

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: Demolish existing dwelling, erect 2 dwellings, create vehicle access to west boundary and associated works

LOCATION: Aqir, Rue Des Renouards, Ruelle De La Tour, Castel.

APPLICANT: Mr S Geall

I refer to the application referred to below received as valid on 27/10/2025 regarding the above proposals as described more fully in the application and drawings referred to below.

Date of refusal of permission: 02/01/2026

Drawing Nos: Arch+ - 216-3-300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312.

Application Ref: FULL/2025/1680

Property Ref: D014950000

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 proposed development is overbearing and would result in overdevelopment of the site by virtue of its scale, mass, bulk, form and siting, contrary to Policy GP8.

The mass and bulk of the new dwellings, coupled with their scale, mono-pitched roof forms, and fenestration and materials, including timber fencing, results in a composition that would be highly prominent, inappropriately sited, and at odds with the surrounding built environment, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the locality.

2. The proposal would also result in significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring residents when taking into account the level of overlooking and loss of privacy to the residents to the east.

Overall, when considering the factors above, the cumulative effect of the development does not achieve a good standard of design for the purposes of Policy GP8 (Design) and is considered to have a significant adverse effect on the character

and appearance of the surrounding built environment, and the amenity of neighbouring residents. The development would be contrary to Island Development Plan Policies GP8 and GP9.

3. Policy LC2 supports new housing provision within the Local Centres of an appropriate mix, type and variety of dwellings but only where it accords with all other policies of the Island Development Plan. As the size of the two dwellings proposed under this scheme is larger than that indicated by the latest States' Strategic Housing Indicator as being required to meet current housing needs and the proposal conflicts with other Plan policies it is also contrary to Policy LC2.

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/2025/1680
Property Ref: D014950000
Valid date: 27/10/2025
Location: Aqir Rue Des Renouards Ruelle De La Tour Ruelle De La Tour
Castel Guernsey GY5 7TX
Proposal: Demolish existing dwelling, erect 2 dwellings, create vehicle
access to west boundary and associated works
Applicant: Mr S Geall

RECOMMENDATION - Refusal with Reasons:

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposed development is overbearing and would result in overdevelopment of the site by virtue of its scale, mass, bulk, form and siting, contrary to Policy GP8.

The mass and bulk of the new dwellings, coupled with their scale, mono-pitched roof forms, and fenestration and materials, including timber fencing, results in a composition that would be highly prominent, inappropriately sited, and at odds with the surrounding built environment, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the locality.

2. The proposal would also result in significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring residents when taking into account the level of overlooking and loss of privacy to the residents to the east.

Overall, when considering the factors above, the cumulative effect of the development does not achieve a good standard of design for the purposes of Policy GP8 (Design) and is considered to have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding built environment, and the amenity of neighbouring residents. The development would be contrary to Island Development Plan Policies GP8 and GP9.

3. Policy LC2 supports new housing provision within the Local Centres of an appropriate mix, type and variety of dwellings but only where it accords with all other policies of the Island Development Plan. As the size of the two dwellings proposed under this scheme is larger than that indicated by the latest States' Strategic Housing Indicator as being required to meet current housing needs and the proposal conflicts with other Plan policies it is also contrary to Policy LC2.

OFFICER'S REPORT

Site Description:

The application site consists of a detached, hipped roof bungalow located on an elevated corner plot, between Ruelle De La Tour and Rue Des Renouards. The property is elevated above Ruelle De La Tour by circa 2 metres.

The house was built in the early 20th Century and is sited adjacent to the south boundary.

The site is subject to change in ground levels, with the land rising in both a north-to-south, and west-to-east direction.

The property features wrap-around gardens to the front (west) and north of the house, a detached shed sits to the north of the site, and an enclosed patio area and raised lawn to the rear (east).

The character of the surrounding built environment varies in terms of the scale, form, age, type and design. The north of Ruelle De La Tour features older properties, including fishermen's cottages which adjoin, and are sited perpendicular to the road, whereas the pattern of development to the south is set back from the roadside which provides a feeling of separation between properties and the public realm due to their building line.

The site is situated within Cobo Local Centre as designated in the Island Development Plan (IDP).

Planning permission was previously granted to remove a section of the roadside wall and create a parking layby. It is understood that the house was served by a piece of land and outbuilding located north of the site and used for parking provision.

