

STATES OF JERSEY



SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE: PARKING (P.54/2025) – COMMENTS

**Presented to the States on 22nd September 2025
by the Minister for the Environment**

STATES GREFFE

COMMENTS

Introduction

This proposition about parking is in two parts, each of which needs to be considered separately, because the issues raised by each part are very different.

Before setting out my comments on the individual components of the proposition, I wish to provide members with an overview of the supplementary planning guidance on residential parking standards, which part (a) of the Connétable of St Helier's proposition seeks to amend.

In doing this, I wish to highlight to Members that parking standards for new homes should not be considered in isolation but alongside other critical factors, including dwelling size, provision of amenity space, and development density. Together, these elements shape not only the quantity and quality of housing delivered but also the overall viability of development schemes. Altering one aspect of this integrated framework risks destabilising the entire approach to delivering new affordable housing; creating better places to live and threatens to further weaken an already fragile construction and development sector.

Supplementary planning guidance for residential parking standards

The supplementary planning guidance (SPG) for Residential parking standards¹ is designed to reflect the island's diverse character, rather than impose a one-size-fits-all rule for all residential development. This context-sensitive approach is essential for balancing housing delivery, affordability, and sustainable transport goals.

The guidance is structured around the following key principles

Parking standards are tailored to location

Instead of a one-size-fits-all approach across the island, parking standards vary by area – where the island is divided into six sustainable transport zones (STZs) - to reflect differences in accessibility and the travel options available for reaching the places that people need to get to.

- In St Helier Town Centre (STZ1), where access to services and goods is the best in the island and where public transport, walking, and cycling are viable alternatives to car use for some journeys, the guidance sets maximum parking standards to discourage unnecessary car ownership and to reduce congestion.
- In parish centres and suburban areas, the standards are more flexible, allowing for minimum parking provision where car dependency is higher.
- In rural parts of the island and edge-of-centre locations, parking expectations are adjusted to reflect limited transport alternatives and the greater likelihood of the need to travel, particularly by car.

This approach avoids the over-provision of car parking space in urban areas, where there is likely to be greater choice as to how to travel and where goods and services are within easier reach; and prevents under-provision in more rural or car-dependent areas.

¹ [Residential parking standards](#)

Parking standards are tailored to housing type and size

The guidance differentiates between flats, houses, affordable housing, and specialist accommodation (e.g. sheltered housing), recognising that not all households have the same travel needs; and that the size of households – and the number of people living in them – will influence the amount of car parking space that might be required. The guidance explicitly references the need for parking in family homes.

It also considers visitor parking, cycle storage, and motorcycle provision, ensuring developments serve a range of users - not just car owners.

Planning for liveability: aligning parking, housing size, and development density

Parking standards must be considered in conjunction with home size and development density. These elements are interconnected and should be evaluated collectively.

The revised supplementary planning guidance for residential parking standards was produced at the same time as revised guidance was issued for residential space standards² – which increased the size of internal and external space for and quality of dwellings; and for development density³ – which defined minimum density standards to encourage and ensure the most efficient use of land in the island's built-up areas.

This integrated approach to new housing development prioritises planning for people – delivering better places to live and creating vibrant, sustainable communities - rather than simply accommodating cars.

At its core, the effectiveness of the planning guidance for residential parking standards lies in its context-sensitive approach. The standards respond to the location of development and the needs of different types and sizes of households. This represents positive and progressive planning that seeks to deliver more sustainable forms of development in the island and which eschews the outdated assumption – and one that was embodied in the 30+ year-old guidance that the revised standards replaced - that every household requires or has a right to a car.

It sets flexible standards - not zero standards

The guidance introduces maximum parking standards for St Helier town centre only (comprising less than 1% of the island), and minimum standards elsewhere. This allows for reduced parking provision in areas with better access to goods and services and with better travel choices - but it does not go so far as to promote or enable zero-car developments as a default or desirable outcome.

This means that developers are expected to provide some level of car parking, even in the most central urban locations.

It is important to emphasise that, across the majority of the island, the planning guidance establishes minimum parking standards. This framework deliberately enables flexibility, allowing developers the discretion to either meet these minimum requirements or provide additional parking spaces beyond the minimum baseline. Such adaptability ensures that parking provision can be tailored to the specific needs of each development. For example, developers have exercised this flexibility by making car

² [Residential space standards](#)

³ [Density standards](#)

parking provision that meets or exceeds minimum standards on the recently approved rezoned affordable housing sites.⁴

By tailoring minimum parking requirements to location, accessibility and the type and size of home, the guidance aims to reduce pressure on surrounding streets and avoid overspill into public spaces.

It is important to highlight that the guidance does not actively support or incentivise car - free housing schemes. It does, however, allow car-free development to happen in St Helier town centre, but only where:

- it is well-located, with good access to services, facilities and alternative transport options;
- the development will provide ten or fewer homes;
- the predominant type of accommodation is less likely to accommodate families; and
- a contribution to the provision of other off-site sustainable transport measures, such as shared mobility services, is made.

