



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Thursday, 23rd May 2019**

*All published Official Reports can be found on the  
official States of Guernsey website [www.gov.gg](http://www.gov.gg)*

**Volume 8, No. 12**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

*Published by Her Majesty's Greffier, The Royal Court House,  
St Peter Port, GY1 2NZ. © States of Guernsey, 2019*

**Present:**

**Sir Richard J. Collas, Kt, Bailiff and Presiding Officer**

**Law Officers**

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur)

**People's Deputies**

**St Peter Port South**

Deputies P. T. R. Ferbrache, J. Kuttelwascher, D. A. Tindall,  
B. L. Brehaut, R. H. Tooley

**St Peter Port North**

Deputies C. N. K. Parkinson, L. C. Queripel,  
M. P. Leadbeater

**St Sampson**

Deputies L. S. Trott, P. R. Le Pelley, J. S. Merrett,  
T. J. Stephens, C. P. Meerveld

**The Vale**

Deputies M. J. Fallaize, N. R. Inder, M. M. Lowe, L. B. Queripel,  
J. C. S. F. Smithies, S. T. Hansmann Rouxel

**The Castel**

Deputies R. Graham L.V.O, M. B. E, C. J. Green, B. J. E. Paint,  
M. H. Dorey

**The West**

Deputies A. H. Brouard, E. A. Yerby, D. de G. de Lisle, S. L. Langlois

**The South-East**

Deputies H. J. R. Soulsby, H. L. de Sausmarez, P. J. Roffey, R. G. Prow, V. S. Oliver

**Representatives of the Island of Alderney**

Alderney Representatives S. Roberts and A. Snowdon

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

J. Torode, Esq. (H.M. Greffier)

**Absent at the Evocation**

R. M. Titterington, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller);  
Deputy J. A. B. Gollop (*relevé à 9h 33*); Deputy M. K. Le Clerc (*relevée à 10h 50*); Deputy J. I.  
Mooney (*indisposé*); Deputy G. A. St Pier (*absent de l'île*); Deputy J. P. Le Tocq (*relevé à 9h 56*);  
Deputy A. C. Dudley-Owen (*absent de l'île*)

## **Business transacted**

Evocation .....	915
VI. Requête – St Peter Port Harbour Development – Debate continued .....	915
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.32 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.</i> .....	954
Requête – St Peter Port Harbour Development – Debate continued – Propositions carried as amended .....	954
VII. Schedule for Future States' Business – Approved.....	966
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 3.21 p.m.</i> .....	967

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m.*

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## PRAYERS

*The Greffier*

## EVOCAATION

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop, you wish to be relevé?

**Deputy Gollop:** Yes, sir, thank you very much.

## VI. Requête – St Peter Port Harbour Development – Debate continued

5       **The Greffier:** Billet d'État VIII, Article VI, Requête St Peter Port Harbour Development – continuation of debate on the Requête and the amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

10       **Deputy Roffey:** Thank you, sir.

I was not going to contribute to this debate but when I heard Deputy Ferbrache tell us that it was the second most important thing that we were going to debate in this term I thought I had better go home and write a long speech. Now that is not quite true of course.

15       It does beg the question though if it is such an important issue why has it been so conspicuously absent from the policy agenda before this Assembly for the last three years. Now I accept work may well have been going on on it industriously behind the scenes with Port sub-committees etc. but if it is really such a crucial thing to catapult to the top of the policy agenda I think we had a right to know about it.

20       This Assembly, if it has done nothing else, has discussed policy programmes and policy priorities *ad nauseum* and yet suddenly this has sprung almost from left field. I will return to that theme later.

25       Before I really get to the meat of what I want to say I want to make one comment on an issue that came up yesterday, and say I completely agree with Deputy Ferbrache that the States cannot be above the Law and that includes the Planning Law. I served in this States when the Planning Law did not apply to the States, it caused enormous resentment. A classic was, 'Why can't I do whatever to my house when the IDC have allowed Sir Charles Frossard while you have allowed Custard Castel to be built, it is an awful building and yet I cannot do something quite nice?' I had to explain to them actually the IDC were usually critical, they said it was an appalling design, they would not have allowed it if the Planning Law had applied. Sir, so the response was, 'So it is one law for the States and one law for the rest of us, is it?' I do not want to go back to that position.