Relevant History:

Reference No	Description	Decision	Date
PREA/2025/0211	Demolish existing dwelling and erect 3 new dwellings	Pre-application enquiry	2025
PAPP/2005/2981	Remove section of roadside wall and create a parking layby.	Granted	2005

Existing Use(s):

Dwelling-house (Residential – Use Class 1).

Brief Description of Development:

Planning permission is sought to demolish the existing dwelling and erect 2 x 3-bedroom dwellings.

The new units feature a kitchen/dining and family room on the ground floor, with a living room at first floor level, located towards the front of the units.

The proposal also features bedrooms on the ground and first floor level, located towards the rear of the buildings. Both units will feature a study room at first floor level and will be served by a new (9m wide) shared vehicular access and driveway, with parking provision for 2 cars per dwelling.

The proposal includes mono-pitch roofs, with Unit 2 incorporating an inverted roof form. Both units feature large expanses of glazing, including Juliet balconies, particularly on the north and west elevations. The proposal also incorporates terraces to the front (west) of Unit 1, and to the north of Unit 2. Unit 1 features a small garden to the rear, whereas Unit 2 features an enclosed lawn.

The proposal includes reducing ground levels by approximately 1.5m, although this figure varies across the site. Consequently, Unit 1 is split over 3 levels providing an under-croft serving as a bin and bike store. Unit 2 does not include an under-croft and is split over 2 levels.

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

LC2	Housing in Local Centres
GP1	Landscape Character and Open Land
GP8	Design
GP9	Sustainable Development
IP6	Transport infrastructure and support facilities
IP7	Private and communal parking
IP9	Highway Safety, Accessibility and Capacity

Representations:

The Authority has received 18 representations objecting to the proposal, including from the Constables of Castel. Grounds for objection principally relate to the following issues:-

- The corner plot is sensitive to development.
- Proximity to the road.
- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Scale, bulk, massing and siting of the development.
- Extent of glazing.
- Overbearing, visually intrusive and disproportionate.
- Overlooking.
- Impact on Landscape Character.
- Over-engineering of the site.
- Inappropriate roof form.
- Incongruous design.
- Increase in traffic movements and congestion.
- Impact on private views.
- Emergency access.
- Infrastructure provision.

- Increase surface water runoff.
- Light pollution.
- Limited landscaping proposed.
- Precedent for further development.

The Constables of Castel have confirmed in their representation that the Douzaine considered the plans at its meeting on 8th December 2025 after receiving notification about the proposed development from some of the neighbours of the site. The Douzaine objects to the proposed development, the main reasons being the overbearing size and location of the proposed development. The site is elevated above the road and currently contains a bungalow that is set back from the road. Due to the height of the site above the road, any development on the site needs to be particularly sensitive to the area as it will have an amplified impact on the street scene and character of the area. The Douzaine carefully considered the proposal and concluded that it is overbearing due to the size, height and location that is significantly closer to the road than the existing property. The combination of the height, footprint and closeness of the development to the road will not maintain or enhance the Cobo area. The scale and setting will have a significant negative impact on the character of the road and the Cobo area due to the prominence of the proposal, therefore the proposed development should be rejected as it is not consistent with the preamble to Policy LC2 or the actual policy. There were also concerns raised about the adequacy of parking for such large properties when there is already a shortage of parking in the Cobo area, the lack of amenity space for such a large house and the importance of such space for relaxing outdoors in a private garden.

Consultations:

States Archaeologist:

"I would like to make some brief comments on this application. There is some potential archaeological interest because of the presence of early medieval buildings on the site of what is now the Le Feugre Flats, just 50m west of this site. I note that the application proposes to lower the existing ground levels quite substantially, and I would therefore request that an archaeological watching brief be imposed as a condition, to take place in the initial stages of soil removal. It may be - as suggested on p. 8 of the cover letter submitted - that the ground has been built up comparatively recently, but this should very quickly become apparent if a watching brief is put in place."

Summary of Issues:

- Whether the principle of residential development is acceptable in this location;
- Impact on the character and appearance of the area;
- Impact on neighbour amenity, and;
- Whether the proposal would impact negatively on highway safety and traffic management.

Assessment against:

1 - Purposes of the law.

The objectives of the Law, as set out in Section 1(2), have been considered and this forms part of the assessment of policy issues set out in 2 below.

