

Review: P.24/2025 - Draft Residential Tenancy (Jersey) Amendment Law 202-

Submission: Anonymous 17

Dated: 12 May 2025

The Jersey Landlords Association's assessment and analysis of the proposed law is excellent and most helpful to the likes of us who might struggle to collate all the potential issues that are about to befall us if this nonsense law is passed.

I accept I may have misinterpreted elements of this paper due to the complexity of the topic but it seems to me that this proposed law is not a sledgehammer to crack a nut but more like a nuclear bomb with the negative effects going to be felt across the wider housing sector for a long time! Many of us do not like change at the best of times but we as a family have always embraced it when it is sensible and of wider good. This draft law is neither; in fact we fear this will be harmful to this much needed sector. As you have pointed out the draft law ignores issues and flaws found in similar 'housing laws' that have been implemented and tried elsewhere and seems to be focused upon a small number of problem landlords and with a total lack of willingness or ability of local authorities to address those specific cases. We are fortunate to live in this beautiful Island and with its success over the years has come an increase in living standards and inevitable higher costs and a diversity of inhabitants attracted by its economic success. Jersey is not unique in finding success brings other problems but we seem to have politicians in this Island who cannot see any other way to deal with issues other than to use broad brush legislation to address what seem to be a relatively small minority of problem people.

This draft law is so biased towards tenants it is embarrassing to think that 'learned' people have compiled it. The flexibility of the current fixed term regime suits both sides. Why change it when what you need to do is address the root causes of the perceived issues? Politicians would be better advised to address issues that preclude the redevelopment and occupation of properties that are purposefully allowed to deteriorate unoccupied when they could be redeveloped for occupation rather than rot away.

The proposal to limit rent increases to RPI or 5% max when there could be rampant inflation in the future is absurd. Why would anyone willingly run that risk to their own hard-earned wealth? We are not all multimillionaires who may be able to suck up such costs; many of us are pensioners who invested their hard-earned savings into property to contribute to their own financial wellbeing in their latter years. We now only have one flat that we bought to live in whilst our house was being renovated many years ago. We intend to return to that flat when we downsize in the next few years. The current regime allows us to give reasonable notice (we'd give 3-6 months so as to be fair to our tenant) to vacate the property so that we can move into it. The proposed regime negates our current options so we must react to that if the law is passed as it stands.

We had another flat which we bought a number of years ago [REDACTED] [which] we rented. On two occasions, the latter being when we gave notice that we'd not renew the lease because we wanted to sell the property, the tenants left the property in a very poor condition. A couple of months old cooker looked like it had been used for years uncleaned, grease all over the place in the kitchen including the ceiling, carpets so dirty they had to be replaced, walls so marked or

stained they had to be totally redecorated and we had to cover all the costs. Being a landlord is not all about taking cash from hapless people as some people clearly think!

How can the Minister think it's fair that a tenant does not have insurance when he requires the landlord to have it? How can it be fair that a tenant can give one month's notice but a landlord must give 3 or 6? Where is the level playing field in these proposals?! If a tenant leaves at short notice there are immediate costs perhaps to redecorate, test electricals etc. and to pay an agent to find a replacement tenant usually with a void intervening period, further increasing the landlord's costs.

The political bias in this draft legislation is glaringly obvious. The uncertainty it has already created before its debate is only a prelude to worse outcomes for tenants and in some instances owner occupiers if the law is passed. Our flat is in a small complex with many owner occupiers. As a landlord how am I supposed to address issues such as unsociable behaviour or blatant ignoring of association rules when I can't use the threat of termination of the lease in a cost-effective way to gain a tenant's agreement to change their ways? Why does the Minister think that we have such deep pockets that we can afford to pay lawyers to sort things out through the courts? Which planet is he on?

We had not previously seriously considered selling our remaining property as we intended to use it ourselves in the future. However, because of these proposed changes we will consider doing so in the not too distant future. These proposals which are clearly not based on facts but a politician's distorted and ill-informed views are so skewed against honest and decent landlords that it makes little or no sense to remain in the rental sector. We have a lovely tenant at the moment (most of ours have been of that ilk overall) [REDACTED] but we need to consider either a sale or change of lease terms so that with agreed appropriate notice we can regain access as and when we require to reoccupy OUR PROPERTY when we are ready to downsize!

We cannot and will not allow our plans to be dictated by a politician who is so out of touch with reality that it is frightening. Having read your excellent paper, the strongest likelihood for us is that we will terminate the lease early to arrange a sale or give notice of not renewing the lease at its expiry later this year and leave the flat empty until such time as we are ready to reoccupy it (after some refurbishments are undertaken). I'm sure of course that the Minister won't care about the loss of a rental flat from the market (one of many I'm sure over coming months and years); after all why should he when it doesn't affect him.