

Roads Committee meeting

Trinity Parish Hall

29th September 2025 at 11:00am

The Roads Committee (Constable, Rector and N Le Maistre) assembled at the Parish Hall at 11:00am.

1. Apologies were received from Mr B Fossey.
2. The minutes of the meetings held on 23rd July 2025 and 5th September 2025 were approved:
3. Matters arising:

23rd July 2025

- (a) **La Rue du Catel.** It was noted that the debris had been cleared and that the banque had been reinforced.
- (b) **Private lane off Rue de la Garenne.** It was noted that the work had been carried out.
- (c) **Rue d’Egypte.** It was noted that road had been part resurfaced to a good standard.
- (d) **La Rue de Bechet.** It was noted that the Constable had met with the property owner and the problem seemed to be arise from St John.
- (e) **South cemetery paths.** It was agreed that the quote for levelling should be accepted. However, it was also noted that there were tree routes near the sexton’s shed that required levelling. It was further agreed that the contractor would be asked to include this in the existing quote.
- (f) **Sexton’s shed.** It was noted that the shed had been painted.

5th September 2025

There were no matters arising.

4. La Ruelle, La Rue du Moulin du Ponterrin

Following the developer’s presentation to the Roads Committee on 25th September 2025, members of the Roads Committee considered its reply to the Planning Department. It was agreed that the reply (as attached) would be sent to the Planning Department.

5. Any other business

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 12:00pm

P Le Sueur

.....

Connétable

15th October 2025

.....

Date

1st October 2025

Planning and Building Services

By email only: planning@gov.je

Dear Sir

Planning Application P/2025/0845 La Ruelle, La Rue du Moulin du Ponterrin, Trinity JE3 5HH

I refer to your letter of 29th August 2025 and my subsequent reply of 9th September 2025. As mentioned in my reply, the Roads Committee received a public presentation (from KR Synergy Traffic Consultants on behalf of Castletree Homes) on 25th September 2025 and has also had the benefit of a site visit to the surrounding Parish roads. The Roads Committee has examined the plans and Transport Statement and Outline Travel Plan ("TSOTP) and I now write on behalf of the Roads Committee with its reply to your letter of 29th August 2025.

The description of the proposed works is 'Partial demolition of existing dwelling, and remodelling and extension of retained buildings. Comprehensive redevelopment of the site to provide 27 new homes (comprising 4no. 1-bed, 12no. 2-bed, 1no. 3-bed, and 10no. 4-bed dwellings), with associated car parking and gardens. Road widening and relocation of existing vehicle access on Rue du Moulin de Ponterrin. Create new pedestrian access and public footpath, and various site landscape works to include shared open spaces, and new children's play space.'

The Roads Committee's comments are limited, as far as possible, to the site; traffic, travel and transport; road safety; and construction site traffic and I will address each in turn:

The site

It is the Roads Committee's considered opinion that the density scale and mass proposed by this development is completely contrary to the spatial strategy framework outlined in the Bridging Island Plan which directs that the highest densities be located in the most accessible and sustainable locations. This will be where there exists a greater range of facilities and services, limiting the need to travel whilst offering genuine access to sustainable transport modes, which this site clearly does not have.

Victoria Village best fits the criteria of a smaller settlement comprising a mixture of small, mostly suburban residential forms of development with no facilities or services and where the opportunity for development is limited.

Whilst accepting that the site in question falls within the built-up area, this is primarily a countryside area which demands a justified and appropriate scale of development that will not cause unnecessary harm to its landscape and seascape character and protect its special built heritage and biodiversity value.

It is the density, mix of accommodation and the number of residential units proposed with inadequate vehicle parking provision, coupled with the location of the site on a narrow country lane which causes the Roads Committee its greatest concern. Furthermore, we respectfully suggest that the developer's TSOTP does not adequately reflect the site's rural location which is completely remote from schools, shops and other local amenities. Accordingly, residents will be wholly reliant on private modes of transport, predominantly the car.

Traffic, travel and transport

(a) Private transport

As mentioned above, the Roads Committee is concerned that the remoteness of the location will require residents of the proposed development to be highly reliant on the private car as a mode of transport. Yet, the developer's TSOTP suggests that any increase in proposed vehicle movements to and from the site is minimal.

Furthermore, the TSOTP relies heavily on the Supplementary Planning Guidance on residential parking standards. However, those standards are the minimum required. The Roads Committee acknowledges that the proposed development marginally exceeds those standards but does not consider that the provision for surface parking is sufficient given all other material considerations. The Roads Committee has experience in the provision of parking at a recent parish development of 39 residential properties in Le Grand Clos. This site provided 39 garages, 72 residents' spaces and 26 visitors' spaces. As the site has matured over the years parking is at capacity. As members of the Planning Committee will be aware, Le Grand Clos is on a main road, close to local amenities including a shop, pub and school. The estate is also serviced by regular bus routes. These factors being in complete contrast to the proposed development.

In addition, the proposed widening of the Parish Road is likely to cause additional on road parking required to supplement the lack of on-site parking. This will negate the whole purpose of proposals to widen the road and introduce the chicane.

