

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 dwelling, remove hedge and erect retaining wall and fence to north and east boundaries, alterations to west boundary and associated works.

LOCATION: Site Adjacent to Tabor, Le Feugre, Ruelle De La Tour, Castel.

APPLICANT: Torode Developments

I refer to the application referred to below received as valid on 04/06/2026 regarding the above proposals as described more fully in the application and drawings referred to below.

Date of refusal of permission: 28/07/2026

Drawing Nos: Torode Architects - 6351-02E

Application Ref: FULL/2026/0791

Property Ref: D01454A000

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 would not make an efficient and effective use of land and would not provide an appropriate mix and type of development. The application fails to accord with Policy LC2: Housing in Local Centres and Policy GP8b): Design, and the Objectives of the Island Development Plan.
2. The proposal does not satisfactorily demonstrate that there would be no adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring property in respect of overshadowing, and would result in overlooking of such property. The application fails to accord with Policy GP8d): Design and GP9b): Sustainable Development.
3. The proposed development does not adequately take into account the use of energy and resources, failing to include provision for renewable energy, and fails to accord with Policy GP9: Sustainable Development.

OTHER REMARKS:-

Whilst not comprising a reason for refusal, if any further applications are to be made at this site it is recommended that:

- Site levels and/or a site section is provided demonstrating existing and proposed ground levels;
- Careful consideration is given to the treatment for the east boundary;
- Consultation is undertaken with the relevant utility companies to ensure that the infrastructure in the area can sustain a development of the nature proposed.

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/2026/0791
Property Ref: D01454A000
Valid date: 04/06/2026
Location: Site Adjacent to Tabor Le Feugre Ruelle De La Tour Ruelle De La Tour Castel Guernsey GY5 7TY
Proposal: Erect dwelling, remove hedge and erect retaining wall and fence to north and east boundaries, alterations to west boundary and associated works.
Applicant: Torode Developments

RECOMMENDATION - Refusal with Reasons:

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposed development would not make an efficient and effective use of land and would not provide an appropriate mix and type of development. The application fails to accord with Policy LC2: Housing in Local Centres and Policy GP8b): Design, and the Objectives of the Island Development Plan.
2. The proposal does not satisfactorily demonstrate that there would be no adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring property in respect of overshadowing, and would result in overlooking of such property. The application fails to accord with Policy GP8d): Design and GP9b): Sustainable Development.
3. The proposed development does not adequately take into account the use of energy and resources, failing to include provision for renewable energy, and fails to accord with Policy GP9: Sustainable Development.

INFORMATIVES

Whilst not comprising a reason for refusal, if any further applications are to be made at this site it is recommended that:

- Site levels and/or a site section is provided demonstrating existing and proposed ground levels;
 - Careful consideration is given to the treatment for the east boundary;
 - Consultation is undertaken with the relevant utility companies to ensure that the infrastructure in the area can sustain a development of the nature proposed.
-

OFFICER'S REPORT

Site Description:

The site is currently occupied by a garage to the northeast corner and is otherwise undeveloped, having formerly been used in association with an adjacent dwelling. The site is set to the west of and at a lower land level than the Rue des Renouards and to the east of, at a level with and accessed from, Le Feugre. The site is bounded by residential properties to the north and south, and across the road to the west, and at a higher level and facing across the site from the opposite side of the road to the east.

The site is within the Cobo Local Centre as designated in the Island Development Plan.

Relevant History:

Application site

FULL/2025/1774 Demolish building and erect 2 dwellings with associated works.
Approved 22/12/2025

Adjacent site to south-west

FULL/2024/1930 Erect dwelling and detached outbuilding, create vehicle access and associated works. Demolish section of east boundary to create vehicle access for existing dwelling (Tabor). Approved 14/01/2025

FULL/2025/0958 Variation to previously approved plans to erect dwelling and detached outbuilding, create vehicle access and associated works - Raise roof ridge height to create accommodation at 1st floor level, fenestration and material changes. Enlarge and material changes to detached garage/carport. Install oil tank and relocate. Widen vehicle access. Approved 08/08/2025

FULL/2025/1895 Variation to previously approved plans to erect dwelling and detached outbuilding, create vehicle access and associated works - Enlarge rooflight to south elevation and replace east (roadside) boundary wall with hedges. Approved 13/01/2026

Adjacent site to west (Tabor)

FULL/2026/0984 Demolish existing dwelling, erect 2 dwellings, alterations to roadside boundary to create vehicle accesses and associated works. Pending

Existing Use(s):

Residential

Brief Description of Development:

This application proposes to erect a single 2 bed dwelling, with recreation room, study and storage area at first floor and integral garage at ground floor. As part of the works it is proposed to remove the hedge to the north boundary and to erect a replacement retaining wall varying between 700mm-1250mm and topped with 1800mm or 900mm fencing, to install 1800mm fencing along the south boundary and 900mm fencing along

the east boundary and to erect a low wall and plant hedging along the roadside boundary.

