

# STATES OF JERSEY

## MIGRATION POLICY REVIEW

BLAMPIED ROOM, STATES BUILDING

-----

Committee: Deputy G. Southern (Chairman)  
Senator P. Le Claire  
Deputy J. Martin  
Deputy J. Bernstein

-----

### EVIDENCE FROM

MR JOHN RICHARDSON (Chief Executive, Public Services Department)  
MR ROGER CORFIELD (Principal Planner, Planning Department)

-----

on

Friday, 6th May 2005

-----

(Digital Transcription by Marten Walsh Cherer Limited,  
Midway House, 27/29 Cursitor St., London, EC4A 1LT.  
Telephone: 020 7405 5010. Fax: 020 7405 5026)

-----

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Welcome this afternoon to this Scrutiny Panel session. We are talking to John Richardson and Roger Corfield from the Planning Department. Before we start, I have to deal with a formality. It is important that you fully understand the conditions under which you are appearing at this hearing. You will find a printed copy of the statement I am about to read to you on the table in front of you.

Shadow Scrutiny Panels have been established by the States to create opportunities for training States Members and Officers in developing new skills in advance of the proposed changes of government. During this shadow period, the Panel has no statutory powers and the proceedings at public hearings are not covered by Parliamentary privilege. This means that anyone participating, whether a Panel Member or a person giving evidence, is not protected from being sued or prosecuted for anything said during hearings. The Panel would like you to bear this in mind when answering questions and to ensure that you understand that you are fully responsible for any comments that you make.

Our aim today is to understand some of the background, the factual background, which lies behind basically the document *Planning for Homes* and its links with the work produced by the Statistics Department on housing needs. That is where we are examining. So the first point is that, going back to the Strategic Plan 2005-2010, it calls for an increase in the housing stock of no more than 1,750 units. The first question, I suppose, is how is this number arrived at? Where did it come from and should it require being revised in the light of the latest Housing Needs Survey?

MR CORFIELD: The first point, I think, is that this figure emerged, in my understanding, from OXERA, who were consultants to the Policy and Resources Committee, and there was no consultation, as far as I am aware, with the Planning Department on arriving at that figure, so I wouldn't want to speculate on how they arrived at that figure. They must have made certain assumptions about things like natural growth -- births over deaths -- they must have made assumptions about the formation of household rates and they must have made assumptions about migration. Really, I wouldn't want to speculate on how they put all those things together in coming up with that figure.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Does this go back to the sort of 2002 area, where they were talking about population and the economy, population and housing? Was there a report OXERA did at that time? I am certainly aware of one that says *Population and the Economy*.

MR CORFIELD: I wasn't privy to that report. I am just aware of where the figures came from. I know there was some consultation within the Department, with the Chief Executive at the time, questioning where the figure came from. That is just about all I know on the subject and really, you know, not being the author of it, it is very difficult to comment on it really.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Right, fair enough.

DEPUTY BERNSTEIN: But the figures were taken as read?

MR CORFIELD: Well, by the Planning? ... the thing is, in approving the Strategic Plan, the States presumably recognised that that was a requirement of the plan, that there should be no more than that number of homes produced. So they must have agreed that, the States. The Planning Department, in all its work in dealing with land availability and policy... planning policy... has based its requirements figures on information produced by the Statistics Unit.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Right.

MR CORFIELD: And the Island Plan itself was informed by the previous Statistics Unit report, which basically involved an analysis of the 'Couttie Study'.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: That is right.

MR CORFIELD: Which goes back to a household survey of 2000,... the year 2000.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Yes.

MR CORFIELD: So we would base our information, the Planning Department and its policy, and certainly the Island Plan does, on the information produced by the Statistics Unit.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Okay, and certainly we have been hearing from the Stats Department this morning and one of the issues that arose from that is that the earlier study produced a turnover of something like 20,000 households; whereas the latest figures suggest that the market has cooled down, as it were, and we are looking at 12,000 as a shift.

MR CORFIELD: Right. I think that is probably demonstrated better by the overall requirement figures. If we take the requirement figures that informed the Island Plan for 2002 and 2006, we

were talking about something in the region of 3,000 qualified sector homes and 1,000 (in the region of) non-qualified homes required. The new survey talks about something like 1,900 qualified homes -- significantly less new homes -- being required in the qualified sector and something like 570, or something like that, in the non-qualified sector. So it shows a reduction, and there are all sorts of reasons for that, I think.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Okay. In the latest, the 2004 Housing Requirements Survey, I don't know if you have got that with you?

MR CORFIELD: No, but I do have some outline questions here, which has some of the information on it.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Are you talking about question 2 on my sheet?

MR CORFIELD: Question 2, yes. It is yours, is it? Yes, I do have that and I do have some outline information.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Okay. So we are talking about potential shortfall of some 1,500 units in the two, three and four bedroom owner-occupier properties.

MR CORFIELD: That is right.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: And effectively, if that shortfall becomes a reality, this will make the housing market stodgy. It is going to block up the housing market because it is no good having a surplus of a particular type of accommodation, the one and two bedroom flats or whatever. If you can't free people up to move on into the three and four bed properties, then that surplus doesn't count for anything because nobody is going to move. Would you like to say something about that, about that pinch-point? How do you see that?

MR CORFIELD: I think there has always been a difficulty in moving throughout the housing market in Jersey anyway and once people get into a property it is difficult to make the next step up to the next stage. Clearly, you know, if you don't meet the demand for three and two and family sized homes, then it will mean that there will be pressure put on that sector, you know, and that is translated into all sorts things like higher costs and all the rest of it, but, equally, it will mean that those people who have an aspiration to move to there, and they could come from a lot of sources -- they might be private rental, they may have got their housing qualifications just,

