

# **STATES OF JERSEY**



## **REZONED SITES: ASSESSMENT OF HOUSING NEEDS**

---

**Lodged au Greffe on 19th October 2010  
by the Deputy of St. John**

---

**STATES GREFFE**

## **PROPOSITION**

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

- (a) to refer to their Act dated 16th July 2008 in which they approved the rezoning of approximately 58.5 vergées of land for the provision of lifelong dwellings for people over 55 and first-time buyers; and
- (b) to request the Minister for Planning and Environment to defer the granting of any planning permission in respect of any of the rezoned sites where permission has not already been granted until such time as a detailed assessment of the current demand for lifelong homes for people over 55 has been prepared by the Ministers for Planning and Environment and Housing and presented to the States.

DEPUTY OF ST. JOHN

## **REPORT**

In recent times we are seeking many homes for sale, yet developers are keen to build more homes for the over-55s. Members need to be assured that the need exists. It is wrong for us to contemplate the demands of development and developers if the requirement of the elderly and indeed any Islander who seeks accommodation is not visible.

Of course one recognises the desire of opportunists to make money, however this no excuse for land to be continually rezoned and indeed developed upon. By living on an Island that measures 9 miles by 5, there is only a finite amount of land which can be built upon. An article was written in the Jersey Evening Post on 21st September 2010. Currently Hong Kong has a population of 7,055,071<sup>1</sup> which equates to a population density of seven times more than Jersey. As elected representatives of the people, it is the States of Jersey's duty to ensure as high a standard of living as possible for the Islanders and not continue with unnecessary development as warned by the Rural Economy Strategy Sub-Panel's recent review, as this would not add to the quality of life currently found on Island.

The argument against this is that those aged over 55 are amongst the most vulnerable members of our society and we should therefore do our utmost to give them our support and in this case guarantee that there is a dwelling for them to inhabit for their entire lifetime and if this means having to develop new houses to match the ageing population then so be it. This proposition does not impede on any of these facts but simply ensure that we are only constructing what is necessary and that we are utilising to the best of our ability, the accommodation which currently exists. There is nothing wrong with prudence in accordance with development – especially in the current economic climate.

### **Financial and manpower implications**

There are no financial or manpower requirements other than the internal resources requirements for Planning and Environment and Housing to undertake the assessment of housing needs.

---

<sup>1</sup> CIA World Factbook