

# STATES OF JERSEY



## **ISLAND PLAN 2011: APPROVAL (P.48/2011): ELEVENTH AMENDMENT (P.48/2011 Amd.(11)) – AMENDMENT**

---

**Lodged au Greffe on 10th May 2011  
by Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire of St. Helier**

---

**STATES GREFFE**

ISLAND PLAN 2011: APPROVAL (P.48/2011): ELEVENTH AMENDMENT  
(P.48/2011 Amd.(11)) – AMENDMENT

---

**PAGE 2, PARAGRAPH (a) –**

Delete field numbers 21A, 38, 38A, 39 and 59A.

DEPUTY P.V.F. LE CLAIRE OF ST. HELIER

## REPORT

The Fields that I am asking to be deleted in this amendment to the 11th amendment by Deputy Gorst make up Samarès Nurseries, which is a site that is key to the supply of affordable family housing, sheltered housing and a potential new location for a Good Companions Club. The owners are willing sellers to the States of Jersey.

In removing these fields from this amendment, it will be possible to deliver these much-needed houses and community facilities without further complication in my view.

It will also require the approval of my subsequent amendment to the Island Plan, Amendment 12.

It is important to realize that there is considerable uncertainty about the proposed delivery of homes in the Revised Draft Island Plan, and in particular for the affordable housing sector.

Predicting the future delivery of homes is never an exact science, because it is dependent on so many variables, for example –

- The preparedness of landowners to release their land
- Can the developers obtain financing?
- Are mortgages readily available for purchasers?
- What have been the short-term effects of the recession?

i.e. will the proposals deliver the required numbers of affordable and market homes?

There has also been a significant increase in the Housing Department's waiting list over the last 12 to 18 months, primarily due to tenants wishing to move from the private rental to social rental markets and potential First-Time Buyers (FTBs).

In the late 1980s there were demonstrations in the Royal Square of potential FTBs because the States were not allocating sufficient land for such accommodation.

Why additional sites are needed.

1. The 10 year predicted requirement for 4,000 homes, of which about 1,000 are affordable, is generally accepted (Table 6.2. Revised Draft Island Plan (RDIP-2011)).
2. Sites for approximately 350 homes are already designated (2002 Island Plan and 8 sites in P.75/2008 – first-time buyer and lifelong homes.
3. The Consultation Draft Island Plan (CDIP-2009) made provision for 600-650 affordable homes through a combination of 7 designated sites (Policy H1) and the provision of affordable homes as a proportion of private residential developments (Policy H3).
4. There was considerable opposition to Policy H3, and genuine concerns in the short term at least, that it will act as a disincentive to developers, but more likely landowners, to bring sites forward because the policy hits land values. This may create a highly significant shortfall in the number of 'windfall' and

St. Helier 'town capacity' sites anticipated (predicted to be 3,200 homes over the Plan Period).

5. The 7 designated sites were put forward to provide 200-300 new affordable homes in the interim period before Policy H3 becomes established.
6. The Minister has removed 3 of the sites (Samarès, Longueville and Cooke's Nurseries) because of assurances he gave the Constables. It does not remove the need for the homes that would have gone on those sites (between 123 and 195 homes, depending on density, in the CDIP-2009).
7. The Examination in Public Inspectors criticized the decision to remove Samarès and Longueville, because they accepted the need to designate additional sites for affordable housing.
8. The Minister has not accepted their recommendations. Accordingly, it is necessary to designate additional sites for affordable housing. Alternate sites have been set out at paragraphs 6.59 and 6.60 of the RDIP-2011, but it will be some years before these come forward, and to deliver affordable homes on them the Public will have to take a significant 'hit' on their previously assessed value (the anticipated receipts from which are intended to fund the States capital expenditure programme in the coming years).

### **Affordable Housing**

One of the key identified objectives of the Island Plan is to ensure there is an adequate supply of new homes over the next 10 years, particularly for first-time buyers. The Island Plan therefore contains detailed projections as to the number of homes and the 'housing mix' required, taking into account the acute shortage of affordable housing and, in particular, the need to build 'family' homes (i.e. 3/4 bedroom houses). Samarès Nurseries was carefully considered by the professional civil servants employed by the Planning Department and was recommended as a site particularly suitable for development. Their recommendation was supported by the independent Planning Inspectors who led the Island Plan consultation process. The final report of the Inspectors noted that "The Inspectors conclude, with conviction, that the merits of this site are considerable. The site is well located in relation to the Built-up Area; it has good services (buses, schools, etc.); little damaging impact on the countryside, and is previously developed land which is falling into dereliction". It is also abundantly clear from the initial draft of the Island Plan that the development of Samarès Nurseries is crucial to meeting the objective of supplying affordable homes. This is because the site will yield as many homes in isolation as all of the other proposed sites put together. There are no better or more suitable sites available.

### **Demand**

#### Homelessness

It was interesting to see the new home for men, Sanctuary House, run by the Caring Hands Christian charity, opening this week in St. Aubin. It is supported by the ex-Chief Minister and within the first week it was full.

It is housing men from 19 to 66 years of age and it has a waiting list of 20 further men already who are waiting for access to a home (4th May 2011).

As you drive into town for a bit of shopping in King Street, it is sometimes too hectic a place to notice the homeless people, some of whom are walking alongside you and others who are picking food from the dustbins, but they are there.

There was opposition from residents in St. Aubin to this shelter when it was first raised, as people wanted it elsewhere. The same can be said about opponents to housing in this instance.

The reality is though, that there is a shortage and there will be a greater shortage in the future without more being built now.