they may be trying to upgrade themselves from a smaller house or they may be first time buyers even -- those people can't move and so they are left in the original accommodation. A lot of them, I suppose, will be in one bed type of accommodation. I am looking here just to make sure we have got the same ideas, but one bed accommodation and ... I have forgotten what I was going to say on that now. Yes, and so the outcome of that obviously is that the projected shortfalls in that one bed accommodation are going to be less if they can't move. Obviously, the main thing to say, from Planning's point of view and the Committee's point of view, Environment and Public Services, is that this is an issue that is highlighted. It is just one of a number of factors that are highlighted as a requirement in the new Housing Requirement Study that will need to be addressed by the Committees as soon as we have completed our work on planning for homes, and... only when they have the facts about the other side of the equation, what the likely yields are going to be and commitments are going to be over that period, will they be able to make that sort of political decision, if you like, about how they will address this particular issue.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN:           Nonetheless, I don't quite follow your sequencing of that. In terms of supply, you are saying you have already got this figure which has come from, we suggest, OXERA of 1,750 units. Now, if you are talking about a potential shortfall of 1,500 units in a particular sector making the market tighter, if you then add on the political emphasis that is just placed about increasing access to the housing market, to A to H, to decent accommodation and particularly that 1,575 figure doesn't include a number of units -- 155 units from people who will qualify under the 15 year rule; it doesn't include a further 255 units if we bring down, as it is suggested we are going to, the 15 year rule to 10 years; nor does it account for any net inward migration, which might account for another 45 units over the whole spread of the plan. If you add that lot up, I believe you are actually over and above the 1.750 which, according to the Strategic Plan, is the limit of the build.

MR CORFIELD:           Well, that may well be the case. The housing requirements figures are based on the aspirations of the people who filled in that survey basically in the 2004... the end of 2004. So they are aspirations. Now, you might have to ask the Statistics Unit, or you may already have done that, about whether or not they thought those aspirations were realistic. Clearly, some

people's aspirations won't be realistic. They won't be able to afford it, but, generally speaking, my understanding from the Statistics Unit is that people have a pretty good idea of how much properties cost and, therefore, are fairly realistic in what they are saying they want to do in terms of moving within the next two to five years.

Whether or not, you know, this figure ends up something like the figure being suggested by OXERA isn't the relevant point as far as I am concerned. Basically, if there is a requirement, an outstanding requirement, a numerical requirement for a number of units and, after we have added our bit of the equation, if you like, on the supply side there is still a sizeable outstanding requirement for family homes in the owner-occupied sector, then the Committees will have to make a decision how they are going to address that.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Right.

MR CORFIELD: And that is a decision for Housing and for Environment and Public Services and maybe even other Committees who have fiscal controls which impact on housing need and so forth. So that is the issue from what I can see. We have still got to do our side of the equation. The situation may well be helped, I would venture to suggest, by the fact that we have now got quite a lot of family type housing coming on stream, as it were, in terms of the H2 sites, which have started. Four to date have started. Others are at a pretty advanced stage and may be starting shortly, but I think there are only four of those sites that have never progressed to the public consultation exercise prior to an application. So there will be a lot of family sized homes coming forward on those sites.

Equally, we have seen over recent years quite large scale development through the normal planning process...the application process, from private developments. Needless to say, obviously, if the market sees there is an opportunity, then presumably developers will look to provide for that market, just as they have provided for what they have seen as markets before in terms of smaller units. I can't really answer it definitely.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Yes, yes, that is fair enough, my point being though that one has to accept that in the package of measures being brought in, of which the Migration Policy is one and economic growth is another, the bottom of that line and we are continually being told by

people, by the politicians involved, that of course that is all dependent on the ability to actually increase access to a decent housing market. An ability to supply that housing market, and that supply of housing, that consideration will be the limiter in being able to achieve Migration Policy, economic growth, etc, etc.

How seriously, I suppose the question is, do you take this possible mismatch between the Strategic Plan limit and what effectively may well be a shortfall in an area where we haven't built in the past? We have built plenty of one and two bed properties which are knocking around, but three and four certainly in the social housing area I know is a pinch-point from Housing, but that is a "hidey-man's" area and the indication is that it is going to continue to be a pinch-point.

MR CORFIELD: I realise this is verging a bit on the political, but I can say some things though. I can say some things.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Yes.

MR CORFIELD: First of all, I think, through all my experiences with various Committees over the years, since the early nineties, they have all been committed to ensuring that there is adequate housing for the community's needs. They have all been committed to that task, and that is why we have been doing, basically, *Planning for Homes* type reports since 1993. Basically the Island Plan as well, one of its aims is to ensure that there is adequate housing to meet the needs of the community. That is repeated in housing policy, housing strategy and it presumably, I assume as well, it is also in the Strategic Plan that we would need to do that. How seriously it is taken?... I think is a question for the Committee how seriously they are going to take this. Clearly we can report the facts to them. We can tell them what the current situation is and ----

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: When you say "*the Committee*", you mean?

MR CORFIELD: Sorry, the Environment and Public Services Committee, but also the Housing Committee play a part in this because they are working jointly on this sort of issue. We will report the facts and they will determine how seriously they take the situation, and in fact they will determine what action they will take.

MR RICHARDSON: If I can probably add, but I may be moving into the next question you are

going to ask, it appears that we are almost at a transition stage at the moment, in that we are coming to the end of the old *Planning for Homes* period, which was 2002 to 2006; whereas the Housing Requirements Report is five to nine, so we are just at the end of one and the starting the next. It seems, certainly from where I have been picking up, having taken on the planning side of Environment and Public Services, that, in producing the next housing requirements document -- sorry *Planning for Homes* document -- we have to make sure that the timescale for that one dovetails in with the housing requirements report, so instead of being six to ten it will probably be five to nine as well, which is the one that we are producing at the moment. I think it is at that stage that both the Environment and Public Services Committee, the Housing Committee and any other Committees involved need to have a look at previous figures, what the projections are from the housing report and then make sure that the next *Planning for Homes* document adequately addresses it, because I think, if we don't, there could be some imbalance.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: That is right, that is right. Paul, is there something you wanted to come in with?

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Yes, thank you. In the beginning of your report, *Planning for Homes*, you state: "*It is important to recognise that meeting the need for social rented and first time buyer homes is heavily dependent on the delivery of homes on land zoned under Policy H2 of the Island Plan in an appropriate time and at land efficient densities.*" So to meet those needs, it is heavily dependent upon that factor or those factors. You have mentioned that four to date of the H2 sites have come on stream and four have never progressed. How many in total were there?

MR CORFIELD: Eleven.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Eleven. We have at the moment the Housing Committee proposing in the next couple of weeks to reduce the qualifications down another year. This may not be at hand, but I note that 275 families at the end of 2003 were on the housing rental waiting list and 234 of those were considered to be in urgent need of rehousing for a variety of reasons, including ill health, etc.