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

Policy LC2: Housing in Local Centres

Policy GP1: Landscape Character and Open Land

Policy GP8: Design

Policy GP9: Sustainable Development

Policy IP6: Transport infrastructure and support facilities

Policy IP7: Private and Communal Car Parking

Policy IP9: Highway Safety, Accessibility and Capacity

Representations:

Ten letters of representation received (two from the same persons), raising the following points:

- The proposed development goes beyond the limited development allowed in Local Centres under policy;
- The proposed building does not address the housing requirement for smaller, specifically two bedroom, properties. The layout of the building is clearly designed to allow for additional accommodation to be created within the proposed envelope;
- The building size is not appropriate to the plot size, representing overdevelopment;
- The site is an important undeveloped gap site;
- The proposed building form fails to respect the existing scale and character of the surrounding properties, and would have a higher ridge height, resulting in a dominant and overbearing structure that is out of character with its surroundings;
- There is a covenant on adjoining property preventing increase in ridge height (no more than 6ft above Rue des Renouards) and protecting specific views, it is inequitable if this does not apply to development at the application site;
- Impacts on neighbour amenity:
 - o Neighbouring properties have private amenity space, balconies and habitable rooms adjacent to and facing towards the site;
 - o Overbearing – The adjacent site is higher than immediately adjoining property and close to other properties and the building is large and close to the boundaries;
 - o Overshadowing;
 - o Overlooking and loss of privacy, including views from windows, the excessive amount of first floor glazing, the driveway (associated with a reduction in height of the north boundary) and potential future loft conversion;
 - o Loss of views;
 - o The height of the north boundary is not clear. Whilst there are no objections, in principle, to replacement with a wall and fence, this should

be clearly detailed to ensure no overbearing of the neighbouring property (later letter noted height and did not re-reference this concern);

- Landscaping is being removed, particularly hedging with ecological and wildlife value, with no attempt to replace and introduction of hard landscape features. The proposals do not meet the requirements of Policy GP1;
- The level of engineering does not represent sustainable design and the provided information is not sufficient to address Policy GP9;
- Increased traffic from overdevelopment of this part of the Local Centre is impacting on the adjacent road network and, specifically, on this narrow road;
- Vehicles will not be able to access the proposed driveway without crossing/turning on adjacent property;
- An adjacent property has to pass over the land at the application site to access their garage and the proposed wall at the entrance is likely to impede that. It is suggested that the proposed layby be extended to the north boundary.
- There are concerns that the layby will be used by parking once the permission is implemented and the driveway opposite will continue to be used instead;
- Large vehicles constantly using the road is resulting in cracking and subsidence;
- Existing infrastructure is at capacity, the existing electricity cable is at maximum loading (no electric heating allowed in new build across road from this site, yet electric heating proposed under this application). Current developments on the road are having problems achieving suitable drainage, disposal of both foul and surface water unclear under this application. The road is not suitable for further services and upgrade, if possible, would require significant disruption, to neighbouring property and/or the only service road accessing properties to the south.

Consultations:

The States Archaeologist comments as follows:

The site lies approximately 80m south-east of the 'Cobo Longhouse', an early medieval building that was discovered and excavated in the late 1960s. There is a possibility that the medieval settlement extends as far as this site, and so I would be grateful if you could request that the developers contact me if anything of interest is discovered.

Summary of Issues:

Whether the proposal makes effective and efficient use of land;

Whether the proposal comprises an appropriate type of development, having regard to housing need;

Design and impact on the character of the area;

Impact on neighbour amenity;

Living environment of the proposed accommodation;

Parking, highways and access;

Sustainable development.

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).**

The policy framework for housing development on this site

The Island Development Plan sets out six overarching Plan objectives, of particular relevance to this application are Objective 1: Make the most effective and efficient use of land and natural resources and Objective 5: Ensure access to housing for all. These Objectives inform the Spatial and Detailed policies of the Plan.

