

# STATES OF JERSEY



## ISLAND PLAN 2011: REVISED DRAFT REVISION – APPROVAL (P.37/2014) – EIGHTH AMENDMENT

---

Lodged au Greffe on 6th May 2014  
by Deputy J.H. Young of St. Brelade

---

STATES GREFFE

**PAGE 2 –**

After the words “the revised draft revision to the Island Plan 2011” insert the words –

“except that –

- (a) on page 254, for the heading above paragraph 6.132, substitute the heading ‘Provision of sheltered housing, lifelong dwelling homes for over-60s and housing to meet special requirements’;
- (b) in paragraph 6.134, after the words ‘requirement for’, insert the words ‘sheltered housing, lifelong dwellings for over-60s and’;
- (c) in paragraph 6.135, before the word ‘located’ insert the word ‘normally’;
- (d) after paragraph 6.135, insert an additional paragraphs 6.136 and 6.137 as follows (and renumber subsequent paragraphs) –

‘6.136 It is essential that the importance of maintaining the network of familial and community support enjoyed by people living in their particular community, wherever it is in the Island, not just in the rural centres, is recognised in making provision for new homes to meet the needs of an ageing society. With an emphasis on supporting people to live in their own homes, support networks will become increasingly important for people’s quality of life and their care. The Minister for Planning and Environment will, in partnership with the Strategic Housing Unit over the lifetime of the Plan, review the need for sheltered housing, lifelong dwellings for over-60s and housing to meet special requirements. The Minister will work with relevant stakeholders, including the parochial authorities throughout the Island, to ensure that lifelong dwellings for over-60s, sheltered housing and special needs are provided to meet the community’s needs. This can be provided for in the Built-up Areas under the existing provisions of the Plan, and elsewhere in partnership with the parishes, either through Local Development Plans or Village Plans (at Proposal 14 and 15 respectively), where a specific emphasis and scope can be given to the need for, and provision of, specific sites to provide homes close to the local supporting infrastructure, that meet the needs of an ageing society within an existing community.

6.137 Where, in response to local need, Local Development Plans or Village Plans includes specific proposals by the parochial authorities for the development of sheltered housing, lifelong homes for over-60s and housing to meet special requirements outside the existing Built-up Area boundary, this will require the approval of the States to the rezoning of

the land as part of a further revision of the Island Plan during the Plan period.’;

(e) for Policy H7 on page 255 substitute the following policy –

**‘Policy H7**

**Sheltered housing, lifelong dwellings for over-60s and housing to meet special requirements**

Proposals for sheltered housing, lifelong dwellings for over-60s and housing to meet special requirements, including the specific needs of those with disabilities, and including residential care and nursing homes, will be permitted provided that the development –

1. meets a local area, parish or Island-wide need;
2. is sited within the Built-up Area boundary;
3. complies with other policies of the Island Plan.’;

(f) After Policy H7 insert a new Proposal H4 as follows –

**‘Proposal H4**

The Minister for Planning and Environment will, in partnership with the Strategic Housing Unit over the lifetime of the Plan, review the need for sheltered housing, lifelong dwellings for over-60s and housing to meet special requirements. The Minister will work with relevant stakeholders, including the parochial authorities throughout the Island, to ensure that sheltered housing, lifelong dwellings for over-60s and housing to meet special requirements are provided during the Plan period to meet the community’s needs.’ ”.

DEPUTY J.H. YOUNG OF ST. BRELADE

## REPORT

The Minister's review of the 2011 Island Plan, in my opinion, plays down the importance of having planning policies which specifically address the housing requirement of our ageing population; and gives inadequate recognition of the contribution which such targeted policies for sheltered housing and lifelong dwellings for over-60s can make. It would help the big picture of housing our working population by releasing family homes into the housing pool; this in turn could reduce our need to build new homes to meet the backlog of both social rented and first-time buyer homes.

Such targeted policies for meeting the future housing needs of our ageing population can also produce big intangible benefits in the quality of Island life, in sustaining balanced communities and by providing supporting environments in which those of advanced years can remain independent and lead active lives; even, for some, postponing the need for special residential care. Such a policy has the potential to save money, by reducing the cost of the call on the taxpayer to meet the ever-increasing health services costs.