MR CORFIELD: Yes.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Do we know how many are currently on the housing rental waiting



list? That is the first question. The second one is that as pointed out further on in your report, a prime target of the Housing Committee, as set out in its 2002 Housing Strategy, was to reduce the States' rental waiting list to below 100 by 2006 with a waiting list of less than six months for all urgent cases. What is the likelihood of us getting anywhere near that? Do you know the numbers?

MR CORFIELD: Right. That was an awful lot of question. I don't know the numbers, but there are questions behind that. First of all, the housing waiting lists are historically low. They have been up to 900 in the early nineties. They are historically low. They have been below 300, normally kicking around 250, that sort of target, 250/275, that sort of / type of figure.

Secondly, Housing have changed over the years what they consider to be a suitable waiting list, and that obviously depends on how many they have got on their waiting list and what they want to bring it down to. So it has been 200 in the past and they are talking about 100 now. They may even be talking about less if we have a more healthy housing situation and a more balanced situation. So that is the first point. I don't know the figures, but obviously we will incorporate those figures from Housing, the latest figures, whatever they are, into the *Planning for Homes* document and it is just another way of getting a handle on what the situation is with the rental side of things.

On the opening statement of yours about, as I recall, Category A housing and the statement in *Planning for Homes 2004* that, in order to meet target figures for Category A housing we have to develop all the H2 sites and, in fact, all the capital programme and in fact all the sites that were frozen, (the three urban sites that were frozen with funding), we have to develop all those if we are to meet those targets.

The point I would make about that is that those targets have changed. The position has moved. Those targets were based on an earlier household survey. They informed the Island Plan and they were based on a household survey of 2000; they were based on the previous Statistics Unit report of 2002; and now we have this new report which says: "Hang on a minute, we are now starting a whole new chapter in housing requirements. For the next five years we are rolling everything forward, so, instead of talking about the first five years of the plan... 2002 to 2006,

we are rolling it all forward now from 2005 to 2009 and we are talking about generally lower requirements for that type of housing.”

So, to come back to the inference, I think, behind your point, are we doing well really because we have only got four sites that are actually under construction at the moment in the H2 sites?... I would say that the Island Plan was doing pretty well, subject to those conditions that you have mentioned, in meeting the previous targets and we have got an opportunity here / now with the lower requirements to do pretty well, if you like, in the new set of requirements.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: You might have misunderstood.

MR CORFIELD: Sorry.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: I am not inferring anything at all. I am just reading this. This is your report of 3rd August 2004.

MR CORFIELD: Yes.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: And in your report of 3rd August 2004, on page 3, which is basically the first of your plan for the way ahead, your second paragraph: “*However, it is important to recognise that meeting the need for social rented and first time buyer homes is heavily dependent on the delivery of homes under Policy H2*”, blah, blah, blah. What it is saying to me is that, you know, this is a relatively new report, 3rd August 2004, and your objectives of meeting social rental and first time buyer homes, just those two alone, are heavily dependent on the policies of developing H2. Now, I asked how many have been delivered. I didn’t mean to infer anything at all by that. I just wanted to understand how many there were -- eleven.

The second question was, in reference to your second statement, which says: “... *in an appropriate time frame and at land efficient densities*”, so the second question would be you set out your land efficient densities within your report, but have you managed to stay with those densities, which give room for your three references?

MR CORFIELD: Well, the densities aren’t necessarily set out in that report. The densities are set out in development briefs and in the Island Plan.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: All right.

MR CORFIELD: They may be referred to in that report, but ----

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Referred to, yes, referred to.

MR CORFIELD: Now, again, I have got to be a bit careful on the political side of things. I am sorry about this, but I am aware of the man on my right-hand shoulder here, Jiminy Cricket,... but basically the Island Plan talks about certain yields for sites based on average densities.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Can I get us all fresh on it? On page 27: *“The Housing Department suggests that the proportional split of requirements for social rental housing types should be 20% one bedroom, including sheltered units, 10% two bedroom, 60% three bedroom and 10% four bedroom.”*

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: What page is that again?

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Page 27.

MR CORFIELD: Right, that is not density. That is proportion.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: *“The proportional split of requirements for social rented housing types.”* So, because I am referring to social rented, because I am referring to the two areas, social rented and first time buyer houses, this is why I refer to these figures.

MR CORFIELD: Right.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: And in particular this is what I am linking these to. I would just remind you again that in the first part it says: *“Heavily dependent on the delivery of meeting social rented and first time buyer homes we have to meet the time schedule and develop land under Policy H2 and we have to do it within the efficient land densities”*, and the Housing Department suggest that those should be 20% for one bedrooms, 10% for two bedrooms, 60% for three bedrooms and 10% for four bedrooms. I don't know if I am confusing the issue.

MR CORFIELD: You are slightly. I know what you are getting at, but I think you are confusing the different terms there.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Right.

MR CORFIELD: Basically those are the proportions suggested to us to help the Housing Department with what it considered to be the best way, the best proportions, as it were, for different types of housing within the Category A housing sector that we should produce. That is what they wanted to do. Since the Island Plan, we have had 11 sites come forward, as it were,

that the Government rezoned, and each one of those sites had a rezoning proposition -- sorry, had a development brief -- and that development brief referred to these proportions. Then we had a process of dealing with developers and those proportions changed according to the process of dealing with developers, but we always took advice from Housing. What Housing were really saying is: "We want the emphasis to be on larger family homes, not on the smaller units. We are doing very well on those. We want the larger family homes."

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: And that is where I was maybe getting linked up to the table above that on page 27, whereby, in their *Housing for Homes* policy in 2002, they want to bring, or one of the prime objectives of that policy approved by the States was to bring, the waiting lists down below 100 by 2006, with a six month waiting list. We see in that table in 2002 that they had 288 people on the list. Now we are being told, at the end of 2003, we have got 275. I don't know what the latest figure are.

