

MINUTES

Land Development Control Authority Meeting

Date : Thursday, 02 April 2026
Time : 10 am
Venue : The St Helena Community College Main Hall, Jamestown

Present	Mrs Ethel Yon OBE	Chairperson
	Mr Lawson Henry	Deputy Chairperson
	Mr Gavin George	Member
	Mr Ian Gough	Member
	Mr Ronald Scanes	Member
	Mr Mark Brooks	Member
	Ms Patricia Coyle	Head of Planning & Building Control (HoP&BC)/Chief Planning Officer (CPO)
	Miss Petra Joshua	Planning Officer (PO)
	Mrs Karen Isaac	Secretary
Apologies	Mr Gerald Yon	Member

In attendance:

Three members of the public were in attendance, including the Applicant and the Objector.

1. Attendance and Welcome

The Chairperson welcomed all present and expressed appreciation for their attendance. She thanked Member, Mr Lawson Henry, for deputising for her at the meeting held on 5 March 2026.

2. Declarations of Interest

Member, Mr Mark Brooks declared an interest in item 7.2 – Application 2026/06 as he was involved in the gifting in his capacity as Minister at that time. When the item is heard the Member could either leave the table or remain, but not to participate in any discussion relating to the item. The matter with regard to conflict of interest was noted to which the Chairperson advised that she would prepare a policy in readiness for the next scheduled LDCA meeting on 7 May 2026.

3. Confirmation of Minutes of 5 March 2026

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2026 were confirmed and signed by the Deputy Chairperson subject to the word “Chief” to be inserted between the words “Deputy” and “Secretary” on page 4 under Stakeholder Consultation Feedback. The Deputy Chair chaired this meeting due to the Chairperson being engaged in another statutory function.

4. Matters Arising from Minutes of 5 March 2026

Unauthorised Development - Application 2025/50: Clayton Vanguard, Sandy Bay

The CPO advised that she had drafted a letter to Mr Vanguard asking him to let Planning have as soon as possible, the further information previously requested of him as this was still outstanding. The CPO advised that she would give Mr Vanguard for a definitive response.

ACTION: PO/CPO

Unauthorised development - Application 2025/94: Adrian John, Terrace Knoll

The Application was deferred at the meeting of 5 March 2026 pending further information from the Applicant, specifically with regard to the identification of toilets within the proposal. It was noted that the Draughtsman is currently off-island, but he would be reminded on his return. To be followed up.

At this point in time, the Chairperson advised that any members of the public present who could not hear the proceedings should raise their hand so the issue could be addressed.

ACTION: CPO

Retrospective Application: Mark Corker - New Bridge, Jamestown

The CPO advised that an Application had now been submitted. Next course of action would be for the Application to be brought to LDCA.

ACTION: CPO

Works undertaken at St Paul's, near Phillip John's Shop

The CPO advised that submission of documents are still awaited. It was noted however that the Draughtsman is currently off island. A Notice to Apply had not been issued at this time. To be followed up.

ACTION: CPO

Stakeholder Consultation Feedback

It was noted that the Deputy Chief Secretary had written to Portfolio Directors and other consultees. The Chair noted some improvement in responses and welcomed continued progress. One member stressed that pressure should be maintained, as stakeholders were ineffective if they did not respond. If responses continued to decline, the Chair would raise the issue with the Chief Secretary/Head of the Public Service, as this was not an acceptable position for the Authority.

The Chair then referred to comments on Application 2025/109 (Safety Rails adjacent to the Run, opposite Solomon's Garage), approved on 5 March 2026. The comments raised safety concerns and noted delays caused by the Application being considered by the LDCA rather than under Delegated Powers. The Chair advised however that the action taken had been in accordance with the Land Planning Legislation. The CPO advised that she would review and amend the Schedule of Delegation in light of the concerns and report back to a future meeting of the LDCA.

ACTION: CPO

5. Building Control Activities

The Authority was provided with a report on Building Control Activities for the month of February 2026 for their information.

6. Current Planning Applications

The Authority was provided with an updated report on current Planning Applications. It was noted that there were 23 Applications awaiting determination: 1 on hold for Applicant to submit further details, 16 to be assessed, 1 awaiting further information and 4 in the advertising stage and 1 waiting to be advertised.