The Spatial Policy is to concentrate the majority of new development in the Main Centres and Main Centre Outer Areas to maintain the vitality of these areas, and to make provision for limited development in the Local Centres to support and enhance them as sustainable settlements, and this is reflected in Policy S3: Local Centres, which sets out support for development which is of a scale which reflects a Centre's existing functions.

In terms of housing, Policy LC2: Housing in Local Centres sets out support for development providing that each proposal is of a scale that is appropriate to maintain or enhance the character and vitality of the particular Local Centre and will not negatively affect the vitality and viability of the Main Centres or otherwise undermine the spatial policy, and where able to accommodate a variety of dwellings, the proposals provide an appropriate mix and type of dwellings. The prefacing text to that policy expands on the latter point, noting that it will normally be expected that the mix and type of housing will reflect the demographic profile of households requiring housing, having regard to relevant published evidence in respect of housing need. The most recent published report is the States Strategic Housing Indicator 2024, which identifies a need for only 1- and 2-bedroom dwellings.

The prefacing text to Policy LC2 further identifies that residential development within Local Centres will be expected to make the most effective and efficient use of land, whilst respecting the character of the Local Centre concerned. This direction is reinforced through the provisions of Policy GP8: Design.

The principle of housing development at this site

This application follows a previous approval for 2no 2 double bed dwellings at the site. That permission remains extant. The approximate floor area of each approved unit was 115sqm (this is approximate as the approved plans did not show the 1.5m height line at first floor level, therefore it is not possible to accurately measure the usable first floor area for each unit). The minimum floor space requirement for a 4-person dwelling under the Guernsey Technical Standards is 53sqm. The guidance set out in the DCLG Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard, published on the Authority website, recommends a minimum internal floor area of 79sqm. The internal

floor area of the approved dwellings was therefore generous for the size of unit approved.

The current application seeks to reduce the number of dwellings at the site from two to one, with only a 20sqm reduction in footprint, whilst retaining the 1.5 storey form. Notwithstanding the comparable size of the building, the submitted information states that the single dwelling proposed would have only two double bedrooms.

The application does not provide any justification for the reduction in the number of units at the site.

The internal floor space of the dwelling proposed under this application is 113sqm at ground floor, with an additional 43sqm integral garage and a further approximately 43sqm of habitable space at first floor, 19sqm of storage and a large void over part of the ground floor accommodation, including a utility and bathroom. The floor space of the building far exceeds the minimum standards for a 2 bed dwellinghouse and does not comprise an efficient or, in some respects, functional, layout.

As set out above, it has been established through the grant of permission that the site has capacity for the construction of 2 no 2 bed dwellings. The current proposal comprises an unjustified reduction in the number of units which can demonstrably be constructed at the site, and proposes an inefficient floor space and layout which would not address current housing requirements. The proposal cannot therefore be considered to provide an appropriate mix and type of development or to comprise an efficient and effective use of land.

The proposal would therefore fail to accord with Policy LC2b), the prefacing text to that policy, and Policy GP8b).

On this basis there is no policy gateway to consider this development and in light of the Guernsey Court of Appeal judgement in *The Island Development Committee v Portholme* [2002] (Civil 320), the application must be refused and there is no need to consider the proposal further. For completeness, the remaining policy considerations are however set out below.

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

The application site is located within an area of, predominantly residential, development, stepped up the hillside from the west to the east. Built form generally takes a single or 1.5 storey form, of varied character. The proposed development would be visible in short views from the roads immediately to the east and west. In longer views the proposed building would be of limited impact, screened by the topography and surrounding development, however in any such views the building would be read within the surrounding stepped development.

The ridge height of the proposed building, at 5.9m, and width across the site, is as previously approved. The proposed development sets the building closer to the rear (east) boundary (1-2m from that boundary, relative to the previous 4-5m). The depth

across the gable of the building is reduced from 10.9m to 9m, however a forward (west) projecting gable extends the built form along the north boundary to 13.8m and a further forward-facing gable increases the bulk of the building adjacent to the southern boundary. Overall therefore, whilst the proposed building would be of a similar height to that previously approved, the inclusion of forward facing and projecting gables adds to the overall bulk and massing of the building.