### States Housing

I contacted the Housing Department to ask about waiting lists for social housing. There are on the housing waiting list 10 families which are at the worst end of the spectrum with 3 families currently effectively classified as homeless.

The officers said that estimating forward for 'affordable housing' is complex (this term obviously includes all Category A housing, Social Rent, Homebuy, First-Time Buyer and over-55s).

Set out below is the current social housing need, the historic waiting lists and how this has increased once supply dried up in 2008 and the projected waiting lists (assuming current trends and existing supply provision).

The correlation between supply and waiting list level over the past 6 years is shown here.

(Data supplied by The Director of Strategic Development States Housing Department)

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Year end Waiting List</b>	264	233	234	292	385	425
<b>Units supplied in Year</b>	26	205	77	-13	0	0

The correlation between supply and waiting list level over the past 6 years is shown here.

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Year end Waiting List</b>	264	233	234	292	385	425
<b>Units supplied in Year</b>	26	205	77	-13	0	0

Looking forward, it is generally the supply uncertainty that complicates things and so we'd prefer to state demand as a range at this stage.

This is set out below. We have run 2 scenarios from our model.

A worst-case scenario which only assumes that those sites presently underway are delivered. A best-case scenario which assumes that all existing zoned sites are delivered in the next 5 years.

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
<b>Projected Year end Waiting List (existing sites underway)</b>	530	608	732	872	1,014	1,160
<b>Projected Year end position (absolute best case)</b>	382	345	349	452	550	642
<b>Mid-Point</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>477</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>662</b>	<b>782</b>	<b>901</b>

<b>Continued</b>	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
<b>Projected Year end Waiting List (existing sites underway)</b>	1,295	1,432	1,572	1,712	1,852
<b>Projected Year end position (absolute best case)</b>	739	836	933	1,029	1,125
<b>Mid-Point</b>	<b>1,017</b>	<b>1,134</b>	<b>1,253</b>	<b>1,371</b>	<b>1,488</b>

Either scenario is unlikely to be totally accurate and we are likely to see delivery somewhere in between. We have added a mid-point figure for that reason.

The IP suggests that 475 affordable homes will be delivered in the first 5 years of the plan (proposal 17 – page 242).

It should be noted that the model is updated monthly as new application and void turnover data is available. The numbers do therefore change and are likely to be sensitive to economic conditions.

Below is a list of the application numbers by bed type – only applicants who are successful in getting onto the waiting list are included here –

<b>Applications onto waiting list each year by bed type</b>						
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
1 bed	81	103	179	134	135	145
2 bed	104	80	103	101	181	140
3 bed	28	27	31	46	60	46
4 bed	1	4	4	2	3	3
	<b>214</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>334</b>

The Plan has not taken into account the fact that the population is increasing at a much faster rate than we have planned for. The 2002 Island Plan based its needs on a plan that set an increase of no more than 200 people a year. It has exceeded that number on average by 190 people every year since it was adopted. The average number of people

increasing in Jersey over the last 5 years has been 640, with an additional 250 births over deaths.

This Plan is worse. It sets the increase at 325 per year for all policies –

**ISLAND PLAN 2011: APPROVAL – Lodged au Greffe on 29th March 2011 by the Minister for Planning and Environment (P.48/2011)**

At the bottom of page 8 it defines the criteria for all of the policies in the Plan!

5.3 The States of Jersey has considered and adopted a strategy to respond to and best manage the demographic shift in the Island's population, represented by the ageing society. In doing this, it has addressed the issue of inward migration and the Island Plan responds to this key strategic direction. Specifically, in the short term, the States have adopted a policy which allows maximum inward migration at a rolling 5 year average of no more than 150 heads of household per annum (an overall increase of c.325 people per annum). This is to be reviewed and reset every 3 years. And it is this that has been used to assess and formulate all of the planning policies contained in the Island Plan, such as, for example, the level of provision that needs to be made to meet the potential housing demand over the Plan period.

and over the last 4 years that number has been 700 people on average, with an additional 250 every year of births over deaths which takes that number to, on average, 950 a year.

(Data supplied below from Head of States of Jersey, Statistics Unit, April 2011)

Scenario 1 as per Draft Island Plan, +325 people per year (+150 households) sees population peak at around 97,000 in 2035-2040 ..... and then stay around 96,000 until 2060.

(Data supplied below from Head of States of Jersey, Statistics Unit, April 2011)

Scenario 2 as per actual numbers of people arriving, +700 people per year (+325 households) see population increase steadily ..... to 108,000 by 2035 ..... and continuing to rise to 123,000 by 2060.

The Plan as tabled by the Minister, Senator F.E. Cohen, and his 2 Assistant Ministers, Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour and Deputy C.H. Egré of St. Peter, will fail to produce the requirements without cramming higher densities into St. Helier.

The Plan as tabled by the Minister and his Assistants will fail in many policy areas, as only half the numbers have been included that should have been.

It will fail for many reasons on many issues and which ones first will be a matter of debate, but one thing is for certain: it will fail on the provision of housing, especially Category A housing.

And it will fail in all areas of 'affordable housing', which includes all Category A housing, Social Rent, Homebuy, First-Time Buyer and over-55s.

Having discussed Deputy I.J. Gorst of St. Clement's other amendments for a netball court, I was surprised to hear that he had not mentioned the 30 or so Category B homes that he says are required to deliver this sports facility, and wonder where the extra protection he mentions he is seeking in this amendment is being guaranteed in his own proposals for the wealthy and their houses!

**Financial and manpower implications**

There are no financial or manpower implications arising from this amendment to Amendment 11.