area of Biodiversity Importance or, where negative impacts are unavoidable, they can be acceptably mitigated in accordance with a scheme to be agreed with the Authority in accordance with Policy GP3: Areas of Biodiversity Importance; and,
- c. it is demonstrated 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,
- d. it is demonstrated that it would not involve an unacceptable loss of established boundary features that contribute positively to the character of an area, unless the new or replacement boundary treatment makes an equal or enhanced positive contribution to the character of the area; and,
- e. it would not adversely affect the reasonable amenities of neighbouring residents.

Policy GP1 requires consideration of whether the proposal would result in any unnecessary loss of open and undeveloped land, which would have an unacceptable impact on the open landscape character of the area.

The property is not located within or adjacent to an Area of Biodiversity Importance or an Agriculture Priority Area, and the change of use would not require the removal of any boundary features.

The application site is located within a hamlet comprising a mix of traditional and modern buildings, but primarily residential in character. The proposed use of the land immediately surrounding the building for domestic purposes would, in itself, have no adverse impacts on the character of the immediate area and, due to the topography of the area and surrounding built form, the site is not visible as part of the wider landscape character or in conjunction with any contiguous area of open land. As above, clarification would however be needed to ensure any additional features proposed to along the roadside boundary to enclose the site would not adversely affect the character of the area. Due to the protected status of the building, development under the provisions of the Land Planning and Development (Exemptions) Ordinance, 2023 would be limited however, given the open and elevated nature of the proposed amenity space, the erection of any sheds could have potential visual impacts and, were the application to be recommended for approval, it would be recommended that exemption rights for the erection of sheds be withheld.

In light of the above, the proposal would comply with the requirements of Policies GP16(A)f), OC5(B), GP15 and GP1.

In addition to the requirements of these policies, there is an expectation under the Strategy for Nature to seek biodiversity enhancements when considering a change of use of land. The application proposes planting around the perimeter of the site. Whilst this is limited, it is proportionate to the area of the change of use and would be acceptable, subject to the use of appropriate native planting species, which could be secured by condition.

*g. The conversion would not require more than modest extension to the existing building for it to be achieved;*

As set out above, the extent of works proposed to the rear (north-east) extension would amount to replacement of that structure and would therefore have to be considered as the construction of a new extension.

The proposed extension would comprise c25.5sqm (internal floor space) or c30.4sqm (footprint), comprising c50% of the existing floor space within the main building. This scale of extension could not be considered modest for the purpose of this criterion, and the proposal would therefore fail on this point.

The Structural Inspection also notes that the extension would be built on infill material and no commentary is made regarding the stability of that material, and the ability for that material to support the additional loading associated with the proposed extension.

*h. The proposal would have no unacceptable adverse impacts on the amenities and enjoyment of neighbouring properties and the surrounding area;*

This criterion reflects the requirements of Policy GP8d), GP9b) and the material considerations of the Law in respect of the likely effect of the development on the reasonable enjoyment of neighbouring properties.

There are residential properties surrounding the application site and the introduction of an additional residential use, in principle, would be consistent with the surrounding area.

The dwellings to the north-west of the application site (Calais Farm House and Calais Farm Cottage) are set away from the application site, and the land immediately adjacent to the site comprises a parking area and gravelled area associated with the former, which is open to views from the adjacent road. The proposed change of use and associated alterations would not have any adverse impacts on the amenities of those properties.

The property to the north (Shuruuq) is at a higher level than the application site and would not be impacted upon by the proposals.

The property to the east (La Carriere) is located at a lower level than the application site, and the position of the dwelling and layout of that site would prevent any significant impacts on that property. Any impacts which could arise, primarily from overlooking from the proposed garden area, could be mitigated through the provision of appropriate boundary treatment, a matter which could be controlled through planning condition.

The dwelling on the property across the road to the south (La Fontaine) is set back from the roadside and again the position of the dwelling and associated amenity space, together with the existence of mature landscaping along the roadside, would limit any impacts on the amenity of that property.

There are two further properties, located across the road to the west (Pre de Calais) and south-west (Orchard Cottage) of the application site. Taking into account the orientation of the building and the proposed external areas at the application site relative to the dwellings on those properties, it is considered that there would not be a significant impact on the amenities of the dwellings themselves. Both properties however benefit from private amenity space extending towards the application site. Whilst it is acknowledged that the building at the application site is existing and the proposed conversion would reuse existing apertures within the facing elevation, the proposed change of use, and particularly the reverse plan layout proposed, would intensify the use of the building and the potential for overlooking of adjacent property. Whilst the amenity space associated with Orchard Cottage is more screened by boundary vegetation, it appears likely that the proposal would result in some overlooking of the amenity space associated with Pre de Calais, particularly from the full length window proposed to serve the living area.

In light of the above, the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenities and enjoyment of neighbouring properties and would fail to meet the terms of Policy GP16(A)h), GP8d), GP9b) and the material considerations of the Law.