In terms of the height of the proposed building, the ridge height and 1.5 storey approach is comparable with those of surrounding buildings. The Digimap Unique Building Identifier shows that ridge heights of the immediately surrounding buildings vary, with Sante to the north at 4.3m, Abilene to the south at 5.56m and Couer de Cobo to the east at 6.84m. Due to the topography of the area, the ridge heights however stagger up the hillside to the east, and the ridges of the dwellings to the east are correspondingly higher relative to the application site. Based on current spot height data, it appears that the ridge of the proposed dwelling would sit higher than that of Sante, however would be lower than that of Abilene and of the dwellings to the east. The height of the proposed building would therefore sit appropriately within the tiered surrounding development. It is not however clear from the submitted plans how site levels would be managed to achieve a level base or, therefore, at what elevation that base would be. Given the conclusion in respect of the principle of the development above, it is not considered reasonable to require such information as part of the current application, however should there be any resubmission such details would be expected as part of the application.

Measuring from the submitted plans, it appears that the ridge height would be c4.5m above the height of Rue des Renouards. It has been raised in representation that there are legal constraints on the height of adjacent buildings, which would not allow an increase in height of those buildings in a similar manner. This is not however a planning constraint and it has not been suggested or shown that any such constraints are in place at the application site. It would not therefore be reasonable, or required, to apply the limitations of those constraints at the application site, nor could the Authority initiate the introduction of any such constraint at the application site. The proposal can only be considered against the material planning considerations and relevant planning policies, as set out within this application.

It is acknowledged that, whilst the ridge height of the building may be compatible with surrounding development, the proposal would comprise an increase in bulk and massing over both the proposed development and surrounding built form. It is not however considered that such an increase, or the design approach taken, would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area, having regard to the elements which make up that character.

The alterations to the west roadside boundary would enhance the area, and there is no objection to the fencing proposed to the north and south boundaries. The replacement of the east boundary hedging with fencing, along the edge of Rue des Renouards would however be out of character with surrounding roadside boundary treatments and, were the application recommended for approval, either replacement with hedging or a wall would be sought.

The width of the proposed access is generous but taking into account the narrow width of the lane and open fronted nature of the site at present, this element of the proposal would not have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.

On the basis of the submitted plans, the general size, appearance, composition and materials of the proposed dwelling are considered likely to achieve an appropriate standard of design, having regard to Policy GP8, and, given the character of the area and general acceptability of the proposals, it is not considered necessary to require additional ameliorating landscaping. Confirmation of ground works/site levels would however be required to reinforce this conclusion. Alteration would also be required to the proposed east boundary treatment to protect the character of the area.

In terms of ecological value, the existing use of the site is for residential purposes and the proposal would not comprise a change of use, therefore the Strategy for Nature would not be relevant. The site as existing is used for parking and the majority of the site is either gravelled or bare earth, with limited areas of short grass and hedging along the north and east boundaries. The majority of the site was unclassified under the 2018 Habitat Survey, with the southerly section designated as Amenity Grassland. The current proposal would retain a similar amount of grassed area. Whilst the proposal would result in a net loss of hedging, and it is unfortunate to lose such planting, the site represents a small and isolated area, detached from any areas of ecological significance. Furthermore, the site is not located within an open landscape but surrounded by development and the proposal would not therefore conflict with the requirements of Policy GP1. The overall ecological impact of the proposals would not therefore be sufficient to warrant requirement of greater ecological offset, nor would there be a policy basis for such requirement.

In terms of providing an important gap site, the spacing of development in this area varies and the development of the application site would be consistent with the surrounding density. Whilst visible from the immediately adjacent roads, this is only for a limited section of these roads and limits any potential value the site could have in this respect.

The impact of the development on the amenity of people living in the area

The proposed building would extend the full width of the site (set in 1m from the north and south boundaries), as previously approved, would be of comparable ridge height to the approved building and would omit the east facing dormers. The building would however be set further back on the site and would project further forward along the north boundary, whilst also incorporating a glazed gable and Juliet balcony to the west elevation.

In terms of the property to the north, the proposed building would be likely to result in increased impact over that previously approved, both in terms of overbearing and overshadowing. The layout of the adjacent property, with parking and garaging located immediately adjacent to the boundary, is likely to provide some mitigation of these

impacts however, to enable a full assessment of the extent of impact, a shadow analysis would be required. Given the conclusion in respect of the principle of the development above, it is not considered reasonable to require such information as part of the current application, however should there be any resubmission an analysis would be expected as part of the application.