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

Whether the principle of residential development is acceptable in this location

The application site is situated within a Local Centre as identified on the Island Development Plan Proposals Map. Within such areas Policy LC2: Housing in Local Centres supports proposals for new residential development providing:

- a) each proposal is of a scale that is appropriate to maintain or enhance the character and vitality of the particular Local Centre concerned and will not negatively affect the vitality and viability of the Main Centres or otherwise undermine the Spatial Policy; and,*
- b) where able to accommodate a variety of dwellings the proposal provides an appropriate mix and type of dwellings; and,*
- c) where the site is identified as Important Open Land, new housing is achieved only through the subdivision of existing dwellings or the conversion of existing buildings; and,*
- d) in all cases the proposed development accords with other relevant policies of the Island Development Plan.*

The development proposes 2x 3-bedroom dwellings. There is also the potential for the proposed study rooms located in both Units 1 and 2 to be turned into bedrooms without a separate grant of planning permission, thereby increasing the potential for greater number of bedrooms on the site.

In accordance with planning policies in the Island Development Plan, 2016, where housing proposals can accommodate a variety of dwellings, it will normally be expected that the mix and type of dwellings is reflective of the demographic profile of households requiring housing. In establishing the mix and type of dwellings required, the Authority will take into consideration the information produced by other States' Committees relating to this issue, such as the most recent States' Strategic Housing Indicator or any subsequent revised or amended document and any other relevant data or relevant direction by the States of Guernsey.

The States' Strategic Housing Indicator ("SSH") is a States-agreed figure which sets out the total number of additional accommodation units that need to be created each year if Guernsey is to meet its projected housing need. It describes the units required to appropriately house those that are anticipated will form new households over the period, as well as already established households whose housing is not currently appropriate to their needs.

The output of the latest 2024 housing needs model projected a total housing need for the five-year period 2024 to 2028 as 1,488 additional units of accommodation. Private Market Housing Need in 2024 comprised 354 one-bedroom units and 461 two-bedroom

units, with no new three-, four- or five-bedroom private market units being required to meet projected housing needs as described in the SSHI.

Therefore, the size of units proposed under this scheme is larger than that indicated by the latest SSHI as being required to meet current housing needs, and this is a relevant factor in the assessment of the application which follows.

Design and the impact on the character and appearance of the area:

Policy GP8 requires all new development to achieve a good standard of design which respects and where appropriate enhances the character of the environment.

Corner plots such as this site are typically sensitive to development where they provide a spacious quality to the surrounding area and can often highlight inappropriate design given that several elevations are visible from multiple vantage points.

Inappropriate design in terms of the physical scale, form, mass, and siting of development, amongst other factors, can lead to overdevelopment of a site, which in turn can adversely affect the rhythm, form and characteristics of the surrounding built environment. This has the potential to set an undesirable precedent for other similar sites within the wider area.

In this case, the proposed development is not considered to represent a good standard of design when considering the context of the site, its relationship with the surrounding built environment, and the impact on neighbouring properties.

In particular, the scale, form, mass and siting of the development would be at odds with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The land not only rises in a north-south direction, but also in a west-east direction. The siting of the proposed units considers the forward building line of properties to the west of the application site, although fails to respect the building line of neighbouring properties to the east. The position of Unit 2 would be sited forward of the building line of properties to the east and therefore would be at odds with the general siting, form and rhythm of properties facing onto Ruelle De La Tour.

This impact is compounded by the scale and form of the proposed dwellings which adopt mono-pitch roofs, which slope upwards on a south-north axis. This roof form is markedly different to the general pattern of roof forms in the surrounding area which are predominantly pitched roofs on a north-to-south axis, following the topography of the land (also rising in a north-to-south direction). Whilst it is recognised that mono-pitched roofs could be supported under Policy GP8 in this case, the design adopted would not complement the local character of the area (Paragraph 19.9.4 of Policy GP8).

Although the IDP encourages multi-storey design which has been adopted in this instance, the resultant effect of the development would create a prominent tall building (2.5 storey high) close to Ruelle De La Tour which would undermine the feeling of separation and distance between properties and the public realm and create an oppressive and dominant structure in the landscape.

With regards to bulk and massing, the 2/2.5 storey building (Unit 2) is approximately 15m in length, and therefore would create a large building mass when viewed from the public realm, which would be visually disproportionate and overbearing when viewed in context with other properties in the vicinity.

