

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 porch and extension, erect 2-storey extension to west (rear) elevation, install rooflights to east (front) elevation.

LOCATION: Fulmar Cottage, Route De Rocquaine, St. Pierre Du Bois.

APPLICANT: Mr J Dickinson

I refer to the application referred to below received as valid on 21/04/2026 regarding the above proposals as described more fully in the application and drawings referred to below.

Date of refusal of permission: 03/06/2026

Drawing Nos: The Drawing Room: 437/C2, /C3, /C4, /C5 & /C6.

Application Ref: FULL/2026/0664

Property Ref: F011360000

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 extension, by virtue of its scale, mass and bulk and its position in proximity to adjoining properties, would be unacceptably overbearing and would detract significantly from the amenities that neighbouring residents might reasonably expect to enjoy, contrary to Policies GP8 and GP13 of the adopted 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/2026/0664
Property Ref: F011360000
Valid date: 21/04/2026
Location: Fulmar Cottage Route De Rocquaine St. Pierre Du Bois
Guernsey GY7 9HT
Proposal: Demolish porch and extension, erect 2-storey extension to west
(rear) elevation, install rooflights to east (front) elevation.
Applicant: Mr J Dickinson

RECOMMENDATION - Refusal with Reasons:

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposed extension, by virtue of its scale, mass and bulk and its position in proximity to adjoining properties, would be unacceptably overbearing and would detract significantly from the amenities that neighbouring residents might reasonably expect to enjoy, contrary to Policies GP8 and GP13 of the adopted Island Development Plan.

OFFICER'S REPORT

Site Description:

The property known as 'Fulmar Cottage' is a one and a half storey traditional cottage which is set slightly back from and faces west onto Route de Rocquaine. Neighbouring cottages are attached to the north and south, the coast is across the road to the west and beyond the garden to the east is open land. The property is located Outside of the Centres as defined in the Island Development Plan.

Relevant History:

There is no relevant history pertaining to this application.

Existing Use(s):

Residential use class 1: dwelling house.

Brief Description of Development:

This application is to demolish the existing front porch and the rear extension and erect a two-storey extension to the rear (east) elevation and install rooflights to the front west facing roof slope.

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

GP8: Design

GP9: Sustainable Development

GP13: Householder Development

Representations:

There has been one representation received and the issues raised are: -

- There are concerns relating to residential amenity, health and wellbeing, loss of light, noise pollution, dust and air quality, privacy, access and parking, boundary treatment, the adequacy of the submitted plans, the overbearing nature of the proposed two-storey development, and the importance of preserving the historic and architectural character of this unique coastal setting.
- The Rocquaine Fisherman's Cottages are crucial elements of local heritage and to ensure that any development permitted along this coastline is carefully considered in that context. Extensions that are disproportionate in scale, inconsistent in design, or at odds with the traditional character of these buildings risk eroding, incrementally and irreversibly, the very qualities that make this stretch of coastline so special. It would be a great shame if the cumulative effect of unchecked or poorly designed development were to diminish the historic integrity of these cottages and the unique character of the Rocquaine coast.
- The proposed two-storey development is excessive in scale and mass, both relative to the existing cottage and relative to the character of the surrounding properties. The cumulative effect of both storeys creates a structure that, in my respectful submission, bears down upon my property in a manner disproportionate to what could reasonably be considered sympathetic or acceptable development in this setting.
- The plans do not adequately demonstrate the true size and mass of the proposed extension. In particular, the height and depth of the new extension are not clear, making it difficult to assess the full extent of the development and its impact.
- The submitted plans do not clearly indicate the height of the proposed extension. Based on the drawings, it appears that the proposed extension will be higher than the existing building. This would result in a substantial and imposing structure in direct line of sight from both my home office and my outdoor seating area.
- The two properties are separated by a narrow alleyway that sits on the neighbour's land. This alleyway forms the physical boundary between the two properties. The plans fail to demonstrate how this boundary between the two properties will be treated during and after construction. The alleyway amplifies noise due to the nature and height of the buildings on either side of it.
- There are serious concerns that the proposed plans position a shower room directly on or immediately adjacent to this boundary, placing it in the closest possible proximity to the neighbour's home office. The location of a shower room in this position is entirely unacceptable.

- The applicant's loss of light assessment appears to be based solely on conditions as of 1st July, which represents the period of maximum solar elevation and the longest days of the year. This is inadequate and misleading as a basis for assessment. A single midsummer assessment does not reflect the year-round reality of the impact on neighbouring properties and does not meet the standard required for a thorough and fair assessment. The proximity of the proposed development to the boundary, combined with its proposed height, means that the loss of both sun and light to my office during lower sun conditions could be considerable and sustained throughout significant parts of the day.
- The neighbour wishes to address the issue of construction noise, as it is one of the concerns that will most directly affect their daily life throughout the construction period. Especially as the driveway (belonging to the neighbour) is not up to construction vehicles going constantly up and down.

Consultations:

None.

Summary of Issues:

- Design of the development.
- Impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area.
- Impact of the development on neighbouring properties.

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 as set out in 2 below.

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

The garden of Fulmar Cottage wraps around the rear of the south attached neighbour, which means that their first-floor dormer window looks straight into Fulmar Cottage's garden, and has little outdoor space of its own. There is also another cottage attached to the north, which Fulmar Cottage shares a vehicular access with.

At present each cottage has rear facing dormer windows and Fulmar and the cottage to the north have single storey flat roof extensions. The proposal is to essentially add another one and a half storey structure to the rear of Fulmar Cottage and connect the two with a large flat roof.

Due to the small scale of the original cottages, the proposed structure is taller and the overall bulk and mass of the extension in this context is not considered to represent good design. The proposed extension is overbearing on both neighbours and their amenity spaces.

There are other examples along the coast of larger extensions to the rear of traditional cottages, but they are all detached and have more space around them to prevent overbearing or overshadowing the neighbours. In this case the properties are attached with much less space around them.

The proposed extension, by virtue of its scale, mass and bulk and its position in proximity to adjoining properties, would be unacceptably overbearing and would detract significantly from the amenities that neighbouring residents might reasonably expect to enjoy, contrary to Policies GP8 and GP13 of the adopted Island Development Plan. Therefore this application is recommended for refusal.

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

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 considered in the assessment of this application. Where relevant the issues are considered in section 2 above.

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

The proposal would have no impact on Protected Buildings, Trees or Monuments or on SSS's.

Date: 29/05/2026