DEPUTY MARTIN: No.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: But I think it is still about the same. So what we are seeing, in my view, is, you know, new people coming on, houses being built, but the issue not being addressed. So this Housing Policy primary ... this Housing goal or aim of reducing the States waiting list, although it may have been 900 in the past, hasn't really moved since 2002 when the States approved a policy which we have been working in conjunction with the Planning and Environment Committee to bring the number down and we are still at the same level and we have still got people in urgent need for a variety of reasons, including ill health etc. So it doesn't seem to me that the developments that are coming online are addressing the needs of the social ... you know, it is meant to be a social justice policy and it doesn't look to me like it's meeting the needs of those people on the social rental waiting list.

MR CORFIELD: Well, I accept what you are saying, and the figures speak for themselves. You know, I won't dispute the figures. What you are saying makes sense. But what I would say is that we have had a situation lately where, in 1999, we rezoned a lot of sites. The intent at that time was that they should be partly first time buyer, if you recall, and partly social rented. Because we zoned them as Category A housing sites, they were meeting their obligations ...

developers... by building first time buyers on those sites. Of course, you know, it made more sense economically for them to build them, so we didn't get any social rented homes on those sites.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: True.

MR CORFIELD: With the new rezoned land in the Island Plan that is quite different, and, in fact, we have now instigated on the sites that have been approved planning obligation agreements which effectively mean that they must meet the proportions that the States agreed should be the proportions between first time buyer and social rented units. So when we do get them coming forward, when they are delivered, as it were, we should see a better balance on those sites.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: One last question?

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: One last one and then Judy?

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Geoff is going to pick up later on about the future building programme, but just one last question on the H2. We have got 11. Four have been built on and four have never been progressed. Are all of those other H2 now part of this new agreement and when will they start to move forwards?

MR CORFIELD: Um, right ...

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: You said there was a new agreement now.

MR CORFIELD: There is a rolled forward period, if you like, of five years, which now has a new set of requirement figures.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Yes.

MR CORFIELD: A reduced set of requirement figures generally. Those Category A housing sites, H2 sites, which are in the process of development we will count against, if you like, the new requirement figures. So, you know, obviously there will be a considerable proportion of those that will be met by commitments already in existence and by these sites.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Do they marry up? Just one last sneaky last one, do they marry up to the figures stated in the report that we saw, the 10% and the 20%? Does the new policy marry up to that to meet this need?

MR CORFIELD: No. I mean, on individual sites. On individual sites different proportions of different sized houses are being developed. Now, when we developed the briefs... those sites

must be developed in accordance with the briefs... When we developed the briefs with Housing, Housing took a slightly different view to this, as it were these proportions, when dealing with individual sites. I think these were the proportions they wanted overall across the rental market, but, in dealing with individual sites, Category A, H2 sites, they accepted slightly different proportions in some cases. So the answer, the simple answer, to your question is that these proportions have not been strictly followed on individual H2 sites, but what has been followed is the general tenure of this to create larger family homes on those sites. So that is what we are seeing. We are not seeing a lot of flats and one bedroom units at all; we are seeing a lot of family homes on the new H2 sites.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Well, they wanted 60% three bedrooms. 60% is not a lot of one bedroom flats, is it, really, 60% of vacant sites with three bedrooms and 10% with four bedrooms.?

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Judy?

DEPUTY MARTIN: Yeah, just to get back to or sort of continuing with where Paul's coming from, it is talking about your actual figures in the *Planning for Homes* and you say the figures have moved, but up until a few months ago obviously you were working on the figure of 2,860 homes and then 200 units for sheltered accommodation and 50 homes for young adults with special needs. So my question is, in actual numbers, out of the 2,860 what have we achieved; the 200 units of sheltered accommodation, what have we achieved; and the 50 homes for the young, what have we achieved? Are we anywhere near?

MR CORFIELD: Well, I can only tell you ... I can only ... first of all, I don't have those figures to hand. *Planning for Homes* tried to project the requirements, as it were ... you know, these were the requirements and it tried to work out what is the supply, take away that supply -- I think it is in Section 8 -- and that is what you would be left with. Now, as far as the sheltered accommodation is concerned, that has been an ongoing concern for the Housing Committee. I am not sure who is on what Committee here -- I am sorry about that.

DEPUTY MARTIN: No one is on Housing.

MR CORFIELD: But it has been an ongoing concern for the Housing Committee and there are

meetings being arranged to see if that can be dealt with because I know that the President of the Housing Committee is anxious to bring forward sites seeking, I think, to address that specifically. Clearly there are some private developments that address that issue; for example, the very large development whose name escapes me at the moment. I think the L'Hermitage Hotel at Beaumont.

DEPUTY MARTIN:                Beaumont, yes.

MR CORFIELD:                Which is a very large scale -- sheltered is a very difficult term to define, but it is a large scale -- older person's type development which would obviously involve a great chunk of that, if it was accepted under the term "*sheltered*". Now, I know "*sheltered*" can mean all things to all people. My understanding of "*sheltered*" if I was pressed on that would be something where you have supported living and, therefore, have some sort of warden or somebody to support that living for people who would otherwise not be able to live on their own. Other people's understanding of "*sheltered*" is slightly different -- older persons' homes and community homes where there are groups of people, younger people, living together in the same home or that sort of thing.

So, to answer your question, clearly when we do the next *Planning for Homes*, that will be part of the equation. We have different figures, but it is still an exercise we have to do. We have different figures now for how many sheltered units we produce, how many Category A units we produce, how many units we need to produce over all, rolled forward to 2009. Within that period we will do the exercise, as it were, of saying -- and this is why this is slightly premature, because we haven't done the exercise, we are only at the beginnings of it -- we will do the exercise, take away, if you like, and adapt what we know to be the supply in these different areas that are identified in the requirements figures. We will come up with, you know, presumably a series of shortfalls in certain areas which the Committee then will have to develop into their action programme for meeting those and targeting those areas. I am sorry, as soon as I get the figures maybe I can get them to you, but I don't have them now.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN:            That is not a problem.

DEPUTY MARTIN:                That is fine. Thank you.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: One question is, I suppose, I am picking up this picture of we set out to build this many homes at 2,800 at the beginning of 2002. We have got slippage on H2s so that actually we haven't succeeded in doing that. The States' waiting list is still as long as it was. Whilst I can accept that we have done a lot of building in the last few years and there have been a lot of new homes built, I am just hearing slippage and failure. Am I wrong to draw that conclusion?