30

What we could do is a bit more of what is already in the Planning Law. You will remember I persuaded the States to zone lots of land around the Airport as agriculture priority areas. That protects them to a degree, but if they were needed for strategic reasons the strategic policies override it, so perhaps we could extend the circumstances in which strategy trumps the other policies inside the plan; but that would still have to apply equally both to the States and to the private sector not going back to one law for the States and one law for the Islanders. I will have no part of that.

Moving on to this specific debate, let me preface it by saying I absolutely love Spur Bay so I am one of the people who probably should be grabbing this Requête with both hands. I used to work at *Channel Television*, they had absurdly long lunch hours and Spur Bay was just opposite of where we worked so I used to often go and while away some of the time down there. It is a beautiful little gem which most of the Island are probably unaware of because of where it is tucked away and the views out to sea over to the smaller islands are absolutely superb. So I certainly start from the point of wanting to do everything I can to protect Spur Bay. Although, I do accept that it went through a legitimate process and this Assembly identified it as the preferred site to bring our waste disposal.

Despite my love of Spur Bay I am not convinced by this Requête. I think what we need to do today is to separate our thinking about two very different strategic issues – maybe interlinked at the margins but separate: the need to expand Harbour facilities and the need to dispose of our builders' rubble or inert waste.

They are very different challenges with costs that are of a very different order of magnitude. Now that is not to say, sir, that if we decide we need extra Harbour facilities and if they are to be created wholly or in part through land reclamation then it would make perfect sense, absolute sense, to divert our inert waste to constitute part of that fill material. Whether you would want it to be the only fill material knowing that in that case the timetable for creating these Harbour facilities would depend entirely on the rate at which the Island created inert waste is another matter altogether.

But the real point here is whatever the possible synergy, and I accept there is a synergy, the two strategic challenges are very different with different imperatives. I do worry that at its heart the Requête fails to fully appreciate this.

So, sir, let's look first at whether Guernsey needs to expand its Harbour facilities, and let me say as nothing of an expert in the field, no type of expert at all, I think it probably does – its commercial Harbour facilities in particular. I think it does because all the expert opinions seem to be telling us that the time has almost certainly come to do just that. But even if it has, I really do worry that we have suddenly leapfrogged, as I was saying in my opening, from this not being on the States' agenda to it suddenly being almost at the top.

In the case of the original Requête it has come from nowhere to being a pretty definitive – not absolutely the details but pretty definite – but uncostered project. Now that has to be a complete nonsense. That has to be bad governance.

In the case of the amendment there is some more rationale but the right course of action really was not to latch on to a maverick requête with an opportunist amendment but for the STSB and Economic Development to actually make the initial case to this Assembly in a well-argued policy letter that we needed larger commercial facilities at our Harbour, and if they gained approval they would move forward from there. I accept that moving forward it would be a case that external expertise would be very needed and even though I have been critical of the amount we spend on external reviews, I have always said there are some technical issues that absolutely require them and this would have been one.

So I worry about the subversion process but Deputy Graham is always reminding us not to be paralysed by process, so I will try and park that concern and focus on the fact that I am pretty much convinced that Guernsey does need to expand its commercial port facilities.

As was said earlier, I think by Deputy Inder, when our predecessors back in the Victorian age increased the size of St Peter Port to its current extent many Islanders upbraided them for

85 squandering money on what was an outsize facility which in their view would never be fully  
utilised, and for many years the cynics would be proved right. Then post-war the mailboats started  
to grow bigger and bigger, the leisure boating activities grew in popularity and suddenly it  
became a cliché. Instead of criticising the people who took the original decision it became a cliché  
to praise the foresight of our forefathers. Excuse the sexist expression but that was the cliché, it  
was always used in my early time in this Assembly – that vision of our forefathers. Personally, I am  
sure that behind the scenes our foremothers played their part too.

90 Sir, we now move on again and we are reaching the point where we have two significant  
problems with St Peter Port Harbour.

Firstly, it is inherently too small to handle the sort of ships which may wish to service Guernsey  
today. Now those could be new Condor vessels which are a bit larger than the ones they have at  
the moment, but it could equally be the ships of other commercial shipping lines. Commercial  
95 vessels are tending to get bigger, as Deputy Inder said, and we know that some regional  
operators could not even consider operating to Guernsey because none of the ships in their fleet  
are of the right size. That reduces our options, that reduces our flexibility and in an ideal world we  
would want more flexibility.

Secondly, the Harbour has just become incredibly busy. So the question that is posed at the  
100 heart of this and the amendment against the Requête is the best way to tackle both of those  
problems to make St Peter Port harbour bigger or to make St Peter Port Harbour less busy. I am  
open-minded but I do prefer the less busy option if at all possible because of experience.