The Connétable's supporting report sets out some examples where residential development has been granted planning permission without the provision of car parking in the middle of St Helier: these are instances involving small and constrained sites or where an existing building is being converted to residential use without demolition, and where it is more sustainable and pragmatic to allow a building to be re-used without the provision of car parking space on site.

It balances sustainability with practicality

The guidance acknowledges that many islanders still rely on cars for essential travel - especially families and residents with reduced mobility or specific needs; and those who live outside town.

The guidance is designed to manage car use, not to eliminate it.

In short, while the guidance supports lower car dependency, it stops short of promoting car-free development as a planning objective.

The current approach to residential car parking provision – which replaced one based on the accommodation of the car that was over 30 years old - is moderate and transitional compared to international best practice. It reflects a growing awareness of sustainability and land efficiency but stops short of the more progressive models seen in places leading the shift away from car dependency.

⁴ Field S470 & S415A, La Grande Route De St Martin, La Route De Friquettes, St. Saviour; and Field J1109, Sion, St John - compliance with minimum standards; Fields P558, P559 and P632, La Grande Route de St Pierre, St. Peter and Fields O594 and O595, St Ouen: exceed minimum standards.

Part (a)

The effect of part (a) of this proposition is to require a minimum of one car parking space for every new home throughout the island.

This proposal risks undermining two of the island's most critical strategic priorities:

- the delivery of affordable housing and
- the transition to a more sustainable, low-carbon future.

I urge Members to reject part (a) of this proposition and instead lend support to the maintenance of planning guidance that helps to deliver policy objectives that are inclusive, forward-looking, and aligned with Jersey's long-term goals of affordability, equity, and environmental responsibility.

The adverse implications of supporting part (a) of this proposition are as follows:

Homes will be less affordable

The financial implications of this part of the proposition are significant. The cost and affordability of homes is directly related to the size of a property: this includes internal floorspace and any external space – including the provision of car parking space – that is provided in association with a new home.

The cost of providing a car parking space - estimated at between £30,000 and £70,000 - would add approximately £175 to £410 per month to a typical mortgage. Over a 25-year term, this equates to an additional £52,500 to £123,000 in total housing costs.

Together with mortgage repayments, the annual costs of owning and running a car in Jersey – estimated at between £2,750 and £4,050 each year (or between £229 and £338 each month) depending on the type of car and its usage – will also be a factor.

For many islanders, particularly first-time buyers and lower-income households, these added burdens could make homeownership increasingly unattainable.

This proposal stands in direct contradiction to the objectives for housing set out in this Government's *Common Strategic Policy 2024-2026*⁵ and *Investing in Jersey 2026–2050*⁶, which identifies the provision of affordable housing as a foundational infrastructure investment.

By inflating the cost of every new home, part (a) of the proposition risks exacerbating the housing crisis and widening inequality.

Development will be less sustainable

In addition to affordability concerns, the environmental implications of part (a) are deeply troubling. The transport sector is the largest source of on-island greenhouse gas emissions in Jersey: it produces 41% of emissions. Mandating car parking spaces for every home reinforces car dependency at a time when Jersey should be accelerating its efforts to reduce emissions and promote sustainable travel.

⁵ [Common Strategic Policy 2024 to 2026.pdf](#)

⁶ [Investing in Jersey Document and Capital Investment Fund.pdf](#)

This proposal stands in direct contradiction to the objectives for tackling the climate emergency and enabling more sustainable development in Jersey set out in this Government's *Common Strategic Policy 2024-2026*⁷.

The *Sustainable Transport Policy*⁸, adopted by the States Assembly, sets out a clear vision for reducing the impact of cars on town. It prioritises reallocating road space to walking and cycling, managing vehicle movement through parking measures, and making Jersey's transport system safer and more inclusive. Mandating car parking for every home runs counter to these goals and risks locking the island into a car-centric development model that is increasingly out of step with global best practice and local aspirations.

This proposition also undermines the most efficient use of land, particularly in urban and high-density areas where space is limited and development pressure is high.

Jersey's success in attracting people creates a tremendous challenge for the provision of additional homes and infrastructure. As the island changes and grows, there is a need to ensure the best and most efficient use of its limited land supply and there is an inevitable pressure to increase development densities. There are ways of creating more and better homes in Jersey on previously developed land and at taller, but moderate height. The Bridging Island Plan, approved by the States Assembly; and the Minister for the Environment's supplementary planning guidance on development density, encourages more dense forms of development, setting a range of minimum density standards for residential development of five or more homes across the island's built-up areas.

Requiring every home to include a car parking space seriously reduces the density of development and the number of homes that can be delivered on a given site, thereby displacing housing that the island needs.

A failure to make best use of already developed land will mean having to resort to high-rise development or the further release of greenfield land in the future, increasing infrastructure costs and compromising planning efficiency.

The environmental implications of part (a) of this proposition discourages investment in sustainable forms of development - undermining our climate commitments and locking in outdated planning practices that are incompatible with a low-carbon future.

Development will be less equitable and inclusive

Equally important is the principle of choice. Not every household requires or desires a car. Numerous examples of this already exist. The Horizon development, on the St Helier Waterfront, provides 280 apartments with 194 car parking spaces: four of the parking spaces remain unsold. Andium Homes have approximately 30 unutilised spaces at their Edinburgh House development of homes for social rent in Green Street; and the first phase of their Maison Les Arches development, providing affordable homes for purchase, has only had a 70% uptake of car parking provision; with 30% remaining unsold.