MR RICHARDSON: I think, just picking up from one or two of the comments and questions so far, I think what you haven't seen yet is the full impact of the new Island Plan actually delivering at the point where people are starting to live in these new homes, where the new 45/55 split comes in, because a lot of those developments are fairly large and they are now under construction. So, picking up some of the issues about housing and social rented, that list may still be present (and obviously from the figures it is), but a lot of these H2 sites which were part of the new Island Plan which provided the split between social rent and first time buyer are still in the construction period. I don't think there are many that have actually come on line yet. So I think perhaps it might be a little early to make that firm decision. I don't know when the big ones have started to come on, but certainly ----

MR CORFIELD: Well, Mont a L'Abbe is an example of a very big site that is taking place now. Jambart Lane is another.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: And the funding for that is secure and scheduled to be on line in which year?

MR CORFIELD: It will take 18 months to develop a site that size basically, Mont a L'Abbe, because it is about 124 homes, so it will take about 18 months. Obviously, you know, it is going to be delivering in the new identified requirements five year programme.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: In a set of plans that say to 2005 to 2009, projected on that?

MR RICHARDSON: Yes.

MR CORFIELD: Yes, exactly.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: And we are already half way through 2005.

MR RICHARDSON: But, I think, just to complete that answer, we are, as I think I said earlier,



at a junction in time.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Yes, I think that is right.

MR RICHARDSON: What you see now is the decisions that have been made through the previous *Planning for Homes* document actually starting to bear fruit, but the decisions of the Island Plan, which was where the major change took place in terms of trying to deliver more social rented as part of this split on these properties, they probably haven't come on line yet. You mentioned Mont a L'Abbe, or Roger mentioned Mont a L'Abbe, but that site is only just starting.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: That is right.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Geoff, I think it is important for you, because it is your question and it is not answered really. The Chairman is saying that he is wondering whether there is a sign of failure, although you are saying these houses have begun. There is another part of your report on page 30, which says: "*Other anecdotal evidence, with many of the developers who are engaged in bringing forward the H2 Category A housing site rezoned in the Island Plan have indicated that they have been inundated with requests from first time buyers wishing to purchase one of their homes. Some have reported that their lists are over-subscribed and that they have had to repeatedly turn people away.*" Doesn't that demonstrate that even the ones that have begun are fully over-subscribed and people are repeatedly being turned away, even the ones that have begun, let alone the four they haven't even started?

MR CORFIELD: I think, at that point in time ----

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: August 2004.

MR CORFIELD: Yes, I know it does seem a long time away, or it does to me working in the Planning Department.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: It must feel like a lifetime, I'm sure.

MR CORFIELD: But, yes, there was lots of demand. The thing that we couldn't get a handle on, because it was commercially sensitive and basically the developers wouldn't give us the information, was their waiting lists,... so that we could compare all of the waiting lists of all the developers, because obviously there is going to be a lot of doubling up, as it were, of people

putting their names down on different waiting lists for different developers. So we have got a lot of double counting there. So we couldn't get a handle on that, but you may be interested to know that the Housing Department and whoever is on the Housing Committee will know ----

DEPUTY MARTIN: None of us.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: It is not us, no.

MR CORFIELD: Right. The Housing Department has a list of first time buyers, basically a schedule of first time buyers, and that list was allowed to go out of date and they have very recently indicated that they will be updating that list, clearing out all those people with unrealistic expectations and coming up with a definitive list. So it may be ... I mean, I will certainly chase that up when I am doing *Planning for Homes* and it may be for this group also that it would be a good idea for it to chase that up. Presumably the Housing Department will know which of the sites are now in process, which names are involved there and take them off their list so that you get a better picture, if you like, of the outstanding requirements for first time buyers, as defined by their list as opposed to the Housing Requirements Study.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Can I come back to the balance between the 45/55 social housing and first time buyers split? You are saying that H2 sites we developed for some more ... well, we have got slippage and some that have never got off the ground. The overall intention was to get the 45/55 split across those H2 sites.

MR CORFIELD: Yes.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: And as we have only developed a small number of them, it seems to me that I am certainly hearing that some of those sites went almost entirely to first time buyer homes, so it delivered some of the elements, but not all.

MR CORFIELD: No.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: And if we don't deliver those H2 sites, we may not achieve that 45/55 split. Is that accurate or not?

MR CORFIELD: No. Can I just say that the Committee, both Committees, the Environment and Public Services and Housing, are absolutely committed to this split, this tenure split of 45/55%. That tenure split, yes, should apply to all these sites.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: But it hasn't.

MR CORFIELD: No, but where a developer has two of these sites, it is possible to develop, you know, the split across both sites. So we have an example of Jambart Lane, which you are probably thinking about, which is all first time buyer developments, but the corollary to that is that you have the Hodge Nursery site, which is all rental units.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Right.

MR CORFIELD: Together, combined they are roughly around that split. In the case of something like Mont a L'Abbe, where we have got 124 homes, the split is as is required.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Okay.

MR CORFIELD: And that presumably will apply to St. Peter's as well and the other site that is up and running at the moment, which escapes me at the moment.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: So you are saying that actually, as the developments are taking place, you have actually managed to achieve that split?

MR CORFIELD: Yes.

MR RICHARDSON: Yes, absolutely.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: So we are not waiting for somebody to come along and volunteer to do social housing or a big exercise at the end to make sure that balance is right.

MR CORFIELD: No.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Okay, because I was getting the impression that that was possibly happening, but you are saying that is not the case.

MR RICHARDSON: The big schemes, which are now up and running, although you haven't seen the people moving into them yet, have achieved the 45/55 split.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Right.

MR RICHARDSON: And certainly the ones that are in the pipeline are all, from the Environment and Public Services Committee's point of view, determined, I think along with Housing Committee, to ensure that we achieve that balance.

MR CORFIELD: It may well be, as well, picking up your point, Senator, that the situation has changed over a very short period of time in terms of first time buyer requirements, because, just

anecdotally, I feel, you get the impression talking to developers involved in that process that they are not as urgent as they have been, as it were, in terms of moving their sites forward. For example, there is less urgency on the part of one major developer for developing one of the H2 sites because he is already involved, as it were, in developing one of the others ones.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE:           What other one? Another H2 site?