Sir, I 'fess up' as I have 'fessed up' a number of times, my environmental credentials are shot  
to shreds because I love to travel. I travel a lot, and everywhere I go I see two – and I tend to go to  
105 areas by the sea, I do not know maybe because I grew up by the sea I like coastal areas or islands  
– and I see two different approaches to harbours, elderly harbours that have been outgrown in  
what they can provide in facilities. One is to expand them with new commercial facilities attached  
to that original harbour, the harbour that very often a community has grown up around, that does  
tend to spoil their character, another approach is to create a new commercial port a few miles  
110 away and protect the character of the traditional port and that tends to be, from my observations,  
a far better outcome and a far more attractive outcome, and certainly for anywhere interested in a  
tourist future, a more advantageous outcome.

But at the end of the day I accept we have to create the best technical facilities to enable  
goods to be brought to Guernsey efficiently. I must confess that that imperative probably  
115 outweighs all of those other considerations I have been talking about. But those other  
considerations are indeed important and it is those that make me really swing towards supporting  
this amendment rather than the Requête. I would go further than that; it is those considerations  
that have me hoping against hope that we can find a good solution to expanding our port  
facilities without ever having to carry out the wretched scheme suggested in this Requête.

120 Why? Well firstly because I suspect the cost of the scheme will be astronomical, but that is  
almost a secondary consideration because I accept what Deputy – I almost called him Deputy  
Pope – Deputy Paint – similar statures that is probably why I got mixed up – Deputy Paint said  
yesterday that wherever we put new commercial facilities it is going to end up costing us an arm  
and a leg, so that probably is not the main consideration.

125 Having said that, the fairly feeble attempt to satisfy Rule 4(3) in this Requête is almost, to my  
mind, enough in itself not to allow it to proceed unamended.

But more importantly because I think this scheme – to borrow an expression from the Prince of  
Wales – would be 'a hideous carbuncle on the face of an old friend' – more than an old friend but  
one of Guernsey's biggest aesthetic assets. St Peter Port is beautiful, nowhere is that beauty more  
130 apparent than when approaching the Town by sea. This project, if it goes through unamended, is  
going to mar that experience, to put it mildly.

Also there will be huge disruption in Town. How long for? Who can say? If it is seen as a  
solution to our inert waste disposal, if that is the prime reason for doing it as well as the need to  
increase Harbour facilities, then the timetable will, as I said earlier, be determined by the rate that

135 such waste is generated and could go on for many years, even decades. If on the other hand we  
crack on with it in order to avoid such extended disruption then it cannot be sold today as a long-  
term solution disposing of our inert waste. So it is not going to save Spur Bay; at most it is going  
to protect it for a few more years until we have done this and we look back to where we can put  
our inert waste.

140 As for the suggestion that all of the waste should be double handled, stock piled and then  
moved on again in order to reduce disruption, well that would drive up the cost astronomically –  
double handling always does.

So I think I am going to vote for this amendment in a hope that an alternative solution, a  
solution that revolves around creating a deep water berth around Longue Hougue, will prove  
145 possible.

But I do think the two committees could have been far more forthcoming in their thinking  
about where else it could go other than outside St Peter Port. Are they talking about just north of  
St Sampson's off the existing landfill site, in which case I have to say that is to some extent how  
the landfill project was initially sold, we were told it could be a step towards a deep-water berth,  
150 although originally it was going to be in Spur Bay and Deputy Rihoy intervened and moved it a bit  
further north. We were told that wherever it went around there the long-term vision was a deep-  
water berth. Is it going to be around there and in which case what about the tidal issues? Deputy  
Paint is the leading expert in this Assembly on tidal issues, it does not mean I think we should  
accept what he says on everything.

155 I am really quite pleased that Lagan brought in their material to Longue Hougue and sent it  
round the Island in tractors rather than bringing it into Petit Beau and putting it on a conveyer  
belt, which was Deputy Paint's suggestion. I think even experts sometimes do not come out with  
the best solutions.

But I would like to know if they are thinking that that is a prime alternative to the scheme in  
160 the Requête; have they done their homework, have they spoken to the local people who have  
knowledge about tides? Because I understand, I have experienced it myself, the tidal run,  
especially near high tide is extremely strong, or low tide, but it is more like high tide when the  
boats are coming in.