Throughout the Island Plan review, I have argued for specific planning policies to ensure the availability of sheltered housing and lifelong dwellings for over-60s throughout all parts of the Island, so that people seeking or having to move into such specialised housing would be enabled to remain in the community where they have spent most of their lives, and where they have social and family connections. **Appendix 4** includes the relevant extract from my submission to the Planning review.

The arguments for such policies were clearly set out in great detail by the previous Minister for Planning and Environment in his 2 propositions – P.61/2007 and P.75/2008 – which rezoned 8 sites in the parishes for a significant number of lifelong homes. This, I believed, provided a successful model.

The parishes have for many years, possibly because of their previous custodianship of parish welfare, recognized the overwhelming social and financial benefit of providing support to enable the elderly to continue independent living rather than going into residential care. St. Ouen, St. Peter, St. Lawrence, St. Martin, Grouville and Trinity all have successful sheltered housing developments. The previous Minister recognised the key role which the parishes play in helping to deliver, or supporting the development of, homes which will enable the elderly to remain in or return to their parish of origin. Sadly, it seems that our present Minister for Planning and Environment has neither recognised nor embraced their role. This was quite apparent from the frustration and difficulties experienced by St. Martin and St. Ouen in bringing forward their parish-led schemes. This was very evident at the Planning Inquiry.

I have included extracts of the previous Minister's reports relating to over-55s housing at **Appendix 2**. The original report, which was the basis of the previous Minister's policy, was produced by the cross-department working group supported by Professor Malcolm Johnson, Director at the International Institute for Health and Ageing. In my view, their findings are even more valid today. At that time, their report was backed up by evidence which confirmed the need for sheltered and over-55s homes, the Housing Need Survey of 2004 which projected a major shortfall for 2005–9, and the 2006 Annual Social Survey.

The present Minister for Planning and Environment has since had the benefit of the 2007 Housing Needs Survey, from which Jersey's Housing Assessment 2008–2012 was produced. This was one of the core documents of the Island Plan 2011 review, and the latest statistical information considered. I have enclosed in **Appendix 1** the section entitled "older persons housing". It predicts a total shortfall of some 400 dwellings for older persons in a 5 year period. The important report indicates that this is a mix of need and demand, for both rental and purchase, and has been given little weight by the Minister in reviewing the policy.

The Minister's policy ignores both the specific housing needs of this group and the wider benefits I have outlined. In discussion with him, he regards the housing needs for sheltered housing and housing for the over-60s as part of the provision for affordable housing. If people wish to downsize and have the means to do so, the Minister considers those people can find demand (Category B) housing from within the existing Built-up Area, where he argues there is plenty of availability. Whereas this policy means that if over-60s people fulfil the financial criteria for affordable homes of the housing gateway, that of not having more than median incomes, and don't have capital, then they will be eligible for housing in a parish-led development of sheltered housing or lifelong dwellings outside the Built-up Area.

This I believe to be a socially divisive policy, even if the availability of sheltered housing in the Built-up Area is as the Minister believes it to be. The economic pressures and scarcity of development land in the Built-up zones, has led to garden-grabbing developments and expensive luxury flats. The Minister's own report recognizes that the capacity of the Built-up Areas to deliver windfall "demand" (Category B) housing is likely to diminish as such sites become more scarce. To achieve private developments of lifelong dwellings in the Built-up zone will require development control policies to encourage over-55s housing scheme developments such as Tabor Park in St. Brelade and Avalon in St. Clement. Such desirable developments are unlikely to happen in the Built-up Area otherwise.

This issue was discussed at the Planning Inquiry, the relevant section of the Inspectors' report is attached at **Appendix 3**. The Inspectors' report highlights concerns over lack of recognition of the parish role in housing for the elderly, but the Inspectors have accepted a messy and unsatisfactory compromise, i.e. a promise from the Minister for Housing that he would not apply the housing gateway criteria inflexibly in the case of parish sheltered housing and over-55s housing.

