ISLAND PLAN (P.69/2002): AMENDMENT

Lodged au Greffe on 11th June 2002 by Deputy G.C.L. Baudains of St. Clement



STATES OF JERSEY

STATES GREFFE

150 2002 P.69 Amd.

Price code: A

ISLAND PLAN (P.69/2002): AMENDMENT

In paragraph (b) after the words "Policy H2 of the Plan," insert the words -

"with the exception of sites -

- Fields 203, part 204 and 252, St. Clement Extension to Hodge Nurseries, Fields 89, 89A, 90, 92A, 93, St. Clement Field 40, La Rue de Maupertuis, St. Clement,"
- 9.

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

Report

As a member of the Housing Committee I am as aware as anyone of the need for more homes. The outstripping of supply by demand is a root cause of the high price of property in Jersey that continues to push the price of first-time buyer homes beyond the means of so many.

That said, I have always maintained that my parish has had more than its fair share of housing over recent decades. That is why I am opposing further development in St. Clement. Yet again, and despite an overwhelming message from the Parish meeting, it is being required to take the biggest slice of rezoned land. No less than nine of our fields are in the list of sites to be rezoned. This is not a case of 'nimbyism' but of realising that our infrastructure is already creaking under the strain, without further massive additions.

It is my view that this Island Plan is seriously flawed. We are advised that we need nearly 3,000 homes. To fall short of that demand will ensure land prices remain sky-high, and there is a real danger this Plan will do just that. With such a huge demand, success would be best achieved by starting a new village with new infrastructure, instead of overloading the existing services, but the Planning and Environment Committee has discounted that. Simply taking the next field to an existing housing estate, to be followed by the next one, and so on year after year, is hardly planning - it is a sticking plaster approach doomed to failure.

St. Clement is rapidly becoming a suburb of St. Helier this urban sprawl must be halted.

This amendment has no implications for the financial or manpower resources of the States.