On the other hand are they talking about some sort of hideous Little Venice that we are sort of  
165 seeing rising from the ashes over the last few days. I know they cannot prejudge it. I know they  
are asking for a lot of money to look at all the options and therefore it would be wrong for them  
to prejudge it. But they are being very coy about sharing their initial thoughts with us. They really  
are, and I think we deserve to know what they think are the leading alternatives to the project put  
forward in this Requête, because it will influence me to a large degree.

170 That said, sir, I have no objection to the principle of creating a brand new commercial port. It  
has been said that that would gentrify St Peter Port Harbour; is that a bad thing? (**A Member:**  
Yes.) I do not think it is, I am not sure ... I do not think it would turn it simply into a pleasure  
harbour. I think that form of words is wrong, we would still have the fishing fleet and smaller  
commercial ferries, but what on earth would be a bad thing about separating out the very big  
175 commercial ships which only just about fit within our Harbour now and leaving the Harbour free  
for smaller vessels and more appropriate shipping?

Nor do I accept the narrative that has been circulating in some quarters that this is some sort  
of north-south divide and by gentrifying the Town Harbour it is going to be at the cost of the  
long suffering community who live and work around St Sampson's Harbour. Not at all. In fact  
180 what I hope is that this will actually help to further gentrify St Sampson's Harbour and make it  
more pleasant by taking out of it some of the more industrial and grimy, not to say inherently  
hazardous, activities that go on inside that tidal Harbour now. So I think the Bridge would be a big  
winner if it is feasible and possible to have deep-water berths to the north of St Sampson's, north  
east of St Sampson's Harbour near Longue Hougue.

185 I know St Sampson's Harbour has always been a working Harbour but the world moves on. My  
granddad was Deputy Harbour Master at St Sampson's, which I think was really a fancy title for



the head chap on the night-watch, back at the turn of the century, 19th into the 20th, in its latter days as an ultra-busy port for the export of granite. Now he would not recognise what goes on there today; things move on.

190 When I was first in the States nearly 40 years ago I had to deal regularly with complaints from residents around the northside, Les Monsmains and all that sort of hinterland near St Sampson's Harbour, that when the coal boats were unloading by grab crane on windy days the whole area was coated with a thick layer of coal dust. Thank goodness operations and standards of public health have moved on, or at least I hope they have.

195 So if this amendment is successful I really hope to see several bad neighbour activities taken out of the existing St Sampson's Harbour altogether and I hope that would also see the end of tankers carrying volatile fuel having to dry out on the bed of a tidal Harbour. I know it works. It works and there have not been any accidents but in an ideal world it is not the best way to go about things.

200 So depending on what I hear about where they think it might possibly lead, and I know the two committees cannot commit to exactly what it would be, but they must know what the likely alternatives are so depending on what I hear about where they think it might possibly lead, specifically will it probably lead to Longue Hougue or will it probably lead to Belle Greve – depending on that I think I intend to support this amendment.

205 What about the price tag for the required research? Would it be inconsistent with my rejection of £700,000 to pay for another report on whether to extend our Airport runway. Not at all, not at all. I have always said there are some areas where the States need technical assistance from outside experts, and actually that includes the Airport. What I objected to with that proposal was two-fold. Firstly, that it was a follow on report on top of one we had just received; and secondly,  
210 that it was not really a technical exercise at all but the outsourcing of the drawing up of a business case – something we should be capable of doing. Frankly, it would have been an exercise just in passing a political hot potato to a third party to avoid using our own political judgement about whether to make a difficult decision. This is different, we should only vote for this expenditure if we are willing to agree in principle today that we require enhanced commercial port facilities.  
215 Now we really should, as I started off by saying, have been given a proper informed report on which to make that in-principle decision. We were not. So the question is how convinced are we in order to be able to do it without that background.

But if Members are so willing to resolve today without the evidence properly collated and presented then so be it, because after that in-principle decision the consultant's job becomes a  
220 technical appraisal of how best to deliver that aspiration. We are not asking them to decide if we need a deep-water berth, or if there is a business case for it, but to assist with the technicalities if this Assembly is so decided. We need the options costed, the impact on tide flows analysed, the ergonomics of the various options appraised, and I am afraid these are simply not matters that we have the in-house expertise to do without outside assistance.

225 So in short this is a very bad and ill thought out Requête – well it is, it has come from nowhere but with almost a definite scheme un-costed I have never known anything quite like that –

I will certainly give way to Deputy Inder, even though he is getting fed up with interruptions I know.