The CPO highlighted that the Planning Section is working with one Officer short and, while a Planning Consultant is doing some work, there are delays in processing Development Applications and other Planning work. The Chairperson felt however that Planning was doing what they really could, for which she expressed appreciation.

7. Applications for LDCA Determination

Application 2026/05: Change of Use and Alterations for proposed New Motorcycle Showroom, Half Tree Hollow: Triple Finance Ltd, C/o Mr Derek Pedley

The CPO presented and gave an outline of the Application with a recommendation for approval subject to eight Conditions as listed in the Handling Report.

The site is designated within the Intermediate Zone and the Heritage Coast Historic Conservation Area.

The relevant policies applicable in the assessment are the Intermediate Zone, Built Heritage, Employment Premises, Roads and Transport.

In assessing, the proposed Change of Use and associated alterations were considered acceptable, in line with the LDCP 2012 and the Policies as listed.

There was one Representation. Mr Andrew Pearce spoke in support of his Representation.

In considering, Members raised concerns about noise mitigation and community impact, given the site's location within a Business Park. While it was expected that motor bike servicing would take place with doors closed, potentially secured by condition, this was not confirmed in the report. Although a noise mitigation strategy was referenced, no details were provided, and Members stressed the need to review it due to the change of use. Concerns were expressed about noise from motorcycle servicing, particularly revving, and the potential impact on neighbouring Offices, Shops, and public-facing premises.

Members questioned the suitability of a motorcycle showroom and servicing use within the business park due to potential noise impacts on neighbouring businesses. While the Application stated that engines would not run during servicing, Members sought clarification on whether any testing or revving would occur on site. Although operating hours were acceptable and Environmental Health raised no objections, Members noted the absence of specific noise control conditions including a set Decibel level. The CPO indicated that there were no objections from Environmental Health and that it would be difficult to apply a Decibel level as motorbikes are either off (0 dBA) or on (not known dBA level) and to identify a dB level, which might be between the two would be difficult to meet or enforce outside of applying a condition requiring no testing/revving completely (0 dBA). Members considered that without clear and enforceable mitigation, the use may be inappropriate if engines were to be run on site. It was noted that vehicle operation is binary, with no emissions or engine noise if engines are not started.

The Applicant's submission confirmed that vehicles would not be started or tested inside the building. Members agreed that numerical operating limits could be counterproductive, as they might imply that engine use was acceptable. Instead, Members supported a condition prohibiting the starting or testing of vehicles indoors. It was noted that additional soundproofing could further mitigate any residual noise, with mitigation measures secured by condition and enforced as required. The development must operate strictly in accordance with the submitted Report. Operating hours and vehicle numbers were not the primary concern.

Concerns about blocked pathways were addressed, noting that the Applicant occupies the entire single-unit building. Although there are two doors, there was no shared internal access and no restriction on access to other units.

Members were satisfied that pedestrian access would not be obstructed and that access arrangements posed no safety concerns. The proposal involves a change of use for servicing within a commercial area of Offices and Salons. No objections were received from neighbouring Businesses, Residents, or Environmental Health, which accepted that the proposed measures addressed environmental and safety issues.

Servicing is proposed at the rear (south) of the unit via double doors. Members queried vehicle access due to level changes between the rear road and the building, noting that the plans did not clearly demonstrate safe loading arrangements. While it was assumed the Applicant had considered this, concerns were acknowledged regarding potential blocking and safety.

Subject to conditions controlling vehicle operation and securing mitigation measures, Members considered the issues to be manageable. Discussion focused on rear access and layout, with Officers confirming no ramp is proposed and access is intended from the front. Members requested that the Applicant's mitigation commitments be secured by a condition.

Concerns were raised about a front (western) element projecting beyond the main building line with the public highway. Members preferred any extension to remain flush, though Officers advised refusal would require clear planning grounds. It was noted that building lines within the block are inconsistent, with limited overall uniformity. Members therefore considered whether the partial front extension would result in a sufficiently harmful visual impact to justify refusal.

Members acknowledged the Applicant's right to pursue development and noted that motivation was not a material planning consideration. The main concern related to the impact of the proposal on the building's visual coherence and its relationship with adjoining properties. Members debated whether this issue alone would justify refusal, particularly at appeal, given existing variation along the street and the modest scale of the extension.

