

# STATES OF JERSEY



## **ISLAND PLAN (REVISED) 2011: SITE TO BE REZONED FOR CATEGORY A HOUSING – FIELD 632 AND PART OF FIELD 559, LA ROUTE DU MANOIR, ST. PETER (P.13/2019) – AMENDMENT**

---

**Lodged au Greffe on 12th March 2019  
by the Deputy of St. Martin**

---

**STATES GREFFE**

ISLAND PLAN (REVISED) 2011: SITE TO BE REZONED FOR CATEGORY A  
HOUSING – FIELD 632 AND PART OF FIELD 559, LA ROUTE DU MANOIR,  
ST. PETER (P.13/2019) – AMENDMENT

---

**PAGE 2 –**

Delete the words “*Field 632 and part of*”.

DEPUTY OF ST. MARTIN

**Note:** After this amendment, the proposition would read as follows –

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

to refer to their Act dated 17th July 2014 in which they approved the revised 2011 Island Plan, and to agree that the Minister for the Environment be requested to bring forward, subject to the provisions of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002, a draft revision of the Island Plan such that on page 247 of Chapter 6 (Housing) at Policy H5 ‘Affordable housing in rural centres’ – after the words “*Access to affordable homes provided on this site shall be controlled and managed through the St. Martin’s Housing Association*”, there should be inserted bullet-point three and the words “*Field 559, La Route du Manoir, St. Peter and access to the dwellings to be controlled through the Affordable Housing Gateway with priority given to those who can demonstrate close links with the Parish of St. Peter.*”.

## REPORT

This simple amendment only seeks to move this proposed development, if approved, to a slightly different site, a site a short distance to the east of the one proposed by the Connétable of St. Peter.

This amendment passes no judgement on whether these fields are acceptable for housing, or on any of the other claims made in the proposition.

This amendment does not comment on the consultation process, or the path of this proposition through the St. Peter parish system. It also passes no comment on any potential alternative sites.

This amendment purely seeks to protect the centre of St. Peter's Village as an open space for posterity. If the proposed development proceeds inside the proposed "red line", then the opportunity for an open Village Green amenity-type area, and properly considered and much-needed traffic improvements, will be lost forever.

Unfortunately, the proposition has a complete lack of context in relation to the prospective benefits to the social or community infrastructure of St. Peter's Village. It is a further concern that the opportunity for wider physical works (mainly, but not exclusively roadworks), has not been maximised through the application.

In the proposed development, a "village green" is advocated at the southern end of the site, and there are pedestrian crossings over the main roads, but this appears to be, in my view, completely limited in its scope, and lacks any real ambition to deliver benefits for the wider village. The proposed green is nothing more than a gloried front lawn.

There is, for example, no explanation of how any village green might be used. The proposed open area is certainly not a large space, indeed tiny for a "Village Green", and it is dominated in the proposal by its roadside environment.

The design statement that was included with the original planning application includes reference to the current public space in the centre of St. Ouen's Village; but this has completely different characteristics, being linked with the Parish Hall, and containing both a children's play area and a pétanque area, so being an integrated community space. The proposed village green delivers none of these uses, nor community relationships, and appears to provide just some small visual relief in the built environment, and a pleasant outlook from just a few of the proposed dwellings.

Following a review of the proposed design, the Jersey Architecture Commission indeed noted that there is scope to get a better space for the village green by easing the site boundary (i.e. moving the eastern site boundary further to the east). They also identify that the splayed form is not well defined as a civic space, and question whether this delivers a new heart to the village with reference to the busy road and indistinct environment to the west.

It is disappointing that the application doesn't include a broader urban design analysis to consider, for example, how the village green might link (visually) to the Sir George Carteret Public House (on the western side of La Grande Route de St. Pierre), which has, in the last few years, had its hard-landscaped forecourt redesigned to accommodate a statue and interpretative panels. This is particularly relevant to the requirements of Policy GD7 in the Island Plan, which considers Design Quality and includes a

requirement that applications “*must adequately address and appropriately respond to ... the relationship to existing buildings, settlement form and character ...*”.

This amendment seeks to address the issues above, should it be approved by the States Assembly, by specifically pushing the proposed development further to the east. This movement of the proposed site will allow for a suitably sized Village Green and proper and meaningful changes to the traffic network.

If approved, it may well be that further amendments to positioning of the site will be required but, at this stage, it is imperative that enough green, open, amenity space is retained at the “heart” of the Village. Once built on, there will never be another opportunity to create an open space at the centre of St. Peter’s Village.

Field 559 is approximately the same size as the current proposals; and as such, there would be little or no reduction in the number of homes that could be constructed should this amendment be adopted.

### **Financial and manpower implications**

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