In my amendment, without completely rewriting the Minister's policy review, I have sought to widen out the range of housing falling within the scope of the Minister's Policy H7. I propose this should include all sheltered housing, lifelong dwellings for over-60s rather than over-55s, and housing to meet special requirements. My amendment seeks to separate this type of housing from the affordable homes policies H1 and H5, thus sidestepping the social division which would otherwise arise.

My amendment provides the rationale required by the Planning Law, recognizes the wider benefits of such special housing provision throughout the Island, and the vital role of parish-led developments through the mechanism of Local Development Plans and Village Plans. My amendment opens up the possibility of rezoning proposals for parish-led developments where a specific need for sheltered housing can be demonstrated. My proposed change to Policy H7 is within the Plan's general spatial policy for development. My proposed new Proposal H4 charges the Minister for

Planning and Environment to put this policy into effect. It will enable those parishes, which so far have not progressed sheltered or lifelong dwellings for the over-60s and who wish to do so within the plan period, to do so, subject to a demonstrable need.

### **Financial and manpower implications**

The Planning Department plans to resource this project as far as possible from within its existing resources in partnership with key stakeholders, the parish authorities. This will require the development of a prioritised programme of work over the remainder of the Plan period. If it becomes necessary to speed up that work, additional consultancy support will be required, for which new resources may become available from other sources, ring-fenced as part of the particular parish housing project.

**Extract from Island Plan Review 2011 Core Documents**

“Jersey’s Housing Assessment 2008–2012

Report on the 2007 Housing Needs Survey (Pages 29–32)

Older Persons’ Housing

With Jersey’s ageing population, provision for older persons’ housing is becoming increasingly important; therefore a separate analysis for older persons’ housing has been undertaken. “Older persons’ housing” refers to housing designed for people aged 55 or over to live in independently, whilst also being able to receive assistance from agencies such as Family Nursing and Home Care. Such homes could be houses, bungalows or flats. The following analysis does not include Nursing/residential care; the five year demand for this type of accommodation is some 75 1-bedroom units.

The total potential supply for older persons’ accommodation over the next five years is 125 units, almost evenly split between 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom dwellings (60 and 65 units, respectively). The majority of the supply (90 units) arises from units becoming available due to occupants dying or moving into extended care facilities, (‘death and care’).

Over the next five years there is a potential total demand for 305 older persons’ housing units. Two-thirds of this demand is for 1-bedroom dwelling units. The majority (130 units) of the demand is from people wishing to purchase older persons’ accommodation followed by demand for States’ rental accommodation (100 units). Just over half of the demand (55%) is short-term need, i.e. people wanting to move within the next two years.

The differences between supply and demand, indicating potential surpluses and shortfalls within each tenure and size category, are shown below. Overall, there is a shortfall of 180 dwelling units over the next five-year period. Two-thirds of the shortfall (120 units) is for 1-bedroom units and a third (60 units) for 2-bedroom units.

Table 22: Five-year requirement (supply-demand) by tenure and size of dwelling unit.

| Tenure/<br>Size | Owner<br>occupier | States<br>rental | Housing Trust/<br>Parish rental | Private<br>rental | Total |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|-------|
| 1 bed           | (40)              | (55)             | (25)                            | (+)               | (120) |
| 2 bed           | (40)              | (40)             | (10)                            | 30                | (60)  |
| Total           | (85)              | (90)             | (35)                            | 25                | (180) |

Of households wishing to buy older persons’ housing, around half (53%) are looking for a property priced between £300,000 and £349,000 (see Figure 11).

Figure 11: Price range requirement for households wishing to purchase older persons' housing. (See Original chart via weblink)

<https://www.gov.je/SiteCollectionDocuments/Government%20and%20administration/IRP1%20BT8%20Jersey's%20Housing%20Assessment%202008-2012%2020140115%20mm.pdf>

More than a quarter (28%) of households planning on moving to older persons' housing in the next five years wish to live in the urban area of Jersey (see definitions), followed by just under a quarter (23%) showing no preference.

About a sixth (18%) would like to live in the west of the Island.

