

**QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE HOUSING COMMITTEE ON TUESDAY,  
3rd FEBRUARY 2004 BY DEPUTY G.P. SOUTHERN OF ST. HELIER**

**Question 1**

In an e-mail to the Health and Social Services Department and copied to members on 10th February 2003, concerning one of the Committee's properties vacated by the tenant, the President stated: 'the tenant took possession of this lovely 4-bed new house in 1997'.

- (a) Would the President inform members when the property in question was first built and when it had last been refurbished before the incident in question?
- (b) The President also stated in his e-mail 'we now have to pick up the cost of £20 to £30k to put it right.' Will the President inform members of -
  - (i) the actual costs incurred by the Department along with details of the work that was done?
  - (ii) the costs that were charged to the tenant along with details of the work required?
  - (iii) the time taken to re-let the property?
- (c) Before visiting the property on 10th February 2003 did he or any of the Department's officers attempt to contact the tenant?

**Answer**

- 1. (a) The property was built in 1959 and completely refurbished in 1992.
- (b) (i) Between 10th February 2003, and the return to the Housing Department of the keys on 24th February 2003, the tenant carried out a considerable amount of work to the property. The Department subsequently spent a total of £7,106, broken down as follows,
  - kitchen, including flooring   £2,400
  - plumbing and heating   £700
  - electrical   £646
  - decoration, including external doors   £1,800
  - external work, including drains   £1,000
  - glazing, cleaning, other minor works   £560
- (ii) The tenant was recharged £273 in total, broken down as follows –
  - rubbish clearance and cleaning   (£66),
  - replacement of smoke detectors   (£102),
  - replacement of double glazing   (£80) and
  - administration   (£25).
- (c) No, neither the Department nor I was aware of the tenant's whereabouts. The tenant gave no notice of an intention to vacate and worried neighbours contacted the Department to report that the dwelling appeared to have been abandoned.

**Question 2**

In his e-mail of 10th February 2003, the President referred to the fact that 'there was filth, excrement everywhere' in the property. Does the President still consider his comments to be valid in view of subsequent reports from his Department and other agencies following further visits to the premises?

**Answer**

Yes, when I visited the property on 10th February 2003, it was in an appalling state and I will now circulate to members photographs taken at the time of the visit. The tenant subsequently made a great effort to restore the property to a reasonable condition, and that is commendable, but it does not detract from the validity of my opinion on 10th February.