

# STATES OF JERSEY



## **ISLAND PLAN 2002, POLICY H2: FIELDS 848, 851, 853, AND 854 (P.48/2006) – COMMENTS – ADDENDUM**

---

**Presented to the States on 12th May 2006  
by the Minister for Planning and Environment**

---

**STATES GREFFE**

**ADDENDUM TO COMMENTS PRESENTED BY  
THE MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT**

I have been requested to provide States Members with net residential density figures to allow comparisons between the approved and proposed developments for the Category 'A' housing sites zoned under Policy H2 of the Island Plan.

To-date, I have supplied figures for gross densities, because these are regarded as the best and fairest of the ways available to compare the density of development between one site and another.

The net residential density figures attached roughly relate to the areas of the sites being used for housing only (including roads, car parking and incidental spaces) and need to be used with caution. They are not a true reflection of what individual sites will be carrying, and the raw figures have limited value for comparative purposes. Members should have regard to what all the land within a site is to be used for. Net density figures for some sites may appear relatively high, for example, because they take no account of the provision of significant areas of public open space and community facilities. Other net density figures may appear relatively high because the sites are too small to allow for the provision of significant areas of public open space.

In any event, it is important to recognise the shortcomings of using residential density figures of any type (and especially net densities) for individual sites and to understand that it will only paint part of the picture and allow for a very crude and generalised form of comparison.

It is possible to provide a good and successful living environment at higher densities with good design and a poor living environment at any density.

Ultimately, the Island should be looking to produce well-designed housing developments which fit well with their surroundings and offer attractive and healthy places to live, whilst using the land economically.

**CATEGORY 'A' HOUSING SITES: Density Comparisons (@10/5/06)**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Housing Site Area (approx.)</b>	<b>Net Site Area (approx)</b>	<b>Proposed Habitable Rooms</b>	<b>Est. Gross Density (h.r.a.)</b>	<b>Est. Net Density (h.r.a)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1. Bel Royal, St. Lawrence	10.9 acres <i>(inc. community hall, teenage area &amp; cp and excludes wetland amenity area)</i>	9.16 acres <i>(net of buffer strips, village green, child's play area, teenage amenity area)</i> 9.41 acres <i>(inc. village green and child's play area)</i>	652	60	69 – 71	Application not yet determined
2. Field 1218, Mont-à-l'Abbé, St. Helier	8.9 acres <i>(inc. 1 acre public park)</i>	7.4 acres <i>(net of 1 acre public park and 2 communal open spaces, community building and associated area)</i> 7.5 acres <i>(inc. community building and associated area)</i>	548	61.5	73 – 74	
3. Jambart Lane, St. Clement	6.0*	5.6 acres <i>(net of 2 greens)</i>	393	66*	70	
4. Hodge Nurseries 2, St. Clement	5.4	4.4 acres <i>(net of 3 play areas and a buffer strip)</i>	374	70	85	
5. Route de la Pointe, St. Peter	5.1	4.2 acres <i>(net of green and open space by entrance)</i>	314	61.5	75	
6. Westview, Rue des Cosnets, St. Ouen	3.0	2.8 acres <i>(net of play area)</i>	197	68	70	
7. Field 690A, Maufant, St. Martin	4.7	4.2 <i>(net of green and other significant open spaces)</i>	215	46	51	Application not yet determined
8. Rue de la Sergente, La Moye, St. Brelade	1.9	1.8 acres <i>(net of playground)</i>	145	76	81	No application yet
9. Field 40, St. Clement	1.6	1.5 acres <i>(net of playground and northern courtyard)</i>	115	72	77	
10. Field 873, Rue du Haut, St. Lawrence	0.9	–	–	–	–	No progress
11. Field 1370, Rue de la Mont Sejour, St. Helier	0.7	0.7 <i>(net of playground)</i>	63	90	90	

Note: Information provided by case officers.

\* Amended from previously issued figure