

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

Submission: Anonymous 1

Dated: 1 April 2025

My concerns are as follows:

1. The terms should apply to all landlords, including non-charity, social housing landlords, such as Andium. Social housing landlords are currently subsidised by the taxpayer as they do not pay tax on their rental income. I believe that this exemption is totally unfair and is not transparent as many people don't even realize that this is happening. If social housing tenants need subsidies, this should be through the welfare system and not hidden in this way. The Housing Minister and many other politicians keep highlighting the high rents in the island and put the blame on private landlords, while they do nothing to sort out the far too high rents being charged and profits made by Andium. When you consider that their rents are set at 80% of market rents and the fact that they don't pay tax (along with the low capital cost of their old properties), their profits far exceed any made by private landlords. The Assembly needs to remedy these anomalies before laying down restrictions on private landlords.

2. It is not reasonable or equitable to expect private landlords to accept only one-month's termination notice whilst they must provide 3 or 6 months' notice. Private landlords also have liabilities to meet and, apart from the high costs involved in putting in place a new tenancy, it takes a lot longer than one month to arrange (inspections, repairs, showing of property, vetting of prospective tenants, credit checks, new condition report, lease drafting, etc). Also, it is highly unlikely that a tenant could find a new tenancy or purchase a new property in such a short time so would likely know well before one month that he intended to leave.

3. The legislation needs to account for increased service charges and improvements to the building and not just the rental apartment itself. For example, if an apartment block needs new lifts, new interior or exterior decoration, new lighting, improved communal facilities, these need to be allowable expenses when approving rent increases over 5%. As an example, our service charges have increased by 10% annually and we have also had to pay various levies (between £500 and £2,000) in addition to cover additional improvements.

Please bear in mind that private landlords provide over 75% of rentals and previous legislation along with this proposed new legislation has meant that many private landlords are now looking to sell their properties. Also, very few buy-to-lets are being

purchased due to the increased stamp duty. All of this will only achieve a reduction in the number of rental properties available with the obvious negative effects on our economy. The government should be doing much more to acquire and built rental properties. The number of properties (ca 5,500) has barely increased in 15 years. I personally know of four 3-bed homes owned by the government (The Denes) that have been empty for many years for no good reason and have not benefitted the people they were left in trust to benefit. Also, potential sites are left empty such as the Highlands Hotel.