Overall, the cumulative effect of the siting of the development near to the north boundary, coupled with the scale, form and mass of the proposed units would lead to an oppressive and dominant pair of semi-detached houses that would have little cohesion and relevance to the characteristics of residential properties in the surrounding area. The extent of glazing and arrangement of fenestration on both the north and west elevations would also add to the conspicuousness of the development when viewed in context with the general fenestration found in the immediate vicinity.

With regards to other matters, the large extent of fencing (circa. 15m in length) along the roadside frontage, on an elevated site, does not respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would result in an overreliance on soft landscaping to screen the fence.

In addition, the incorporation of steps leading to the front of both units would make accessibility to the buildings problematic for people of all ages and abilities.

The units have the potential to offer flexible and adaptable accommodation that can respond to people's needs over time, and despite being small, the external amenity space would be sufficient given the proximity of the application site to the coast and nearby park and playing fields. The units would provide acceptable internal space and amenity provision.

Consequently, the proposal does not comply with criteria a), b), c), e) and f) of Policy GP8.

The effect of development on neighbouring residents:

Policies GP8 and GP9 of the Island Development Plan seek to ensure that any development proposed has been designed to avoid unacceptable impacts on neighbouring amenity with regard to sunlight, daylight and amenity space.

Careful consideration has been afforded to the level of overlooking to the north and west of the application site because of the development. However, public views of neighbouring properties, including their gardens, are visible at various vantage points along both Ruelle De La Tour and Rue Des Renouards, therefore a degree of overlooking and loss of privacy already exists in the public realm. Whilst it is considered that the proposal will increase the level of overlooking towards neighbouring properties and that the extent of glazing on both the north and west elevations would also exacerbate this feeling of oppressiveness and loss of privacy, the degree of harm when compared to the existing level of overlooking, coupled with the distance and relationship to respective neighbouring properties, including internal and external amenity spaces, is such that this impact would not be so substantial to warrant refusal in and of itself.

However, the number of first floor windows on the east elevation, coupled with the distance (circa 7.5m) and relationship to the neighbouring boundary to the east, is sufficient to cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring residents in terms of overlooking and intervisibility. The agent has not demonstrated that the proposed bedroom windows would not result in overlooking towards the neighbours to the east to rebut these concerns.

Whilst it is recognised that the development is likely to result in some impacts to the neighbouring property to the south given the proximity of Unit 1, the change in ground level would result in an eaves level of approximately 3.5m above the ground level of the neighbour's garden. Moreover, due to the mono-pitch roof form which slopes away from the neighbour's garden and towards the middle of the site, the impact would be further reduced and would not be so significant to reasonably justify refusal in and of itself.

Due to the scale, orientation, distance and relationship to neighbouring properties, the development is unlikely to cause significant shading of neighbouring properties.

Overall, given the overlooking and intervisibility with the neighbouring property to the east, the proposal would result in significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring residents and therefore does not accord with Policy GP8 (criterion d) and Policy GP9 (criterion b).

Whether the proposal would impact negatively on highway safety and traffic management:

Given that the proposed vehicular access point is located on the western boundary of the site, and is set back approximately 12m south of Ruelle De La Tour, which is recognised as a 'Neighbourhood Road' characterised by low traffic speeds and volumes, the proposal is unlikely to raise significant highway safety and traffic management concerns.

The loss of a 9m section of the granite wall, located towards the upper section of the west boundary, to form a shared vehicular access would not cause unacceptable harm to the landscape character of the area when considering the character and appearance of Rue Des Renouards and other similar vehicular access points along this highway.

Careful consideration has been given to the matters raised in the letters of representation received as part of this application. The matters raised have been discussed above, where appropriate.

Conclusion:

The size of the two dwellings proposed under this scheme is larger than that indicated by the latest SSHI as being required to meet current housing needs.

The proposed development is not considered to represent a good standard of design when considering the context of the site, its relationship with the surrounding built environment, and the impact on neighbouring properties. In particular, the scale, form, mass and siting of the development would be at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of the surrounding area. Given the overlooking and intervisibility with the neighbouring property to the east, the proposal would also result in significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring residents.

Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Island Development Plan Policies LC2, GP8 and GP9.

Whilst it is acknowledged that a decision on the application could be deferred to seek alterations to address some of these matters, cumulatively, and particularly in regard to the scale and design of the development and impact 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.

For the reasons set out above, it is recommended that planning permission is refused.

Date: 02/01/2026