The developers have put some reliance on traffic counting that took place in February 2025 and August 2025. Unfortunately, the traffic counting in August took place during the school holidays. Accordingly, the Roads Committee does not believe that the figures provide a true reflection of actual traffic movements.

The Roads Committee welcomes the provision of electric charging points and bicycle storage but as the site is surrounded by hills and is remote, the use of bicycles is likely to be as a leisure activity only rather than being used for commuting, taking children to school or shopping. One of the four hills accessing Victoria Village is Mont de la Rosiere which has a gradient of 5.8% and is over 700 metres long.

(b) Public transport

The Roads Committee is unconvinced by the comment in 2.6.1 of the TSOTP which states that the site 'benefits from good accessibility with a wide range of travel choices with relatively easy access to services and public transport within reasonable walking or cycling distances.'

The nearest bus stop is 170 metres from the site and is accessible along a narrow lane with no pavement. This bus stop does not benefit from a bus shelter and is only serviced by route 21. The 21 bus route receives the worst service of any in the island with only nine buses a day from Monday through to Friday, six on a Saturday and none on a Sunday. No school buses visit this bus stop.

While the Roads Committee notes that the Planning Obligation Agreement requests funding to improve this service, this will only be a short-term solution as bus services and their frequency are driven by demand. The Roads Committee is further concerned that this proposed development alone will not significantly impact that demand and once any additional funding has been spent, the service is likely to revert to its current inadequate level.

Furthermore, by their own admission during the public presentation there is an error at 3.3.1 of the Transport Statement and Outline Travel Plan which specifies that the site will be serviced frequently by bus route 3 which is completely incorrect. As mentioned above, Victoria Village is serviced only by the infrequent service of bus route 21. While the question was asked at the public presentation, the Roads Committee remains unclear as to whether the assessment contained in the TSOTP was based on the observations of the frequent route 3 or infrequent route 21.

Road Safety

The impact of this development on the local road network and, in particular, for the safety of all road users is contrary to the considerations of Policy TT1 requiring integrated safe and inclusive travel and, as such, remains a major concern for the Parish's Roads Committee were it to receive approval.

In particular, the alterations proposed at the crossroads between La Rue du Moulin du Ponterrin, Jardin de la Ruelle and Victoria Village Estate causes the Roads Committee concern as it considers that safety will be further compromised due to reduced visibility.

As mentioned, the development will inevitably generate a significant increase in traffic and the Roads Committee is also extremely concerned about the adverse safety impacts on the existing junction between La Rue du Moulin du Ponterrin and Rue de la Boucterie due to lack of any near side visibility.

The developers propose to create a chicane at the old bakery in La Rue du Moulin du Ponterrin. This type of intervention is not recommended by the Department of Infrastructure unless the speed is reduced to 20 mph, particularly when the road is unlit.

The developer suggests that the speed limit of La Rue du Moulin du Ponterrin be reduced to 20 mph. With all respect, it is not in the developer's gift to reduce the speed limit on a Parish road. That is for the Roads Committee to decide and, following a review of the speed limits on all Parish roads in 2023, the reduction of the speed limit on this road was considered unnecessary.

The Roads Committee also has concerns about the visibility of oncoming traffic as a chicane will also obscure the line of sight in day light hours. The widening, narrowing and then widening again of the road over a short distance will increase the safety risks. While not directly linked to road safety, the widening of the road and creation of a chicane will lead to an inevitable requirement for increased road signage and/or yellow lines. Any such urbanisation of the country lane will be resisted by the Roads Committee.

All roads surrounding the proposed development, including those in St Saviour, are quiet country lanes and access to the site will put unnecessary pressure on these already busy lanes creating safety issues for all users, including walkers, cyclists and horse riders.

While the Roads Committee appreciates that the developers intend to provide a public footpath through the development, the natural order is that pedestrians will remain on the road rather than divert through the development. It is further noted that no provision has been made for cyclists or horse riders who also regularly use the road.

Construction site traffic

While the construction traffic plan suggests that all construction vehicles will access the site using the same roads as the bus route, it is not clear if this is bus route 3 or bus route 21 (see above). The suggestion of a circular 21 bus route is a totally impractical and unenforceable as the sheer volume of large haulage and concrete delivery vehicles that will be required to service the project will place an unmanageable burden on the narrow country lanes of Trinity and adjoining parishes. The inevitable but real situation will be that drivers will take the shortest route.

Conclusion

It is the view of the Roads Committee that the unnecessary and unwelcome interventions proposed to the layout of the narrow country lane, La Rue du Moulin du Ponterrin, used extensively by walkers, cyclists and horse riders is driven only by the need to service this development and will result in unnecessary destruction of our built heritage and damage to the rural environment.

In summary, while the Roads Committee acknowledges that the proposed development technically falls within the built-up area, it believes that the scheme currently proposed is too large for all reasons set out above and is unable support this application. Accordingly, the Roads Committee requests that the Planning Committee refuses the application in its current form.

Yours faithfully

Philip Le Sueur
Connétable