MR RICHARDSON:           I think, from a commercial point of view, we have got to be careful not to mention specific developers.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE:           I am not entering into commercial areas.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN:           But another H2 site?

SENATOR LE CLAIRE:           Another site?

MR RICHARDSON:           Yes.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE:           Because, in your report, you also state that you are going to progress new sites as well at the same time, identify new sites and progress them or something like that.

MR CORFIELD:           Right.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE:           I just wondered if you had been progressing new sites whilst these sites have been holding back.

MR CORFIELD:           First of all, we have been waiting for the Housing Requirements Study, because that was crucial, because we had outdated requirements figures basically. They were outdated because they go back to 2000, as I said before, the survey of 2000. So we had been waiting on that. In the interim, it was decided that it would be a very good idea, and I think we put it in the 'action plan', that we could do feasibility studies on the H3 and H4 sites. We do feasibility studies on them and then, if we needed to release them, we would know what the score was before we went to the public consultation on it. So we would have all the information. So that work has been progressing.

Now, clearly the Committee, once we have finished *Planning for Homes*, will have to determine whether or not it feels, (because to date we have always said or it has always been considered that it has not been necessary to release H3 and H4 sites to meet the requirements, for the very reasons that you referred to earlier), that we thought those requirements would be met if

all the H2 sites were built and all the capital programme was built and so forth.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Actually, what I am interested is knowing is these new sites, what is meant by these new sites and how many are there?

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: H3s and H4s.

MR CORFIELD: All I can say to you, because I don't want to, you know, say too much, but all I can say to you is that since the Island Plan a number of developers have come to the Department and the Committee with ideas of their own basically and so ----

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: So they have drawn the Island Plan up?

MR CORFIELD: Those aren't in the Island Plan. We don't want them in the Island Plan.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Right.

MR CORFIELD: Basically it was agreed, and I can't tell you who by, but it was agreed, that if we were doing feasibility studies on all the H3 and H4 sites, it would make sense to pick up these several other sites that were being banded about at the time.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Do you know how many homes in these several other sites we are talking about?

MR CORFIELD: No.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Are they major sites, small sites, additional sites?

MR CORFIELD: Some are major and some are minor.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: So major sites are being considered whilst ----

MR CORFIELD: No, they are not being considered. They are not being considered. They are just being subject to a feasibility study.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: A feasibility study?

MR CORFIELD: That means seeing whether they are feasible or not.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Major sites have gone through a feasibility study and the H2 sites are still sitting there not progressing?

MR CORFIELD: H2 sites are progressing.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Some are.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Well, the finance for some of the H2 sites has been knocked back until

2007, isn't it?

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Four of them you said weren't progressing.

MR CORFIELD: I didn't say they weren't progressing. I said they hadn't progressed to the public consultation stage because we have a public consultation on the brief, to agree the brief, before we invite the application, and some of them haven't got that far forward.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: But the financing for some of those sites has been knocked back and there is slippage.

MR CORFIELD: No, no. There is some confusion there as well.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: How come?

MR CORFIELD: Right. The H2 sites are not dependent on public financing. There are developers building them, so they are not dependent on that.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Right.

MR CORFIELD: When I talked about slippage because finance has been frozen in that report, I have been talking about three urban sites where the funding was frozen. Examples of those are Mascot Motors at Georgetown ----

DEPUTY MARTIN: Sunshine.

MR CORFIELD: Yes, and Salisbury Crescent as well and Sunshine, you are right. Those three sites, if the funding is frozen, I don't know what complications there are with it, but they together would produce something like 70 homes. You know, if we were adding up, as we were in *Planning for Homes*, the supply against the requirements, those 70 homes would have made a difference. The other thing to say is that the requirements for Category A housing aren't just met by zoned land. There are all sorts of sites in the capital programme, like La Coie, for example, or something like that, you know, in the capital programme. They will also meet Category A homes.

It is also true to say that a proportion of privately developed homes, which have become known as Category B through the application process, a proportion of those will effectively meet Category A requirements. If we take an example of that, we have got something like the old Jackson site, is it? What is that called? There is Spectrum anyway and there is the one that is the

old Jackson site. Now, some of the units in there could, in effect, meet, some people could argue, Category A type requirements, because they are low income group type housing, first time buyer type accommodation that is affordable to people of a certain sized household.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Part of the new Migration Policy, combined with the Economic Growth Plan, suggests that there will be an increase in what effectively has been known as J cats on the Island, licensed people in future, and they will have access to the full range of the housing market. If that were to come about, a significant a rise in the number of J cats, effectively an inward migration, what effect would you see that having on the housing market?

MR CORFIELD: I think obviously it depends on the extent to which they come in and the degree to which the Migration Policy controls the levels at which they come in, and that is down to the States obviously, whatever they decide on the Migration Policy. The numbers that are being talked about in terms of migration? I just get the impression that ...and we still need to do the work..., but I get the impression that we are not talking about great numbers of people coming in. You have all sat round this table and, okay, I know you have different views on things, but the Strategic Plan talks about 'controlled growth', it talks about 2% economic growth, it talks about 1% of jobs and so forth and it also during the debate -- and you were part of that debate -- talked about most of those jobs coming forward from people already living in Jersey. Now, if that happens, then clearly the numbers involved aren't going to be that great, in which case it won't necessarily be a major problem for the housing market and delivering in the housing market.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: But there are two changes that are taking place actually as part of the Migration Policy. One is an expansion of the number of J cats and a reduction in the number of low skilled immigrants.

MR CORFIELD: Right.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: That is the policy. That is going to happen. So where you have got a figure like an extra 45 homes in the two, three and four bedroom owner-occupier steer, and that refers to all immigrants in the Island, people who are entitled, people who are licensed, people are going to be registered, so it includes a significant number at the low end, if you take those

low end out, which is what the Migration Policy is trying to do, then effectively you would be importing high skilled, high flying immigrants, probably into FSI or similar areas. Now, that 45 homes total may well increase because you are attracting a different set of immigrants, given that the distribution will be different.