#### Older Persons' Housing – Inclination

To gauge the potential level of interest in older persons' housing in Jersey, all respondents (whether planning to move or not) were asked to answer a separate section of the questionnaire relating to older persons' housing. This section asked whether respondents or member(s) of their household would be interested in moving into older persons' housing, if it were available. Responses to such a hypothetical question would tend to be based more on inclination rather than on actual need. However, other questions in the section do provide interesting information relating to what facilities might be required in older persons' housing.

Of the respondents who answered this section, one fifth (21%) expressed a desire to move into older persons' housing, if it were available, within the next ten-year period (Figure 12). One in ten people (9%) said they would be interested in moving to older persons' housing within the next five years.

It must be pointed out that of the respondents expressing an interest in older persons' housing within the next five years, about half (53%) had stated in earlier parts of the survey that they were not planning on moving within the next five years. This, in principle, could be interpreted as suggesting that a large number of people would like older persons' housing but are unable to move as it is not currently available. However, the most popular reason given for such people not moving is that they are "happy with their current home" (71%). Such responses taken together highlight the likelihood that people answered this question in terms of inclination towards a broad concept rather than in terms of actual need. Fewer than one in six (15%) stated that their reason for not moving was due to no suitable older persons' housing being available.

Figure 12: Percentage of households expressing a desire to move into older persons' housing. Yes, within 5 years, 7% Yes, within the next 6 months, 2% Yes, within 10 years, 13% No, 79% (See Original Chart via weblink)

<https://www.gov.je/SiteCollectionDocuments/Government%20and%20administration/IRP1%20BT8%20Jersey's%20Housing%20Assessment%202008-2012%2020140115%20mm.pdf>

Keeping in mind the lack of a consistent reported basis of the need for such accommodation, the grossed up numbers of households with person(s) interested in older persons' housing is shown in Table 23. Of those interested within the next ten



years, nearly half (46%) were from households currently in owner-occupied accommodation and a third (33%) currently in qualified private rental. Of the 540 households interested within the next six months, more than half (56%) currently live in private rental accommodation.

Table 23: Current tenure of households expressing an interest in older persons' housing In the future.

| Current Tenure                    | Yes, within<br>6 months | Yes, within<br>5 yrs | Yes, within<br>10 yrs | Total<br>Interested |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Owner Occupier                    | 100                     | 655                  | 1,840                 | 2,600               |
| States rental                     | 115                     | 315                  | 480                   | 910                 |
| Housing trust/<br>Parish rental   | 20                      | 110                  | 120                   | 250                 |
| Private rental<br>(qualified)     | 300                     | 675                  | 885                   | 1,860               |
| Private rental<br>(non-qualified) | –                       | –                    | 25                    | 25                  |
| Registered lodging<br>house       | –                       | –                    | 50                    | 50                  |
| Staff/service                     | –                       | –                    | –                     | –                   |
| Private lodging                   | –                       | –                    | –                     | –                   |
| All Tenures                       | 540                     | 1,755                | 3,405                 | 5,700               |

Table 23 shows if older persons' housing were available almost 2,300 households would be interested in it over the next five years. With a potential demand of some 300 units (Table 22) recorded from households who responded that they were actually planning to move, the number of additional households interested in such accommodation reduces to about 2,000. Although the majority of these 2,000 households seem to have answered the above question in terms of inclination rather than need, it is possible to derive a measure of who have expressed a latent but real need for such accommodation. Of these 2,000 households some 8% stated they were not currently planning on moving in the next five years due to there being no suitable older persons' housing; this corresponds to some 160 households. These 160 households may thus be considered as representing a further latent need for older persons' housing in addition to the shortfall of 180 units presented in Table 22.

Taking the above figures (180 and 160 units), and also factoring in some known reductions in current supply, a total shortfall (representing an upper bound) of up to 400 dwellings for older persons' accommodation becomes apparent.

Households were also asked which facilities they would require for older persons' housing. Respondents were able to select as many facilities as they wished. Having a small garden was the most popular facility with seven in ten (69%) respondents requiring it. This was followed by around five in ten (56%) people requiring lifts and a further four in ten (37%) requiring a warden (Figure 13). The 'Other' category included: parking/garage, being near a good bus route and having a ground floor flat.