230 **Deputy Inder:** I know – well, I have not bothered to interrupt you yet, so there you go.

But Deputy Roffey is always very keen to talk about everyone else's problems but we have one of the big flag wavers for the Inert Waste Strategy, I would be really keen for him to talk about the £30 million to £50 million and see the criticism of that, that was key to – he is very good at knocking everyone else's ideas and schemes and ... I ask Deputy Roffey let's talk about the  
235 £30 million now screaming towards £50 million which people who are basically friends of his put in front of us. Let's talk about that. I will give you five minutes to talk about the £30 million to £50 million disastrous financial scheme that was put in front of this Assembly.

240 **Deputy Brehaut:** Sir, can I ask –?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut, on a point of order, is it?

245 **Deputy Brehaut:** Yes, could I just ask Deputy Inder to please withdraw that. He is implying that friendships override policy in this Assembly and I think it implies an influence which is inappropriate.

**The Bailiff:** I did not interpret his remarks like that.

250 **Deputy Roffey:** I am not sure that was –

**Deputy Dorey:** Point of correction.

**The Bailiff:** Point of correction from Deputy Dorey.

255 **Deputy Dorey:** It is £45 million, not £50 million. *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Inder:** Deputy Dorey –

260 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

**Deputy Inder:** Sorry. No, I will let it go.

**Deputy Roffey:** Okay, I am going to respond to the intervention from Deputy Inder.

265 I do not think he was implying that necessarily. He was completely wrong in saying that I was one of the big flag wavers for the Inert Waste Strategy. In fact I feel that he is getting a bit too frazzled with overwork and his memory is playing him up, but what I would say is when you do not like what people are saying about what you are putting forward, get up and say why!

270 Why isn't he talking about this, why isn't he talking about the problem over there? *(Interjection)* Because he wants me to do that – he wants me to do that, sir, because he knows that what I am saying here is absolutely correct.

This has gone from a policy vacuum, suddenly to be leapfrogged forward as something that I think is likely to cost somewhere in the region of £200 million on the basis of previous research, if the whole kerbang is done. It will be here, yes, the details can come back, do you need this pier, do you need that? But basically we are committing, look at part one of the Requête: the preferred scheme shall be this, on the back of nothing! It might be right. I do not know if it is right, I do not want to dismiss it out of hand. I suspect we need some more Harbour facilities and this may be the only place to put it, but this is completely ill-thought out.

280 I think the amendment is opportunistic. It is just a way of – and I do not blame them really – who would not be opportunistic. I think one of the Members of STSB said this sort of saved us two years of preparatory work and we have leaped ourselves forward. Well fine, but it might become a trend; we might see all committees organising requêtes that they can put amendments to in order to get their thing up the priority list.

285 So I know I am going to vote for this amendment, what I have not yet decided is whether to vote, if it is successful, for the amended Propositions and that will very much depend I think on the two committees opening up and explaining what their vision is, not closing down the alternatives. I know you do not bring in experts to look at the alternatives and say well that is the answer we want, but they must have given it some thought, they must have some thought about what the alternatives are. If it is Longue Hougue what about the tidal issues, and if it is Belle Greve? I am sorry I have real reservations about that.

290

**The Bailiff:** I will call Deputy Stephens but first of all, Deputy Le Tocq, do you wish to be relevé?

295 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Stephens.

**Deputy Stephens:** Thank you, sir.

300 I, like Deputy Roffey, am struggling with the marrying of a solution for builders' waste with this much larger sort of blue-sky thinking strategy which is the seafront project.

Now I have got some very specific questions for both the supporters that maybe the supporters of the amendment and the supporters of the Requête can answer in turn.

305 I want to return to the issue that Deputy Roffey raised about double handling of what Deputy Kuttelwascher, quite rightly, calls a very valuable resource. Now I had assumed that the amendment was the only presented option that included double handling of hard-core and that in the Requête scenario that tipping would happen as required at the location where it was to be used. Now in the nightmare described in debate yesterday of lorries passing up and down and barges trundling across Belle Greve, what came out of that, it did seem that the Requête may include an element of double handling as well. So I would be interested in further comment on that.

310 My preference is one journey, one destination as double handling costs, and if anyone has any more information about what is envisaged in those costings and what those annual costs might be then I would be really interested to know.