The central question was whether the lack of uniformity would result in demonstrable planning harm. While concerns were raised that the proposal appeared as an add-on rather than integrated with the main building, it was generally felt that refusal on design grounds could be difficult to defend. Members also noted the submitted drawings lacked clarity due to scale. Noise was identified as a key issue, and the CPO said she would draft an appropriate condition for Members to review. Some Members felt unable to approve the scheme as submitted, and it was

agreed to seek revised proposals that better align with the main frontage. It was noted that there was sufficient time for amendments ahead of the Applicant's intended October 2026 opening.

It was confirmed that Mr Pedley had been invited to attend the meeting but no response had been received.

Resolution: The Application was deferred for the Applicant to submit further information as requested by LDCA and for the CPO to draft an additional condition in relation to Noise Mitigation measures.

ACTION: CPO

Application 2026/06: New Cemetery Extension, near the Ex Radio Station/St Paul's Cathedral: Bishop Dale Bowers

The CPO presented and gave an outline of the Application together with background information with a recommendation for approval subject to three Conditions as listed in the Handling Report.

The site is located within the Intermediate Zone and the designated St Pauls Comprehensive Development Area. It lies to the south and east of St Paul's Cathedral, a Grade I listed building, and adjacent to St Paul's Vicarage, a Grade III listed building. The site measures approximately one acre and extends from the existing cemetery boundary to the main road to the east, with existing vehicle access from the north.

An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening opinion for the proposed cemetery extension was adopted in August last year and the conclusion was that a full EIA Assessment was not required to be submitted with the Development Application.

The relevant policies applicable in the assessment are the Intermediate Zone, Social Infrastructure, Built Heritage, Roads and Transport and Environment Impact Assessment requirements.

In assessing, it was considered that the proposal would meet the Policies, taking into account that material considerations do have to be considered which point to the CDA not being able to fulfil its original intentions in the location, such that the proposal could be supported. The layout of the site and details would utilise the landscape and natural appearance of the area to keep any visual impact of the use to a minimal.

Members discussed whether the perimeter of the Graveyard would require fencing. It was confirmed that no additional fencing is currently required, as the site falls within an existing boundary. While there is some existing fencing in the wider area, there is no fencing proposed along the application site boundary at present. Members felt that specific reference to the fencing should be added to Condition 3 (requiring that such items are the subject of appropriate

approval). It was noted that if adjacent land to the south is to be used for grazing, fencing might also need to be installed in future to prevent animals from wandering.

Members noted and were sympathetic to the needs of burial attendance but sought clarification on access arrangements where it was confirmed that access to the proposed Graveyard extension would continue via the existing road serving the upper part of the existing Graveyard, with a small car park already in place. No new access routes are proposed. The extension forms only part of the wider CDA site which may come forward for a further Cemetery extension in future (subject to a separate Development Application being submitted and approved).

Resolution: The Application was approved as recommended in the Handling Report subject to specific reference being made to fencing in Condition 3. Decision Notice to then issue.

Application 2026/08: Construction of a Conservatory and Change in Roof Profile, near St Marys Church, the Briars: Evelyn Yon, C/o Ms Cassandra Peters

The PO presented and gave an outline of the Application with a recommendation for approval subject to eight Conditions as listed in the Handling Report.

The site is located within the Intermediate Zone and part of the parcel sits within the Briars Conservation Area, but it is not within the area of the proposed development.

The relevant policies applicable in the assessment are the Intermediate Zone, Water, Sewage, Storm and Drainage.

In assessing, the proposal could be supported as it had no adverse effect on the amenity or aesthetic of the immediate area and complied with the policies as listed.

It was noted that the roof colour policy permits either red or grey. Clarification was sought on whether one option should be preferred. It was acknowledged that while grey is commonly favoured, the surrounding properties predominantly feature red and green roofs, and the current roof is red.

Members discussed whether a recommendation should be made for the roof to remain red in order to better integrate with the surrounding area. It was agreed that while such a recommendation could be included, it should not be imposed as a condition, as the formal condition should remain aligned with the existing roof colour policy.

It was confirmed that the standard approach is to attach a condition referencing the Policy, which sets out the approved colour options within scope.

A recommendation could however be made that the roof remains red to reflect the surrounding area, but this would not be enforced as a condition. The condition would reference the approved roof colour Policy only.

No further concerns were raised.