Figure 13: Facilities required by those interested in moving into older persons' housing in the future. (See Original Chart via weblink)

<https://www.gov.je/SiteCollectionDocuments/Government%20and%20administration/IRP1%20BT8%20Jersey's%20Housing%20Assessment%202008-2012%2020140115%20mm.pdf>

Figure 14 shows the areas (see definitions) of Jersey in which respondents interested in older persons' housing would prefer to live. The most popular choice was the urban area (24%) followed by the west (22%). About a sixth of respondents (18%) showed no preference for a particular area. The least popular areas for older persons' housing were the northern and central parts of Jersey (both 6%).

Figure 14: Preferred area of Jersey for older persons' housing. (See original chart via weblink)

<https://www.gov.je/SiteCollectionDocuments/Government%20and%20administration/IRP1%20BT8%20Jersey's%20Housing%20Assessment%202008-2012%2020140115%20mm.pdf>

Of the households interested in older persons' housing, more than half (55%) of the demand would be for single person's dwellings, with the remainder interested in dwellings for two people.

**Extracts from Report accompanying the Proposition of the previous Minister for Planning and Environment – P.61/2007 – ‘Rezoning of land for Category A and lifelong dwellings for the over-55s’ dated 14th May 2007 and the subsequent Proposition – P.75/2008 – ‘Provision of land for lifelong dwellings (for people over 55) and first-time buyers: amendment to Island Plan (2002)’, which rezoned 8 sites and 58.5 vergées of land, including lifelong dwellings for over-55s**

**The Island-Wide Strategy for the Ageing Society**

In 2004, the Island-Wide Strategy for the Ageing Society (ISAS) raised the issue of the Island’s increasing elderly population and identified that the number of elderly people in Jersey would begin to steadily increase over the next few decades and made it clear that this was not a temporary bulge, but rather a long-term shift in the composition of the Island’s population.

The ISAS strategy was commissioned by the Social Policy Strategy Group, which comprised the Presidents and Chief Officers of the Employment and Social Security Committee and the Health and Social Services Committee. The strategy was produced under the direction of the Health Department with input from a wide-ranging interdepartmental working group and consultancy advice from Professor Malcolm Johnson, Director at the International Institute on Health and Ageing.

The 2001 census found that 17% of the population (14,507 persons) were above working age (women/men aged 60/65 and over) and the ISAS predictions expect this number to rise to 19% by 2011 and to around 30% by 2031.

ISAS recommended that the Island should start to plan now and identified a number of key principles which the States should aim to achieve and those which refer to the quality of people’s living environment are outlined below –

- Improve the quality of people’s living space and their local environment as these are key issues if health inequalities are to be reduced;
- Establish and recognise the requirement for the provision of a sufficient amount of housing to accommodate an increasing and changing population in Jersey;
- Use existing stock of living accommodation occupied by members of an ageing society wisely and appropriately to the requirements of residents;
- Enable people to feel safe and secure, and have good access to a high quality visual environment as well as open space and other amenities and services.

**Jersey’s Housing Requirements 2005 – 2009 – Report on the 2004 Housing Needs Survey (Statistics Unit)**

The Housing Needs Survey identified the Island’s potential housing requirements for the 5-year period, 2005 – 2009.

The survey looked at the potential release of owner-occupied family homes through downsizing and found that 205 households living in two- to five-bedroom houses

anticipate moving into one- or two-bedroom sheltered units. An estimated 125 three-bedroom houses would be 'freed-up' by this move. Accordingly, the release of 125 family homes back into the market place will save at least 25 vergées of land (using a density of 5 homes per vergée).

### **2006 Planning for Homes** (Planning Department)

Planning for Homes, published in November 2006, reported the outcome of the Housing Needs Survey. It noted that the Island's ageing population was likely to result in a significant increase in demand for retirement accommodation from 2010 onwards and recommended that it was important to plan now for the demand for retirement homes, including the securing of sites, within the 5-year period to the end of 2009. This is particularly critical, as there is a typical lead-in time of about 3 years before homes can be completed even on the most straightforward of sites. Whilst recognizing the need to release additional land specifically to meet the requirements for retirement or lifelong homes, the report also identified the need to release land for first-time buyers, where it could be shown to be in the best interests of the community.