⁷ [Common Strategic Policy 2024 to 2026.pdf](#)

⁸ [Sustainable transport](#)

Imposing a blanket requirement removes flexibility from homeowners and developers alike, forcing them to pay for infrastructure they may not need or use in addition to being both environmentally regressive and economically inefficient.

Planning policy should empower people to make decisions that suit their lifestyle, income, and values - not impose an outdated one-size-fits-all model that assumes car ownership is universal and that the ability to own and park a car is a right.

Car-dominated neighbourhoods also discourage walking and cycling, particularly for vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and those with disabilities. Whilst car parking provision should be made within development sites, surrounding streets designed primarily for vehicles often lack safe, accessible pedestrian routes and cycling infrastructure. This not only reduces mobility options for those who do not drive, but also contributes to social isolation, reduced physical activity, and increased safety risks. A planning approach that prioritises cars over people is incompatible with inclusive, healthy, and connected placemaking and the communities that Jersey aspires to build.

Threatens to further weaken the construction and development sector

Part (a) of the proposition, mandating one car parking space per residential unit in new developments, also presents financial and economic risks. The cost of delivering a basement car parking space is approximately £70,000, which must be recovered through sales. Current market values for such spaces are closer to £60,000, creating a £10,000 shortfall per space. This misalignment threatens development viability, reduces housing affordability, and increases sales risk.

This misalignment is even greater on the St Helier waterfront, where the cost of delivering a basement car parking space is increased by a further £20,000 (to £90,000) as a result of the need to deal with contaminated ground.

Crucially, the proposed change, at part (a), risks further undermining a fragile development industry that is already facing market uncertainty and rising construction costs. If developers lack confidence in market absorption at elevated prices, they may delay or cancel projects, leading to reduced housing supply, lower economic output, and further contraction of the construction sector.

A more flexible approach to parking provision, as set out in adopted standards, is required to support sustainable development and better maintain a stable pipeline of housing development.

Part (b)

Part (b) of the proposition requests the Minister to allow the development of new car parks where proposals are feasible under the terms of the Bridging Island Plan (BIP).

These powers are not generally vested in the Minister, except in the case of the determination of planning appeals, where the Minister is required to give effect to the appeal inspector's recommendation (who will have regard to the island plan policy framework) unless the Minister is satisfied that there are reasons not to do so.

Most planning decisions are made under delegation or by the Planning Committee. Consequently, proposals for new car parks will continue to be evaluated by decision-makers within the planning application process, in line with the Bridging Island Plan's policy framework.

The policy framework for the assessment of planning applications for new car parks has been set by this Assembly when it approved the Bridging Island Plan. This cannot be changed until it is next reviewed by the Assembly, in accord with the specific process defined for a review of the plan, and will remain unaffected by part (b) of the Connétable's proposition.

To promote more efficient land use, whilst aiming to reduce reliance on private vehicles and to encourage sustainable travel modes, the island plan does not support the creation of additional car parks as a standalone land use - that is, parking facilities not directly related to or required by a specific development. The current policy framework only supports the provision of temporary, short-stay 'meanwhile' shopper parking.

The Connétable's proposition aims to prioritise any new car park spaces for drivers with reduced mobility, shoppers, and visitors. Notably, the management of public car parks is based on duration of stay rather than user type, a model that aligns with the BIP's support for time-limited 'meanwhile' short-stay parking provision.

Given that the Minister's consideration of planning decisions is limited to appeals, where he is bound to follow the advice of an independent inspector who will have regard to the island plan, unless the Minister is satisfied that there are good reasons not to do so; and that the provisions of the Bridging Island Plan will remain fixed until the Assembly's next review of the plan, the substance of part (b) of the Connétable's proposition lacks purposeful substance and can be considered benign.

Summary and conclusion

To conclude, part (a) of this proposition risks making homes less affordable, less sustainable, and less responsive to the diverse needs of islanders. It also risks inefficient land use, the displacement of critical housing supply, the creation of neighbourhoods that are less safe and inclusive for vulnerable groups and presents further risk to an already fragile development and construction sector, undermining progress to deliver Government objectives.

Significantly, it also removes choice from homeowners and developers, and contradicts the direction set by planning and transport policies that have already been approved by this Assembly.

The guidance that part (a) seeks to amend was developed and adopted following a rigorous consultation process involving the public and key stakeholders in the development sector. Given that these revised standards have only been in effect since October 2023, it remains premature to fully evaluate their impact, as few development projects have yet been completed under these new requirements. Any further proposed amendments should be preceded by a thorough assessment of the standards' actual effects, coupled with additional consultation with both the public and industry stakeholders, to ensure decisions are well-informed and balanced: this is not included by the Connétable in support of the proposition.

For these reasons, I would respectfully and unequivocally urge Members to reject part (a) of this proposition.

Part (b) lacks substantive purpose and is essentially ineffectual; and should be similarly rejected.