The second element that I think we are going to see come forward is that private sector J cats are lobbying and the businesses are lobbying to make sure that their J cats have the equivalent right to public sector J cats to buy when they arrive and not have the company buy for them, or whatever arrangement it is currently. So, again, it could well be that this might have an effect on the housing market, actually increasing demand. We already see, for example, in the two, three and four -- did you catch **that** one a week ago? (**Document shown**)

MR CORFIELD: Yes.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Wendy Arrowsmith suggested that, in the three bedroom and four bedroom house market, they are already seeing a tightening. I still believe that there is a serious danger if we fail to meet that target in that particularly tight area of the market and perhaps we are seeing some evidence that it is already tightening up and we are going to have to think again. But, as you say, the plan was originally, I believe, that April or May this year the new *Planning for Homes* document would be being worked on.

MR CORFIELD: That is right.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: How close are we to doing that? Has it started yet?

MR CORFIELD: Well, I estimate that we are probably talking about mid-June before you get certainly the draft report. That is what we are aiming for and, you know, obviously that is all things being equal, because resources and people are taken off-stream quite regularly to deal with other priorities, you know, such as the ongoing concerns about the built-up area boundary.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: How important do you think this document that you are going to produce in June will be to us having policy information in the future in relation to what we are doing?

MR CORFIELD: First of all, I think that providing adequate housing is the most important issue facing the Island and always has been and, in my view, it still is. Therefore, it is critical that we



ensure there is an adequate land supply to meet that requirement. Therefore, it is critical that we know all the things that combine to have an effect on that requirement, like the Migration Policy that you are debating, because that will have a crucial effect. Depending on what eventually is approved, it will have a significant impact. I think all I can say is that this *Planning for Homes* document will set the direction, if you like, and the tone based on a quite recent, you know, and fairly robust idea of what housing need is. It will set the tone for the way forward not just for the Planning Department, not just for Environment and Public Services and Housing, but other States Committees who can have an impact on the housing situation, who deal with finances around housing and all the rest of it. So I think it is very important.

But the important thing, the most important thing, to note, I would say, is that it is a moving thing. It is always a moving thing. Monitoring is always a moving thing. Circumstances change all the time, as they have in a very short period of time, which I think, you know, has come out today through our discussion, hasn't it? They have changed. Aspirations do change. The economy does go up and down and that does have different impacts on people, you know, and whether they feel confident. It is all about confidence, a lot of the market, you know, whether they feel confident entering into the market or whether they don't want a home because, you know, they don't have ----

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: So you would say it is very important?

MR CORFIELD: It is incredibly important.

MR RICHARDSON: I think this document, the next one, really does set the blue print as it is intended for the next five years.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Yes.

MR RICHARDSON: But there is a lot of recent information, such as Migration Policy, such as Fiscal Strategy and such as the Housing Needs Survey. That is going to be crucial in bringing that document together. Although we had said in the original document April, I think ----

MR CORFIELD: Only one part of the original document said April, but that was a mistake.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Yes, it did suggest that you did give a hostage to fortune -- "We'll do it in April, oh will we?"

MR RICHARDSON: But it is such an important document that if by May we can get that document out and we have been able to bring in all of these threads ----

MR CORFIELD: By June.

MR RICHARDSON: Sorry, by June we can bring all of those threads in. We have got to make sure that that is really setting that blue print for the way forward, but, as Roger has said ----

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: It is critical.

MR RICHARDSON: It is.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: It is critical for elements of the Migration Policy.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: So it is possible that it will be out before 7th June, do you think, the final draft?

MR CORFIELD: I don't think so.

MR RICHARDSON: No.

MR CORFIELD: I don't think so. Why, is 7th June critical to the debate?

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: It is critical at the moment to the Migration Policy debate. I think we have got a problem -- it depends what you call the chicken and what you call the egg -- as to whether Migration feeds into this, *Planning for Homes*, or whether *Planning for Homes* actually is the limiter that says: "Hang on, all these social equity and greater access aims that you have got for migration are dependent on being able to supply." Now, if we have got a report that says we may or may not be able to supply the housing needs that go with all these wonderful aspirations, then which comes first?

MR CORFIELD: I would err on the first one basically because Planning, obviously Planning has the crucial rôle in providing the land and making it available, but it can respond to any set of circumstances in a way. Obviously it is a highly politicised process, but, in terms of strategy and policy, it can respond to any set of circumstances that the politicians want to produce.

MR RICHARDSON: And I think that is something which the Committee, the Environment and Public Services Committee, will have to consider. I think our position now is that we have got the timetable. We have got certain criteria that we know has got to be built into it and obviously there are a lot of other policies which feed into this. It is something that the Committee is going

to have to consider, but a realistic timescale is that I don't think it is going to be out before June. It is a lot of work that goes into this document.

DEPUTY BERNSTEIN: We know that pressure, don't we?

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Time pressure, yes, we have got to write a report in a fortnight.

DEPUTY BERNSTEIN: So these houses will be completed?

MR CORFIELD: Which houses?

DEPUTY BERNSTEIN: Well, the whole lot that we have been talking about, 2009?

MR CORFIELD: All the ... right. If we are talking about ... no, I will start again. The housing requirements figures are met in different ways.

DEPUTY BERNSTEIN: Yes.

MR CORFIELD: The Category B requirement figures, the normal private market figures, are met by the normal application process and, as we know, in recent times there has been an awful lot of applications approved and developed providing private housing. So that is one element of it and a very large element of it -- a very large element of it -- that, in fact, is probably the highest element in terms of meeting overall housing needs. Clearly the Island Plan provides a built up area boundary and all the rest of it and policies to enable that to happen and makes estimates about how many units will come forward as a result of that process. So that is the Category B units.

The Category A units come forward either because they are in the capital programme already or because we zone land specifically for them in the main. Therefore, we zone land for first time buyer units and for social rented units.

The other side of the equation is the non-qualified sector, which we haven't really talked about very much today, but the non-qualified sector is lodgings, registered lodging houses and staff accommodation. The Island Plan leaves it virtually for the market to deal with that side of the situation and, as luck would have it in some respects from that particular aspect, because the economy has been changing over recent years, the actual demand that we originally projected of course has gone down, because there are less jobs in construction, less jobs in finance and all the rest of it. So it has actually gone down. So that has helped the situation. Plus there has been an

awful lot of renewal, as it were, of units in that sector and certainly in the registered lodging accommodation. So we have a situation there where I see the new requirements figures... and we need to work on them and think about them, ..but we are really in a situation at the moment where there has been choice for the first time in years really in that sector. We have got lower rents. We have got people not knowing what to do with some of the lowest type of lodging type of accommodation. We have got people advertising in the paper for let and all that sort of thing, you know, because we don't have the booming economy that we had before. So that has been met in a different way. Of course, if the economy improves, then pressures in that sector could also increase. We only talked about J cats before, but obviously there are other people that come in, transient people who would come in if the economy improved and that is why also it is very critical that the controls are in place in the Migration Policy just to keep that situation under control, so we don't go back to the bad old days of where the economy was really booming in the 1980s and most of the 1990s.