#### Residential amenity

The converted building would exceed the requirements for a three person dwelling (Bedroom 2 being of insufficient size for double occupancy), having regard to both the guidance set out in the Guernsey Technical Standards and the Nationally Described space Standards. The layout of the building has been designed to maximise light to and outlook from the living areas, working within the constraints of the existing building. The size and quality of the outdoor space would be appropriate for a property of this size. Whilst the amenity space is currently open to views from the adjacent road, it appears that planting is proposed along the roadside boundary which would have the dual advantage of providing privacy and a barrier to the drop to the road. Overall, the proposed dwelling could provide a good living environment, in accordance with Policy GP8d) and Annex I: Amenities.

#### Traffic, access and parking provision

The application proposes to retain the existing garage to the south of the building for use by the new dwellinghouse. The garage is approximately 4.1m deep and 3.3m width,

whilst the door is c2.3m wide. Taking into account the size of the garage, together with the limited width of the door and its position relative to the floor area of the garage, the type of vehicles able to park in the garage would be limited, and access would involve manoeuvring on the adjacent highway, which is itself constrained. It was however apparent on site that it would be possible for a vehicle to manoeuvre to access the garage and, on balance, this parking provision would be acceptable, in accordance with Policy IP7 (Private and Communal Car Parking).

Taking into account the nature of the adjacent road (a no-through road serving a limited number of properties) and that the proposal would reuse an existing garage, the proposal would not raise significant highway safety or traffic management concerns and would be in accordance with Policy IP9 (Highway Safety, Accessibility and Capacity) and the material considerations in respect of roads.

The proposed garage is also indicated to provide enclosed cycle storage. Given the limitations of the garage described above, it is likely to be difficult to store both a vehicle and cycles within the garage. It is however accepted that, due to the change in level between the road and the proposed garden area, storage of cycles elsewhere on site is unlikely to be a possibility. On balance therefore, given the advantages associated with reuse of a redundant building, it is considered that the indicated storage would be sufficient to address the requirements of the Parking Standards SPG and Policy IP6 (Transport Infrastructure and Support Facilities) and it would not be reasonable to pursue alternative options.

#### Sustainability, accessibility and adaptability

In terms of accessibility, it is stated that level access will be sought, although the submitted plans do not detail how this would be achieved. It is further noted that there is sleeping and sanitary accommodation at ground floor level. There is limited information to demonstrate adaptability of the accommodation however, given the constraints associated with the conversion of an existing and protected building, the information provided is considered adequate to address the requirements of Policy GP8 f) & g).

In terms of sustainability, the proposal comprises the re-use of an existing building. Confirmation has been received that the proposed development has been designed to take into account matters of energy efficiency and current Building Regulations, within the constraints of the conversion of an existing and protected structure. In these circumstances and in the absence of adopted guidance, the information submitted is adequate to meet the requirements of Policy GP9a).

In terms of surface water management, it is a requirement of Guernsey Water that all such water be dealt with on site and discharge on to the adjacent road would not therefore be acceptable.

### Other matters

Management of foul water and sewage, including any provision of a cess pit, would be controlled under separate legislation.

The points raised above by Agriculture, Countryside and Land Management Services and La Societe Guernesiais in respect of the potential presence of bats and the protection afforded to those species and their roosts under the Animal Welfare (Guernsey) Ordinance, 2012 are noted and information should be attached to any decision issued to bring this to the attention of the applicant/any potential developer.

### Conclusion

Policy GP16(A) provides a policy gateway to consider the reuse of redundant buildings, and, within the pre-facing text, recognises that such reuse can be required to sustain the special interest of a protected building. The application as submitted however fails to meet the terms of policy as follows:

The works proposed to the single storey structure to the north-east of the main building amount to the construction of a new extension. By virtue of the floor area of the proposed extension relative to that of the building to be converted, the proposal would comprise more than modest extension. The application as submitted is therefore contrary to Policy GP16(A)g (Conversion of Redundant Buildings).

There is insufficient information to fully assess all elements of the proposed alterations on the special interest of the protected building and, in particular, the design of the windows proposed to the south-west elevation of the building would not respect that special interest. The application as submitted is therefore contrary to Policy GP5 (Protected Buildings), GP8 (Design), GP9b (Sustainable Development) and GP16(A)d (Conversion of Redundant Buildings) of the Island Development Plan and would not meet the statutory duty in respect of protected buildings.

As the proposed window design does not respect the special interest of the protected building, the application does not achieve a good standard of design which respects the character of the local built environment. The application as submitted is therefore contrary to Policy GP8 a)&c) (Design).

The application as submitted, by virtue of the change of use of the building, floor layout and associated window position, orientation and size, would result in overlooking of neighbouring property and consequently would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenities and enjoyment of that property. The application as submitted is therefore contrary to Policy GP8d) (Design), GP9b) (Sustainable Development) and GP16(A)h) (Conversion of Redundant Buildings).

Whilst it is acknowledged that a decision on the application could be deferred to seek alterations and additional information to address some of these matters, cumulatively, and particularly in regard to the scale of extension and impacts on neighbouring property, these matters are considered to go beyond what could reasonably be

addressed through that process. Consequently, it is recommended that the application be refused. It is however considered that there could be potential for a revised application, addressing the issues laid out within this report, to successfully meet the requirements of policy.

**Date:** 10/11/2025