

# STATES OF JERSEY

**r**

## **DRAFT HIGH HEDGES (JERSEY) LAW 200- (P.51/2007): AMENDMENT**

---

**Lodged au Greffe on 19th June 2007  
by Deputy A.J.H. Maclean of St. Helier**

---

**STATES GREFFE**

PAGE 17, ARTICLE 7 –

*In Article 7, for paragraph (4) substitute the following paragraphs –*

- “(4) The Minister may not, by a remedial notice, require –
- (a) in the case of a hedge that existed before residential development was carried out on the land of the complainant, the hedge to be removed or to be reduced to a height of less than 4 metres above ground level; or
  - (b) in any other case, the hedge to be removed or to be reduced to a height of less than 2 metres above ground level.
- (5) If a hedge to which paragraph (4)(a) applies reaches the end of its life and is replaced, that paragraph shall apply to the replacement hedge as if it were the original hedge
- (6) The Minister may not, by a remedial notice, require anything to be done by a date that is sooner than 28 days after a copy of the notice has been sent to each person who is the owner or occupier of the neighbouring land.”

*Renumber paragraph (5) as paragraph (7).*

DEPUTY A.J.H. MACLEAN OF ST. HELIER

## **REPORT**

I support the principle of the Draft High Hedges (Jersey) Law 200- but invite members to consider this small amendment which seeks to address my perception of a minor flaw in the proposed law. This amendment will protect the value and enjoyment of a property where a high hedge pre-exists a new residential development built on adjoining land. In such circumstances it would discourage a developer from building too close to a boundary where loss of light or enjoyment of the 'new build' property might be deemed an issue. A purchaser of the 'new build' would only choose to acquire the property in the full knowledge of the boundary limitation where an existing hedge is *in situ*. The existing hedge would be limited to a maximum height of 4 metres in the above circumstances.

### **Financial and manpower statement**

There are no resource or manpower implications arising from this amendment.