### **2006 Jersey Annual Social Survey** (Statistics Unit)

The survey conducted by the Statistics Unit looked at Islanders' aspirations in respect of retirement accommodation and one of the key findings showed that 7 out of 10 people (69%) are worried to some extent about their standard of living in retirement.

The survey included both home-owners and people in social rented accommodation and the results show –

- 39% of the population don't know where they would like to live upon commencing retirement.
- 33% believes they will stay in their current neighbourhood with suitable modifications to their existing home if required.
- 18% of the population thinks they will leave the Island when they retire.
- 10% of Islanders (currently aged 55 and over) who own and occupy family accommodation, hope to downsize to purpose-built retirement accommodation either in their own community or elsewhere in the Island.
- Less than 1% think they will live with relatives.

### **Parish need**

The need expressed by Connétables for retirement housing signals that the above indicators are accurate and indeed becoming reality. Many parishes already have successful schemes, such as St. Ouen, St. Peter, St. Lawrence, St. Martin, Grouville and Trinity; however, the Minister for Planning and Environment has received requests from nearly every Connétable to consider rezoning land for retirement homes

The Minister recognises that the Parishes have a key part to play in helping to deliver, or supporting the development of, homes which will enable elderly people to remain in, or be able to return to, their Parish of origin if they wish. The Minister for Housing has many country folk living in town accommodation, and believes that they should have the opportunity to retire to the country parish where they were brought up and have strong ties.

### **Sustainable communities**

The 2005 Housing Needs Survey identified the potential for 125 family homes to be released if elderly homeowners were provided the opportunity to downsize. Homes designed to 'Lifetime Home' standards will provide the opportunity for elderly people to live independently for as long as possible and be in an appropriate and safe environment. It will also afford the opportunity for elderly people to remain in their local community or perhaps return to their Parish of origin.

The potential for the release of family homes back into the local community will in turn help sustain the Parish schools, shops, churches, community facilities and the honorary way of life. Most importantly however it will ensure the delivery of affordable lifelong social rented homes, through the use of planning obligations.

### **Lifelong dwellings**

Lifelong dwellings are defined as homes designed to accommodate both 'fit' and 'less able' older people, in a socially supportive and stimulating environment which enables them to live independently. They will also be able to receive support from Family Nursing and Home Care and other agencies when required, which will assist their continued independence, allowing them to live as long as possible in their own home.

### **Independent living**

The decision to provide land for retirement homes is an important step forward in addressing the issue of an ageing community. It is important to state from the outset that 'lifelong dwellings' are not sheltered homes, but are homes designed to make it possible for people to live independently for as long as possible. This means that the dwellings must be in appropriate locations with access to services and amenities, and must be designed to lifetime homes standards.

### **Access to services and amenities**

The location of homes relative to services and amenities is particularly important in the context of an ageing society. The Island Plan spatial strategy seeks to promote a sustainable pattern of development where new homes are developed with pedestrian access to local amenities and facilities. In the assessment of each of the sites the proximity to local amenities is important. In addition the topography of the land is also an important factor to ensure that the site is fairly flat and avoids the need for steps or steep slopes.

### **Lifetime homes standards**

It is vital that all new homes are well designed, not just aesthetically, but also in terms of the internal and external ergonomics, and all schemes will be required to conform to 'lifetime homes standards'. These standards were formulated by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, following their concern about the design quality of British housing and in particular how inaccessible and inconvenient many houses were for large segments of the population – from those with young children through to frail older people and those with temporary or permanent disabilities. The standards broadly encompass the following –

- Approach to the home to be wide enough for a wheelchair.
- Entrance thresholds to be level.
- Circulation areas within the home to be wide enough to allow wheelchair users to manoeuvre into and around all rooms.
- Bathrooms and WCs should be capable of taking adaptations, be wheelchair accessible and provide a route for a hoist from the main bedroom.
- Occupants should be able to enjoy views through the windows whilst seated and wheelchair users should be able to open at least one window in each room.
- Switches, socket outlets and other equipment should be easily reachable by wheelchair users.