315 Secondly, I am interested in the pace of the seafront project and the projected timescales for that. Now I know it is early in the life of the project and this is probably difficult to forecast, but this is important particularly if double handling is necessary. The potential for drift in the project – and this is a very big seafront project – is unavoidable, I would suggest. So how long is it likely to be before hard-core can be used in the seafront project or equally how long is it likely to be before hard-core can be used in what the Requête suggests?

320 Now I often refer to Deputy Paint in matters to do with the sea and I do sincerely thank him for his speech yesterday. If, as Deputy Paint says, the extension of commercial harbour activity at St Sampson's is likely to prove a poor choice to pursue then I am interested – both supporters of the Requête and the amendment – on their views if there are any risks in using Longue Hougue South which was the decision that we made a while ago, using that site whilst further decisions are being made on the seafront project.

325 So I am asking if perhaps either Deputy Ferbrache or Deputy Inder can address those questions when they are summing up.

Thank you, sir.

330 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Thank you, sir.

335 Well I am going to address more of the sort infrastructure issues in this debate because I know that my good friend Deputy Brehaut is going to be talking more about the inert waste aspects in his speech later.

340 But I start by responding to a couple of comments on process really from Deputy Roffey who says that what should have happened is the Committee for Economic Development and the STSB should have come forward with proposals. The problem with that theory is that the whole of the subject of the Seafront Enhancement Area has been entrusted to a working group led by Policy & Resources which has three Members sitting on that working group, two of whom have signed this Requête. (*Interjection*) So that working group was formed about 18 months ago and I regret to say has made very slow progress (*Interjections*) in this area. It has made progress in what we call the

quick wins, the small scale developments around the Valette and so on which are now starting to bear fruit.

345 So I have to say to Deputy Roffey, no, it was not my Committee's responsibility to bring forward proposals and, as I will conclude at the end of the speech, I think one of the merits of where we get to with this Requête and the amendment to it is that there will now actually be a process going forward which stands a chance of delivering something.

350 So I am going to focus on the infrastructure aspect, and of course I think generally although Members of the Committee for Economic Development may have different views of the merits of any particular infrastructure project, for example runway extensions, we would share the view that in general terms infrastructure investment is a good thing. The UK National Infrastructure Delivery Plan says infrastructure is the foundation upon which our economy is built, which is a truism, but it also points to the value of the investment, the stimulation to the economy and the  
355 improvements in the efficiency of the economy.

I also agree, although I have said inert waste will basically be dealt with by Deputy Brehaut, that inert waste is a valuable resource and fundamentally that has been my view all the way through the inert waste policy debates, and it is a shame the Inert Waste Strategy did not identify a use for Longue Hougue South. I was a persistent and vocal critic of that aspect of the policy  
360 letter. But the fact that the Inert Waste Strategy did not identify a use for Longue Hougue South does not mean that it has no use and I think the use for that area is pretty obvious but I will develop the arguments as to how we get to that conclusion.

Fundamentally, sir, a port is a gateway. It has to interface with the sea obviously, but it also has to interface with the land and the Requête proposals address the interface with the sea but  
365 neglect the interface with the land. St Peter Port is a very congested and conflicted Harbour with streams of small pleasure boats mixing with high speed ferries and roll-on roll-off freight vehicles mixing with pedestrians. It needs deconflicting and decongesting.

There are a lot of complex policy issues around where a port facility might be needed to be built and that many of those policy issues are in development within the States, the energy policy  
370 which will be coming forward I hope in the next few months, hydrocarbons strategy, the Inert Waste Strategy itself of course, and there are also many interesting opportunities in the question of what port facilities do we need and where should they be located. The opportunity to better exploit our cruise liner market or the leisure boating market, for example.

One very important issue which has been high on the radar of the Seafront Enhancement Area is rising sea levels. The sea is forecast to rise by a metre by the end of this century and it already  
375 overtops the Quay in St Peter Port and The Bridge in St Sampson's on high spring tides. So you add a metre of water on top of the water that is already coming over the walls and this is an existential issue for parts of the Island of Guernsey.

In terms of climate change impact there are very few issues which would rank higher up our list  
380 of considerations and when we are talking about new port infrastructure we are obviously looking at time horizons at least until the end of this century; we have to factor this into whatever we plan today on the eastern seaboard. Now I will come back to exactly how I think these various schemes might address those issues in due course.

