

STATES OF JERSEY

r

FIELDS 203, 204 (PART) AND 252, RUE DE JAMBART, ST. CLEMENT: RESTRICTION OF DEVELOPMENT (P.152/2003) – COMMENTS

**Presented to the States on 23rd December 2003
by the Environment and Public Services Committee**

STATES GREFFE

COMMENTS

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report is in response to Report and Proposition, P.152/2003 - Fields 203, 204 (part) and 252, Rue de Jambart, St. Clement: Restriction of Development, lodged au Greffe on 4th November 2003 by Deputy G.C.L. Baudains of St. Clement.
- 1.2 In responding to the proposition, the Environment and Public Services Committee is mindful that a planning application was submitted on 24th September 2003 and is currently being held in abeyance pending the outcome of this debate. The Environment and Public Services Committee are charged with determining the application under the Island Planning (Jersey) Law 1965 and in so doing will have regard to the decision of the States arising from P.152/2003. However, the Committee would remind members that it has the responsibility under the Island Planning Law to determine the application.
- 1.3 The proposition requests the States to refer to their Act dated 10th July 2002 in which they agreed to rezone Fields 203, 204 (part) and 252, Rue de Jambart, St. Clement, for Category A Housing and to request the Environment and Public Services Committee –
- to limit development on the said site to a maximum of 45 x 3-bedroom homes (or their equivalent) and ensure adequate resident on-site parking; and
 - to ensure that adequate extra parking is provided on the site, or nearby, to cater for visitors to St. Clement Parish Church and the Caldwell Hall.

2 Island Plan Debate

- 2.1 The States are reminded of the Island Plan debate and the representation made then by Deputy Gerard Baudains, in his amendment P.69/2002, which requested the States to exclude 3 sites from being rezoned in St. Clement, including this site.
- 2.3 The amendment to exclude the sites was defeated by a majority vote and the site zoned for Category A dwellings, with an indicative yield of 75 x 3-bedroom homes.

3 Density

- 3.1 In July 2001 the Consultation Draft of the Island Plan was published for public consultation. However an error appeared in the document which stated that the area was only 3.8 acres and thus capable of being developed for only 45 x 3-bedroom dwellings. The site area had been miscalculated and is 5.3 acres in extent. Following the public consultation, this error was identified the area and the adjusted yield of the site for 75 x 3-bedroom dwellings were correctly referred to in the final draft of the plan and subsequently approved.
- 3.2 The density for the proposed development reflects the requirement of the Island Plan which calls for an average density of 70 habitable rooms per acre (14 dwellings per acre) be achieved on the zoned sites. This density reflects the sustainable policies of the Island Plan which acknowledge the finite nature of the Island's land resources and the requirement to use land as efficiently as possible. However, it is also a requirement that the design of these new developments ensure that the amenities of existing residents and the residents of the development itself are not unduly compromised and this can be achieved through the application of sound design principles. The density is therefore reasonable for this type of development and the Committee is confident that this yield can be accommodated satisfactorily on this site.
- 3.3 The density proposed in Deputy Baudains proposition would not fulfil the sustainable requirements of the Island Plan and would necessitate further encroachment into the countryside as more land would need to be released to satisfy the resulting shortfall of homes.

4 Rural setting

- 4.1 The rezoning of agricultural land for housing is a decision which has never been taken lightly. It is a fact that development by its very nature, changes the character of an area and the States were clearly aware of this when the land was rezoned during the Island Plan debate.
- 4.2 The Agriculture and Fisheries Committee were also consulted at an early stage in the site investigation process and confirmed that the loss of this land to agriculture would be negligible and were not opposed to the release of the land for residential purposes.

5 Traffic

- 5.1 The approved Island Plan recognised that access to this site via Rue de Jambart would not be acceptable given the poor visibility at the 'black spot' junction with the St. Clement Inner Road (opposite St. Clement's Church). It identified that the new development could either be accessed off the inner road or provide the opportunity for a new link road from Rue de Jambart to the St. Clement Inner Road. This matter is the subject of discussion with the Parish Roads Committee and the Public Services Highways Section as part of the current application.
- 5.2 The car parking for the Church, if it is a problem, will be looked at as part of the planning application process. The access to the development is likely to prevent no more than 6 cars from parking on the Inner Road. This is not sufficient justification to require the developer to provide a new car park, but the lost spaces could be accommodated on the new road proposed as part of the scheme.

6 Infrastructure

- 6.1 The development is required to achieve a public open space area of 10% of the site to provide quiet sitting out areas and children's play areas.
- 6.2 The capacity of the primary and secondary schools to accommodate children from the development has been confirmed by the Education Department both during the feasibility work for the Island Plan and more recently, following the public consultation exhibition held in June 2003.
- 6.3 The Public Services Drainage Department has confirmed the capacity and stipulated their requirements for both the foul and surface water sewers and detailed engineering designs for the sewers will be required as part of the development application.

7 Demand for First time buyer and social rented housing

- 7.1 The proposition questions the need for 75 homes on this site, stating; '*one has to ask if 75 houses are really necessary, given that supply is already starting to balance demand*'. The States are reminded that the Island Plan, which was approved in July 2002, identified a need for 2860 homes to be built over the first 5 years of the plan period. Now, some 18 months on, none of these homes have been started, yet there is clear evidence from the developers that first-time buyer lists are full and from the Housing Committee who require social rented housing.

8 Conclusions

- the reduction from the indicated yield of 75 homes to the 45 would be unsustainable, making inefficient use of the land, and putting pressure on more open land for development;
- the capacity of the existing infrastructure (schools, drains, traffic in Rue de Jambart) can accommodate the proposed new development;

- an appropriate form of development can be achieved to complement the village setting;
- sufficient car parking provision can be made;
- reducing the number of first-time buyer homes and social rental houses would not serve the best interests of the Island.