

STATES OF JERSEY

r

FIELDS 181, 182 AND 183, ST. PETER: RESTRICTION ON DEVELOPMENT

Lodged au Greffe on 6th July 2004
by the Deputy of St. Peter

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 re-zone Fields 181, 182 and 183, St. Peter for Category A Housing and to request the Environment and Public Services Committee to limit development on the said site to a maximum of 54 three-bedroomed two storey units or 68 two-bedroomed two storey units, or any equivalent combination of three and two-bedroomed units.

DEPUTY OF ST. PETER

REPORT

A planning meeting was held at St Peter's Parish Hall on Monday 11th June 2001 to outline proposals for re-zoning land for housing development prior to the adoption of the Island Plan. The presenters included the then President of the Planning Committee, Senator Nigel Querée, the Director of Planning, and Mr. Geoff Webber of WS Atkins.

It was at that meeting that adjoining fields 181,182 and 183 were highlighted as a site on which to develop **54** homes. The meeting was well attended and those present expressed concerns that the Parish had already contributed to the housing stock with the development of St. Peter's Village along with the urbanisation of the Beaumont area. In addition the Airport development had taken up just under a third of the Parish land area and must be regarded as a major contribution to overall Island facilities.

The need for a policy to provide affordable first-time buyer homes was accepted. However, as the Parish was given little option, it reluctantly agreed that the designated site was well situated for any such development.

The Island Plan was published in 2002 and particular reference was made regarding the St. Peter fields. The plan stated that the site could provide approximately **68** homes. It further stated that "It represents a logical extension of the village of St. Peter, a key **rural** settlement."

During the planning process the Parish has been faced with the following proposed number of units on Site:

- 54 Units
- 55 Units
- 65 Units
- 68 Units
- 87 Units (First formal Plan)
- 78 Units
- 74 Units
- 72 Units

During that period the quoted size of the site as varied in the following way:

- 4.5 Acres
- 4.8 Acres
- 5.08 Acres
- 5.1 Acres

It is difficult to understand how and why these figures have changed to such an extent.

Since 2003, when the first development plan was muted, the Parish have been consistent in their view that the density was too high and out of keeping with the current village development. Three well attended public meetings (up to 180 people on one occasion) have been held in the presence of members of the Planning Committee. In addition to density, concerns were expressed over schooling, traffic congestion, both in the Village and at the bottom of Beaumont, and the disposal of water runoff from any new development.

At no time have satisfactory answers been given over these concerns.

Many Parishioners have written to the Planning Department, (the published figure in the Jersey Evening Post of 22nd September 2003 stated that 85 comments had been received) along with several letters from the Connétable supported by the Procureurs, Deputy and a resident's representative. All have repeatedly expressed worries that consultation appeared to be of no consequence and that planning was going to pay little heed to comments made.

At a meeting held on the 1st July 2004 the Environment and Public Services Committee considered the current plans submitted by the Developers. Despite representation by the Connétable and Deputy repeating all the concerns expressed by the Parishioners and the Municipality, the Committee announced that they were minded to

approve the application subject to certain conditions. On the following day a letter was received outlining those conditions. Not one condition reflected the concerns sincerely expressed by the Parish over an extended period. The Committee have always been warned of the inevitable result of a failure to address issues raised.

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