There are, in my view, two options for enhanced port facilities on the east coast of Guernsey:  
385 one is an extension to St Peter Port Harbour as proposed by the requérants; and the other is a new port facility off Longue Hougue South. Now we can dismiss ideas of Longue Hougue North or outside St Sampson's Harbour, Deputy Paint elaborated on exactly why new port facilities to the north or east of Longue Hougue would be completely untenable, but south of Longue Hougue there is deep water; it is 11 m deep south of Vivian Rock at low tides and actually if you  
390 look at the charts carefully that area can be made accessible with the removal of maybe two rocks.

So it is a viable area – (*Interjection*) one is called Le [*inaudible*] It is a viable area. The tides would certainly be stronger than they are outside St Peter Port but they are much weaker than they would be, as they are, outside St Sampson's Harbour which we currently use.

395 I will explore in a little bit of detail the merits of the two options but clearly we are not saying  
as the movers of the amendment that we have a solution here, we are saying it needs to be  
looked into. A new port at Longue Hougue South would of course help to deconflict St Peter Port.  
Many of our passengers come in on RoPax ships which carry freight and passengers and a RoPax  
ship arriving at a new port south of Longue Hougue South would be an ideal position to  
deconflict the traffic. The passengers essentially would turn left and the freight would turn right.

400 If commercial shipping was moved out of both St Sampson's and St Peter Port both Harbours  
could be gated. This is quite important because if sea levels are going to rise by a metre you have  
essentially, as I see it, two options: you either build walls around the edges of all the quays or you  
gate the Harbour, and you can only really gate the Harbour if you have moved the big commercial  
shipping out of it, because you could obviously have an opening section of the gate in the middle  
405 of the gate or wherever to admit small passenger ferries, leisure boats, fishing boats, but you  
would not want a gate that was so big that it could admit the Condor Rapide.

The concept of a completely new port outside either of the existing ports actually creates  
possibilities for dealing with rising sea levels. It is true that both the proposed extension to  
St Peter Port Harbour and a new port south of Longue Hougue South would permit the  
410 commercial shipping to be moved out of St Sampson's and St Peter Port into the new port facility  
allowing St Sampson's Harbour and the historic St Peter Port Harbour to be gated and to protect  
those crucial bits of the eastern sea board against rising sea levels.

However, if the new port is constructed outside St Peter Port, as the requérants propose, that  
will exacerbate the land side issues of conflict and congestion which St Peter Port already suffers  
415 from because a lot of freight which now goes into St Sampson's would be moved down to  
St Peter Port, not just the fuel supplies for the Island which in future are likely to arrive in ISO  
tanks rather than in bulk fuel ships in any event, but also the bulk freight which currently lands at  
St Sampson's and which would have to move out if that port was basically closed as a commercial  
port. That is why in an interjection yesterday I said to Deputy Inder that if the bulk freight ships  
420 are moved to a new port facility in St Peter Port that means 400 lorry movements to unload one  
ship on top of all the existing freight that goes through St Peter Port which includes our waste  
and the likelihood that all fuel supplies will in future come through this new port facility in ISO  
tanks.

Deputy Queripel in a very good speech yesterday pointed out the logistical nightmare that we  
425 currently have in relation to freight movements on the east coast: all of our groceries arrive on  
RoRo ferries, get shipped up by lorry from St Peter Port to Bulwer Avenue –

**Deputy Merrett:** Point of correction.

430 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Merrett.

**Deputy Merrett:** All of our deliveries do not get shipped up to Bulwer Avenue. We have  
something called on demand. Many of the especially refrigerated goods for some of our  
supermarkets that have virtually daily deliveries go straight to the store. The lorries are taken  
435 straight to the stores for ... Other supermarkets are available – Marks & Spencer and Waitrose, etc.  
They are not shipped up to Bulwer Avenue and then shipped back down.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Well, I stand corrected and thank Deputy Merrett for her intervention.

440 But we know that an enormous amount of freight goes up to the Ferryspeed offices. They  
import I think more than 90% of all the freight that comes into Guernsey and their premises are in  
Bulwer Avenue.

Meanwhile the Island's waste is compacted at our shiny new and very efficient waste transfer  
station in Bulwer Avenue and shipped down the coast to St Peter Port. All of that traffic could be  
avoided if essentially the freight was handled at Longue Hougue South, because Longue Hougue

445 South is next door to where the Ferryspeed warehouses are; it is next door to the waste transfer station. So either solution could be a tenable solution but both would be a compromise.