**Key criteria for lifelong dwellings (2008) (extract)**

2. The minimum net internal floor space of a one-bed lifelong social rented dwelling is to be 650 square feet.
3. The maximum net internal floor space of a two-bed lifelong dwelling for the over-55s is to be 850 square feet, to ensure that these homes are attractively priced to encourage downsizing to occur.
4. All units are to be designed to ‘lifetime home standards’, and 20% of the social rented dwellings are to be fully disabled compliant.
5. All social rented dwellings are to have wheelchair accessible shower ‘wet’ rooms.
6. Bedrooms should be located with easy access to the bathroom and with adequate wheelchair circulation around the bed. Provision should also be made in the ceiling to enable a hoist to be fitted which can connect the bedroom with the bathroom.
8. The homes are to be designed to reduce the dwelling CO2 emission rate and comply with BREEAM – ECOHOMES ‘very good’ or ‘excellent’ will be required – at the Minister’s discretion.
9. The external private and public amenity areas are to be designed to be accessible for the elderly and disabled, and private amenity areas should be designed to minimise maintenance.
10. Central refuse storage areas should be designed with provision for future waste separation and recycling.
11. Permanent Broadband Internet access, telecommunication and digital TV service shall be provided to each home.
12. A minimum of 10% of the site area should be made available for communal open space within the development.
13. On-site parking provision should meet the current requirements of the Minister for Planning and Environment.

14. Schemes must be designed to minimise the visual impact of car parking.
15. Sustainable forms of transport that reduce reliance on the private car will be encouraged where practicable.
16. The design of the units should comply with the design principles issued by the Minister for Planning and Environment and other relevant Island Plan policies.
17. The homes will be single-storey bungalows and anything other must have appropriately designed lift access. Any loss of privacy or overbearing impact to neighbouring property must be minimal.
18. Single-storey units should include front and rear patio gardens.
19. In larger schemes, an area of land should be set aside for allotment gardens for use by the residents.
20. All schemes for retirement accommodation shall incorporate a community room, which will provide a point of contact for residents and a store for nursing and home care purposes. The amenities and facilities provided on the sites will be required to be inclusive and available to all residents.
21. Any off-site infrastructure which is deemed by the Minister to be necessary in relation to the proposed development will be a planning obligation on the development.
22. In developer-led schemes, the Parishes shall have initial nomination rights over all the first-time buyer and lifelong dwellings for the over-55s. All social rented dwellings shall be allocated jointly by the Housing Department and the respective parish.
23. The minimum occupancy age for an open market retirement home will be 55, which is to be in perpetuity.

## APPENDIX 3

### Extract from the Jersey Island Plan 2011 Interim Review Inspectors' Report: Chapter 4: Housing – Volume 1 – Main Report and Appendices dated 18 February 2014

Chris Shepley CBE BA DipTP MRTPI – Inspector  
Alan Langton DipTP CEng MRTPI MICE MCIHT – Assistant Inspector

#### Examination in Public held on 14 to 23 January 2014

##### *Housing for the over-55s*

- 4.67 The provision of housing for the over-55s in Jersey has two prongs. The first is that in order to enable people to stay in their own homes for as long as possible, since 2007 new homes in Jersey have been required to meet local “lifetime homes” standards under the Building Bye Laws. The second is to provide homes especially for this group, and Jersey has a good record of doing this, through the States and the Parishes and the private sector. Policy H7 (not the subject of proposed alterations) is the key here.
- 4.68 The Minister usefully discussed this issue on page 5 of his closing statement (EPD2/21) and we don't repeat that analysis; but he concluded that “evidence for the current supply of homes for the over-55s is good ..... the Minister remains to be convinced of the need to specifically zone further land for this purpose .....”. There are therefore no proposals specifically to provide for the over-55s in the proposed revisions. Those who are over 55 and come through the Housing Gateway will be eligible in the normal way but others will be reliant on Category B housing. Deputy Young thought this was “socially divisive”. But, though there is a natural and widely held view that there is a need to respond to the challenges of an ageing society, in the context of Jersey's overall affordability problem, we think this is a reasonable approach at the present time given the statistical evidence before us.