The application proposes the removal of the existing hedge along the north boundary of the site, and replacement with a retaining wall (tapering up from ground level at the front of the property to 1.25m to the rear) and fence (1.8m high except for the front 2no panels which would be 900mm). The cumulative height of the wall and fence would be 3.05m at the rear of the site, reducing to 2.5m in the centre of the boundary (approximately level with the front of the garage on the adjoining property) down to 900mm at the front of the site. The highest point of the boundary would be no higher, and therefore no more overbearing, than the existing boundary treatment, and would not generate greater overshadowing. The proposed treatment would also prevent any overlooking of the neighbouring property from ground floor windows.

In terms of overlooking from the first-floor fenestration, the north facing first floor study window was omitted by the agent during the course of consideration of the application. The proposal however retains north facing roof lights facing towards the primary amenity space associated with the adjoining property. These rooflights do not appear to be high level and would therefore give rise to overlooking of the adjacent property. In respect of the Juliet balcony proposed to the west elevation, the position of that window and the slight overhang of the roof would prevent obscure views into the amenity space of the adjoining property.

Concerns have been raised in representation regarding additional overlooking of both the adjoining house and garden of the property to the north from the driveway at the application site and from the adjacent road, as a result of the alterations to the north boundary and, in particular, the reduction in height of the first two fencing panels. The adjacent property to the north however has a high wall along the north side of the driveway, which, despite stepping down in height towards the house, obscures views into the front garden area from the road. Whilst the windows in the house itself are visible from the road, the intervening distance is such as to prevent any significant visibility into the associated rooms. The removal of the hedging along the north boundary of the application site and replacement as proposed would not significantly alter the extent of visibility into the adjacent property.

In terms of the property to the south, the relative orientation would prevent any shading of that property. The construction of a dwelling so close to the intervening boundary would inevitably give rise to some overbearing however, taking into account the position of the new build relative to the dwelling on the adjacent property and the layout of that property, it is not considered that this would be so significant as to warrant objection to the application. The proposed boundary treatment would prevent overlooking from the single ground floor window proposed in the facing elevation of the new dwelling, and the proposed rooflight would be high level, above a stair well.

In terms of the properties to the east, the main building line of the dwellings on those properties is set c9m back from the eastern boundary of the application site, although it is noted there is a forward projecting extension and terrace on the property to the immediate east of the site, which comes to within 7m of the boundary. The dwellings are set approximately 1m above road level and all, especially that known as Coeur de Cobo, include glazing in the facing elevation. The Rue des Renouards is located between the properties and the application site. As shown on the submitted plans, the eaves height of the proposed dwelling would be at approximately ground floor level of the adjacent dwellings, and the roof would then extend above that point, away from the adjacent dwellings, to a height approximately 3m above eaves level. Taking into account the relative positions of the adjacent properties, whilst the proposal would comprise an obvious change when viewed from those properties, it is not considered to result in a level of overbearing or loss of outlook as would comprise a reason for refusal of the application. Whilst there may be some loss of private views, such views are not protected under planning law and this cannot form a material consideration in determining the application. Equally, any overshadowing is unlikely to be of an extent which would significantly compromise the amenity of the adjacent properties, however this would be further assessed upon provision of the shadow analysis identified above.

During the course of consideration of the application, the agent introduced a new rooflight to the east roofslope. Taking into account the size of the rooflight, position relative to surrounding property and distance to facing dwellings, this would not however give rise to any unacceptable interface. Otherwise no fenestration is proposed at first floor level to the east elevation. That proposed at ground floor would be below the level of the road and would not give rise to any overlooking.

In respect of the property to the west, there is limited fenestration facing towards the application site within the existing dwelling and the private amenity space associated with that property is set away from the application site, on the west side of the dwelling. The proposed building would be set at sufficient distance to prevent any significant overbearing or overshadowing of that property and, although the proposal would include the creation of first floor fenestration (albeit that, as proposed, the glazed gable would serve a void), there would be no significant overlooking.

It is noted that there is a current application for development of this site, proposing to demolish the existing dwelling and construct two new dwellings. This application has not yet been determined and significant weight cannot therefore be attributed to the proposed plans. It is however noted that, were the application to be approved, sufficient distance would be retained to prevent any adverse impacts on the proposed units.

In light of the above, the proposal does not satisfactorily demonstrate that there would be no adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring property in respect of overshadowing, and would result in overlooking. The proposal does not therefore meet the terms of Policy GP8d) or GP9b).

