

THE STATES OF DELIBERATION
of the
ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

3rd November, 2026

Proposition No. P.2026/82

Policy & Resources Committee

The States of Guernsey Annual Budget for 2027

AMENDMENT

Proposed by: Deputy S Williams

Seconded by: Deputy S Kazantseva-Miller

“To insert, in Proposition 16, immediately after the words “paragraph 6.27” the following:

“, subject to an additional £795,000 of expenditure for the Committee *for* Housing for the purpose of funding the maintenance of States Housing.”

Rule 4(1) Information

- a) The proposition contributes to the States’ objectives and policy plans by supporting and ensuring existing States Housing properties remain in good condition and available for occupation, thereby maintaining Affordable Housing Stock
- b) In preparing the proposition there has been no consultation with stakeholders. However consultation with the Policy and Resources Committee occurred prior to the submission of the Budget and these propositions align with views conveyed during that consultation.
- c) The proposition has been submitted to His Majesty’s Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications.
- d) The financial implications to the States of carrying the proposal into effect are £795,000 of increased expenditure in 2027.
- e) Drafting advice has been sought from the States’ Greffier and from the Officers of Policy & Resources.

Explanatory note

During pre-budget discussions the Committee *for* Housing submitted a request for an additional £795,000 worth of funding for maintaining States Housing stock. This amendment seeks to increase the Committee's expenditure in line with that request. The Committee notes that there has been underinvestment in States Housing stock as a result of previous budget saving initiatives. At a time when housing is in high demand and more housing is required at considerable expense, it would be financially prudent to ensure we keep the existing stock in good repair.

Housing has been through several efficiency savings and cost cutting exercises for over a decade to keep expenditure down. Some of the efficiency savings involved selecting alternative materials and changing processes that reduced costs without having a negative impact on the properties in the future. These included alternative quick drying paint finishes, reducing the number of coats, changing the type of doors fitted and laying stepping slabs instead of concrete paths.

However, other budget cuts have had a negative impact on the appearance of estates e.g. reducing grounds maintenance and extending the period between exterior pre paint repairs and decoration. In some cases, officers have had to issue work to cheaper contractors that are extremely busy and take a long time to complete the work. Whilst this costs less, it also causes frustration for tenants when they must wait so long for the work to be completed.

Leaving components beyond their economical serviceable lifespan reduces costs at that time but is likely to cost more in reactive repairs and replacement costs when they are finally replaced. Housing has already reduced its planned maintenance budget to such an extent that officers can only plan very limited work outside of the routine capital process

It should be noted that even if one takes into account Income Support expenditure, States Housing generates significant net revenue for the States, The Committee is of the view that it is unacceptable to charge an income generating rent but not to use that income to maintain properties to a good standard.