Resolution: Approved with conditions as recommended in the Handling Report. Decision Notice to issue.

Application 2025/10: Construction of a Four Bedroom Dwelling, Bottom Woods CDA: Phanual Shangwa

The CPO presented and gave an outline of the Application with a recommendation for approval subject to nine Conditions as listed in the Handling Report. The CPO apologised as the location should have read Bottom Woods CDA and not Longwood.

The site is designated within the Intermediate Zone and Comprehensive Development Area (CDA) and has no Conservation Area restrictions.

The relevant policies applicable in the assessment are the Intermediate Zone, Housing, Water, Sewage, Storm and Drainage, Roads and Transport

In assessing, the proposed development was considered to accord with the policies as stated and was acceptable.

The Authority did not have any issues and approved the Application.

Resolution: Approved with conditions as recommended in the Handling Report. Decision Notice to issue.

Application 2025/20: Change of Use of Land from Forestry to Use Class B2 – General Industrial Use and Siting of Two Containers for use as Workshop and Storage, Scotland (former Lumber Yard to old Sawmill): Phil Constantine, C/o Theo Meij

The PO presented and gave an outline of the Application with a recommendation for approval subject to eight Conditions as listed in the Handling Report.

The site is designated within the Green Heartland and has no Conservation area restrictions.

The relevant policies applicable in the assessment are the Green Heartland, Employment Premises, Policy on Siting and Use of Containers – LDCP Appendix 6, Road and Transport.

In assessing, the proposal could be supported as it had no significant adverse effect on the amenity or aesthetic of the immediate area.

The Authority did not have any issues and approved the Application.

Resolution: Approved with conditions as recommended in the Handling Report. Decision Notice to issue.

8. Discharge of Planning Conditions by CPO:

Application 2025/54 (DoC's 3 and 4)

- Requested : Discharge of Conditions Three and Four
- Proposal : Condition Three - for the submission of Fencing Details and Condition Four – for submission of a Landscaping Scheme to be approved by the Chief Planning Officer on behalf of the Land Development Control Authority.

- Location : Harford Primary School, Longwood
- Applicant : Education, Skills and Employment Portfolio, SHG, C/o Julian Benjamin
- Official : Patricia Coyle, CPO
- Approved : 18 March 2026

9. Strategic Planning Matters – CPO Feedback

Jamestown Conservation Management Plan

It was noted that, as discussed at the previous meeting, there had been no further progress. It was still understood that the Commonwealth Heritage Forum would be on island in June 2026.

Members would be informed in due course once further information becomes available.

ACTION: CPO

Land Development Control Plan Review

The CPO reported that it was expected that this would be brought to LDCA but would have to go first to the Portfolio Director, ENRP and ENRP and Economic Development Minister. The CPO would keep members updated on progress.

ACTION: CPO

9. Any Other Business

Member of the Public unable to hear Officers clearly

It was confirmed that the revised U-Shaped layout was acceptable. It was noted that hearing had improved.

Report Back from Executive Committee in Planning (ECiP)

The CPO reported that all 3 outstanding Development Applications were decided at the recent ECiP meeting and the Decision Notices had been issued. All the decisions were in line with the LDCA recommendations, including one Refusal and a Temporary consent.

CPO: Overseas Leave

The CPO advised that she would be on overseas leave in June for three weeks but would be here for the meeting scheduled for 4 June. She also advised that while she would return before the July LDCA meeting, it would mean that she would not be available to sign off reports in the usual timescales/deadlines for the July LDCA meeting. The Senior Planning Officer (currently on secondment) had agreed to step in to undertake CPO/Head of Service duties for a maximum of 8 hours a week (i.e., one day per week or one or two hours each day) but it was not clear if he would have time to draft or clear reports for the July meeting. While a Planning Consultant covers some Report work, the CPO expressed her concern regarding current reduced staffing levels and potential further delays due to her absence.

The Chair indicated that the CPO is entitled to take annual leave. No indication was given whether the July LDCA Meeting would not go ahead.

Building Control Approval – Barn View

One Member advised that building control approval had been given for the Barn View HMO proposal. The Chairperson said she was pleased for that.

12. Next Meeting:

The next meeting is scheduled for 7th May 2026.

There were no further business for discussion. Members were thanked for their attendance and the meeting closed at 11.55 Hrs.

Chairperson to the LDCA

Date