##### *Role of the Parishes*

- 4.69 This becomes a problem in particular in relation to the role of the Parishes, which in this EiP assumed considerable importance and complexity. Some of the Parishes have in the past provided housing for the elderly. We saw some of this, and it was of a very high quality. Some Parishes wish to continue to make such provision, with the twin aims of providing for those over 55 who have Parish links, and also freeing up larger houses for families as a result of “downsizing”. Until now, this provision has had support from the centre. However the policy in the Plan that sites for affordable housing should be developed on the 80/20 tenure split discussed above has meant a significant change, since as we indicated building specifically for the over-55s is no longer part of the approach. They are eligible only if they come through the Gateway. The Minister believes that this better meets Island-wide needs and priorities, and that accommodation for the elderly does not constitute the most severe problem since there is already a good supply. This change has led to considerable angst at Parish level, reflected in the debates over the H5 sites which we consider later. And reflected, too, in other Parishes such as



St. Brelade which also have hopes in the future of providing more homes specifically for the elderly.

- 4.70 We note a point which was made by Mr. Dun that not all elderly persons have in fact got a close link with a particular Parish in these days of greater mobility.
- 4.71 There are issues here about the relationship between the Parishes and the States on which we do not wish to comment. We do understand the Parishes' concern about this change, which in some cases occurred (as they see it without adequate warning) whilst they were in the process of identifying sites for housing for the elderly (or for other local needs). On the other hand, as we have indicated, the 80/20 policy is well founded, and the advent of the Housing Gateway now means that housing is much more likely to go to those in greatest need.
- 4.72 This was debated at some length and at various points in the EiP. Light appeared at the end of the tunnel as a result of Deputy Green's commitment to operate the Housing Gateway in a flexible way. He would ensure that, in relation to H5 sites and other Parish-developed sites in the future, preference would be given to those with links to the Parish.
- 4.73 It seems to us that such an approach offers the best way forward and that by discussion and agreement between the States and the Parishes it ought to be possible to give a degree of priority to the elderly of the Parish, providing they are in need (as defined through the Gateway); and to meet the strategic and obviously laudable aims of the Minister(s) to ensure that housing goes to those in greatest need. These will essentially be operational matters. So far as the Plan is concerned, as we have already said, we think the basis of the tenure split is well argued and we do not suggest any change.

## APPENDIX 4

### Extract from Deputy Young's submission to the Island Plan Review (23rd September 2013) to Sheltered Housing

The plan revision (Policy H1 and Policy H5) and paras 6.82–6.84 of the amendment is also socially divisive in respect of sheltered housing. This will do nothing for the creation of sustainable communities throughout the parishes. Sheltered housing is required in the right locations convenient to parish centres irrespective of the occupant's financial status. The new policy proposed is not consistent with our strategy we have adopted to keep people in advanced years in their own homes as long as possible. This needs to be within the communities in which they were brought up and where their personal support systems lie. I am advised by planning officers that affordable homes in the rural settlements do not preclude sheltered housing but such Cat A sheltered housing developments will now be exclusively for those people who qualify under the new Housing gateway, i.e. those of insufficient financial means. This Policy means that access to Sheltered Housing in the parishes will no longer be generally open to parish residents.

Under this amendment the land proposed to be zoned in the parishes for Cat A can be used for sheltered housing but only to those people in the housing gateway. Those parish residents who need sheltered housing but fall outside the new rules will need to look to Cat B developments whether they are in the existing built up areas, in town and elsewhere, entirely at the whims of the market. Current Cat B policies do not favour the development of sheltered housing nor over-55 housing. I cannot think of a more socially divisive policy and I do not support it. I submit we should readopt the very successful 2002/2008 Island Plan spatial policies in respect of the location of sheltered housing in the parish communities, as is currently being applied in those sites under development.

The need for sheltered housing should be based on personal criteria, taking account of the person's individual physical and social support needs which are required to be met for them to remain in their home. This policy should apply equally to all parishes.

In St. Brelade a housing development is planned at para 6.56, Belle Vue Phase 2, which I would like to see developed for sheltered housing for persons of parish connections including some units for sale, releasing their homes also in the parish for first-time buyer homes. Such a scheme could have financial conditions imposed to ensure this objective is met. There are other sites in the parish which are potentially suitable for sheltered housing which should be considered in our parish plan.