Whether the development would result in a satisfactory living environment for the occupiers of the new dwellings

As noted above, the proposed dwelling would substantially exceed the Guernsey Technical Standards minimum internal space standards and the UK's best practice minimum internal space standards which are published on the Authority's website. Whilst aspect from the rear of the building would be poor, those rooms are bedrooms, bathrooms and a utility, and the primary living space would benefit from good aspect to the west. The dwelling would have an adequate amenity space and would also benefit from access to other public open space within the area, such as Cobo Beach and the Guet. In terms of accessibility, the primary accommodation is arranged over the ground floor, with appropriate access and circulation. Overall, the proposal would provide a satisfactory quality of residential environment for future occupiers, in accordance with Policy GP8d) & f).

Other Matters

There are no set standards for car parking within Local Centres. The proposed dwelling would have ample on-site car parking and there would be scope for bicycle storage within the integral garage. Whilst it is acknowledged that parking of vehicles could occur on the proposed layby, the provision of that layby is proposed by the applicant and is not a planning requirement. There would be no justification under planning law to require or limit the use of that layby.

The proposed access would provide adequate sightlines and the enclosure of the site frontage would offer enhancements to the character of the area. Whilst there is likely to be a requirement for some manoeuvring on the adjacent road to access/egress the site, given the nature of that road this is not considered to present a significant road safety risk. It is noted that the proposed boundary enclosure may limit the ability of neighbours to use the land to access their property, however there is no indication that this is a legal right of way and there would therefore be no requirement for the applicant to provide such access rights, nor would it be reasonable for the Authority to require alterations to the Plans to address this. Should a right of way exist, the grant of planning permission is without prejudice to third party rights and privileges and any such right of way would have to be respected.

It was previously accepted that the modest intensification of use of the site associated with two dwellings was unlikely to result in any significant road safety or traffic management concerns, and this would be the case for the reduced number of dwellings now proposed.

The proposal accords with Policies IP6: Transport Infrastructure and Support Facilities, IP7: Private and Communal Car Parking and IP9: Highway Safety, Accessibility and Capacity.

Information has been submitted to demonstrate that the design has taken into account the use of energy and resources, on a par with that accepted for the previous permission. The proposal does not however include the provision of solar panels, which has been a requirement for all such new development to meet the requirements of Policy GP9 since May 2026.

Concerns have been raised in representation regarding the ability for existing infrastructure in the immediate area, particularly electricity, surface water and foul drainage, to be able to service the proposed development. In particular it is advised in those letters that the adjacent development currently under construction to the south-west has had to be revised due to capacity constraints and it is further advised that upgrade is likely to be impractical. These are matters that do not generally form part of the material consideration of a planning application, it being the responsibility of a developer to ensure all necessary infrastructure is available, or able to be upgraded. This report would however highlight these issues as matters to be addressed within a submission should any further application come forward on this site.

Conclusion

It has been established through the grant of permission that the application site has capacity for the construction of 2 no 2 bed dwellings. No justification has been provided for the reduction in the number of units proposed under this application, and the proposed floor space for the new dwelling far exceeds the requirements of the Guernsey Technical Standards for the stated unit size. The proposal therefore comprises an unjustified reduction of units and a form of development which would not address current housing requirements. The proposal cannot therefore be considered to provide an appropriate mix and type of development or an efficient and effective use of land and would fail to accord with Policy LC2b): Housing in Local Centres, the prefacing text to that policy, and Policy GP8b): Design.

There is insufficient information to fully assess the impact of the proposal on the adjacent property to the north in terms of overshadowing, and the rooflights proposed to that elevation would overlook that property. The proposal would therefore have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, and would fail to accord with Policy GP8d): Design and GP9b): Sustainable Development.

The proposed development does not include solar panels and does not therefore adequately take into account the use of energy and resources, failing to include provision for renewable energy, and does not meet the terms of Policy GP9a): Sustainable Development.

In light of the above, it is recommended that the application be refused.

Whilst not comprising a reason for refusal, if any further applications are to be made at this site it is recommended that:

- Site levels and/or a site section is provided demonstrating existing and proposed ground levels;
- Careful consideration is given to the treatment for the east boundary;
- Consultation is undertaken with the relevant utility companies to ensure that the infrastructure in the area can sustain a development of the nature proposed.

Date: 28/07/2026

