

STATES OF JERSEY

r

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

STATES GREFFE

PROPOSITION

THE STATES are asked to decide whether they are of opinion –

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 –

- (a) 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
- (b) 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.

DEPUTY G.C.L. BAUDAINS OF ST. CLEMENT

REPORT

The 2001 Draft Island Plan suggested 55 x 2-bedroom or 45 x 3-bedroom homes for this site, but the later Plan proposed 75 x 3-bedroom, almost matched by the developer's current proposal for 79, which I suggest is an over-development of the area.

Rural setting

This is a rural, agricultural area and, as such, any development must be sympathetic to the surroundings. The current proposals belong more to a town setting.

We should be taking the opportunity to create a village-type development, one that has a feeling of space and compliments the countryside.

Traffic

I submit that insufficient regard has been given to the narrowness of Rue de Jambart and the effect extra traffic will have at the narrow southern end (only 4.3 metres wide at one point).

Whether the proposed new road through the estate links Rue de Jambart with Grande Route de St. Clement (Inner Road) or not, or whether Rue de Jambart is made one-way in a southerly or northerly direction, there is no means of preventing vehicles from the new estate using that small lane for connection with Grande Route de la Côte (Coast Road). In the case of 75 x 3-bedroom homes, that would be around 150 extra cars twice a day. One of the reasons supporting the creation of this estate is that it enabled a fresh exit to be made from Rue de Jambart onto Grande Route de St. Clement, the current junction being extremely dangerous and the scene of many accidents over the years.

This new access will, however, have the disadvantage of preventing parking on the Inner Road, a much-needed facility for people attending Church services or the adjacent Caldwell Hall.

Nowhere in the current plans is this problem addressed. Clearly, alternative parking must be created, preferably incorporated into this new site.

Infrastructure

Schoolchildren from the new estate will use the narrow Rue de Jambart to get to bus-stops. There is a lack of pavements on parts of this lane.

The present plans include insufficient facilities for children – indeed there is almost a total lack in the area generally.

Schools in the area will be further overloaded.

The foul sewer pumping station in the area already suffocates the southern end of Rue de Jambart with disgusting odours. How much worse will it be with all these extra houses?

Situation

Marsh area that floods in winter.

Conclusion

A reduction from the present plan for 79 homes to the original 45 would–

- (a) reduce pressure on infrastructure (schools, drains, traffic in Rue de Jambart);

- (b) allow more sympathetic development given the rural setting;
- (c) allow more adequate parking provision for estate residents and provide some relief for those displaced from the Inner Road;
- (d) by reducing the number of first-time buyer homes, make a corresponding reduction in the number of social rented that need to be built to satisfy the 55/45% criteria. Field 40 (c.20/25 x 3-bedroom homes) would no longer have to be social rented. Perhaps it could be parish sheltered housing, for which it is ideally situated.

Finally, one has to ask if 75 houses are really necessary, given that supply is already starting to balance demand. Will the 'best use of the site' (an euphemism for 'cram them in') result in properties remaining unsold?

Financial/manpower implications

There are no financial or manpower implications for the States arising from this proposition.