DEPUTY BERNSTEIN: Am I right in thinking that some of the hotels can use their accommodation during the winter months as lodging accommodation?

MR CORFIELD: I don't know.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: That is Housing Regs. That no question for Housing, but, yes, they do.

DEPUTY BERNSTEIN: It comes in as part of that.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Yes, they do.

MR CORFIELD: But, to answer your question, you know, this is an ongoing process and so some of the ... certainly I would expect most, with the possible exception of one, of the H2 sites would be developed in the period we are talking about. Most of the current programme would be developed, although I don't know what the score is with the frozen sites or whether any others would be frozen -- that is a decision for the politicians, not me -- but if they were let go, then they could be developed in that time frame and ...any number of Category B units could be developed in that time frame, depending on developers, you know, parcelling up land and feeling there is a market to develop it and individuals wanting to develop their own land.

MR RICHARDSON: But there are an awful lot of Category A H2 sites currently under

development, which provide the 45/55 split, so I think in the next 18 months probably you will see a lot of those actually coming on stream that you haven't seen so far.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Have we got any idea of how many numbers and what we are talking about?

MR RICHARDSON: Well, Mont a L'Abbe I know has just started. I drove past the other day and they have actually started on site now, and that is 124, isn't it?

MR CORFIELD: Yeah, 123/124.

MR RICHARDSON: Jambart Lane is?

MR CORFIELD: It is 68, is it?

MR RICHARDSON: Something like that. St. Peter's, again ----

MR CORFIELD: I don't know what the numbers are, but I can get them to you, if you want.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: It is all right, we have got them somewhere.

MR RICHARDSON: So there are three big developments there, which I think have all started, or certainly all very close to starting, so I think if you allow an 18 month period from start on site to completion, in 18 months you will see a number of these big developments actually starting to have an impact on the market.

MR CORFIELD: There is another very big site. There are two big sites in the zoned land. One was Mont a L'Abbe, which is progressing, and the other one was Bel Royal, which, like most of them, I supposed, is a heavily politicised application. But it nevertheless is an application. It has come a long way through the process and it is quite likely that it will be called on to produce a revised application and we will get, you know, another chunk of housing underway at some point in the future once we have a satisfactory revised application. So the big ones, if you like, are coming forward. We are just about to go to consultation on the Maufant site, which has been, I know, the subject of a States' proposition recently. So that is about to go to public consultation. You know, as I say, we do have these four sites that are dragging their heels a bit, but, you know, only one of them, I think, has been a "*non-starter*", as I think your term was before, or maybe I have got that wrong.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: I think it was your term, but I am not certain.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: We will find out when we get the transcript. It is interesting to hear you talk about the controls offered by the Migration Policy. I always put this out to people. It offers no control. It offers monitoring and regulation. We can count them in and we can put some rules around them, but we can't actually control them and anybody who says the Migration Policy will be a control is actually, I think, barking up the wrong tree.

MR RICHARDSON: I think that is something that has got to be considered at a later date.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Can I ask a numbers question?

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Just quickly, yes.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: On page 20, just because you have thrown out some projections of new homes coming on from the Mont a L'Abbe site, etc, 120, 70 coming on from, I believe, the Sunshine site or something. How relevant is this paragraph in your document from August 2004, the third paragraph down on page 20: "*Drawing this all together, the net increase in total requirements for new homes in the qualified sector resulting from changes in net migration and the residential qualification period is approximately 260 homes.*" How relevant is that figure today and, given the possibility that we will drop it another year, how does that number affect us?

MR CORFIELD: First of all, I would say, as of today, it is not relevant.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Not relevant. What is it?

MR CORFIELD: Well, it was relevant because, as we were dealing with old housing requirement figures at this time, we needed to get a view from the Statistics Unit of what the effect had been of the demographic changes and of the reduction of the qualifying period from 19 to 15 years. So we needed to get a view on that and they came back to us and effectively said: "Well, we know it is old information, but we still think the figures are fairly robust" -- that is what they said -- "and if you adjust them by 260 homes, you should be there or thereabouts in terms of identified requirements", which is what we did in this document.

Now we have moved on and we have new housing requirements figures, but we also, interestingly at this time, have figures about what would happen -- and I think you mentioned it before -- what would happen if we changed the situation in terms of the qualification period and

what would happen if we changed the situation in terms of different migration scenarios. I suspect really that when we do *Planning for Homes*, the next one, it will probably be a very good idea to put different alternative scenarios for the future and what that means in terms of outstanding requirements rather than just stick to one scenario for the future.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: My last question for the day.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Your last question for the day, okay.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Without sounding offensive (and no doubt, although it is not meant to be, it probably will come out sounding offensive), is it possible then that this *Planning for Homes* 2004 document that was presented to the States on 3rd August 2004 might actually, as you say, be old information now, partially irrelevant and how do you see that having had an influence on the proposals for the Migration Policy before us today?

MR CORFIELD: Well, first of all, yes, it is old information. Secondly, it was based on the best information we had available at the time, because we didn't have the new housing requirements figures and we didn't know what they would be. Thirdly, all the statistics in there -- and there are lots of statistics in there -- show commitments in place, show completions that have taken place, show what has been happening over recent years and so, in that respect, I think it is quite a good document, and it gives an overview, if you like, of housing generally in the Island, how it is being treated, so in that respect I think it is quite an informative document, but I would say that, wouldn't I.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Historically.

MR CORFIELD: It is an informative document, but, in terms of housing needs for the future, we have moved on.

SENATOR LE CLAIRE: Thank you.

DEPUTY SOUTHERN: Okay. Thank you very much for attending today.

MR CORFIELD: Thank you.

DEPUTY MARTIN: Thank you.

-----