Certainly in terms of navigational aspects I suspect that an extension to St Peter Port would be the easier option, although I think the extension proposed by the requérants would be very exposed to south easterly winds, and I think it would probably be pretty short of water for the  
450 larger ships that we anticipate arriving in Guernsey in the future. But in terms of the land side aspects of the port I am pretty sure that Longue Hougue South would win the comparison by a country mile.

Now if that is the case and there is a clear evidence base for examining Longue Hougue South as an option you may say well who is advocating this and the answer to that is everyone who has  
455 experience of constructing ports who has looked at it. In the Ports Master Plan, which was prepared with the assistance of Moffatt & Nichol, who are very experienced consulting engineers on port infrastructure etc., the Plan said:

The Longue Hougue reclamation is only partially infilled at the present time and it is assumed that completion of the infill will be completed within the period of the Master Plan. The reclamation represents the optimum location for expansion and consolidation of future marine-based activities. Consideration should be given to the potential merits of further expansion of the reclamation southwards or seawards as part of the evaluation of significant infrastructure ...

That was the view of Moffatt & Nichol. We have also received, independently and unpromoted by the States of Guernsey, a presentation from a group calling itself Hydro Port which is  
460 comprised of experienced port operators and builders. The people involved in Hydro Port have built ports in Germany and Poland and they have operated ports in the UK and in Germany and Poland. They are experienced builders and operators of ports and their scheme which I appreciate most Members of the Assembly have not seen is –

I give way to Deputy Merrett.

465 **Deputy Merrett:** Thank you, Deputy Parkinson.

Can you just remind the Assembly of the estimated cost that Hydroport have recently declared in the media?

Thank you.

470 **Deputy Parkinson:** Yes, they said £350 million. (*Interjections*) That is a much wider scheme. It includes essentially a barrage to protect the entire low-lying east coast of Guernsey. And I am not saying that their scheme is the right scheme or that we would end up agreeing with every detail of it, but actually there are quite a few good ideas in it and the significant point which I was trying  
475 to draw Deputy Merrett's attention to was that their port facility, which they propose, would be south of Longue Hougue South. So my point is that various engineers and experts in the construction and operation of ports have independently of the States of Guernsey identified that area as the better place to stick a port.

Now against that background we believe, the proposers of the amendment and supporters of  
480 the amendment, that both options need to be seriously considered and we also recognise, as many have said, including Deputy Roffey, that we do not have the skills on Island to do that work. We have many mariners, some of them more ancient than others, (*Laughter*) but we have I suggest very few people in Guernsey who have experience of building a port, and that is why we need expert advice from outside the Island.

485 Now I actually welcome the Requête and the opportunity that it presents in the form of the amendment because I think this process and this debate does take us forward or can take us forward if Members support the amendment, because I said at the beginning, like many others, I have been frustrated by the pace of progress on the Policy & Resources-led Seafront Enhancement Area Group and what this Requête and the amendment would collectively do is  
490 shift the responsibility for developing these ideas to the STSB and I have every confidence that the

STSB would actually discharge that responsibility and I have very great confidence in the quality of the staff in that Committee which I share with Deputy Ferbrache.

495 The Requête also crucially provides some funding for them to do the examination because at the moment the Seafront Enhancement Area Group is not specifically funded and therefore there is no allocated pot of money out of which to do this work.

500 So I think I am glad we have had this debate I am glad the requérants brought their Requête. I think it has given the STSB and Economic Development and the Environment & Infrastructure Committee the opportunity to do more work on the use of inert waste as a resource and on the much wider question of what do we need to do on our east coast to secure not only the economic future of Guernsey but actually the environmental future of Guernsey as well. I think with that step forward, if the Assembly do agree to support the amendment, we will be able to make good progress and hopefully possibly even by the end of this political term we might have more clarity on which direction the Island should go in.

505 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Smithies.

**Deputy Smithies:** Thank you, sir.

510 I was originally opposed to the proposal to build out from the east arm but coming back from Herm I took a good look at the view from the sea and I realised that because my eye was actually drawn to the landscape behind the Harbour the existing rock armour wall virtually disappeared from notice.

However, after yesterday's debate I have once more changed my mind. The assurance that no buildings are envisaged on the proposed infill seems to me to be naïve. Even if that pledge could be made reality the prospect of a lorry park seems little better.

515 However, I am not opposed to the idea, nor am I opposed to the other suggested sites. Wherever inert waste is disposed is going to cause disquiet. We had a long discussion about how and where to dispose of non-inert waste and there were strongly held opinions on all sides. But a decision was made and the STSB as Waste Authority acting through the Waste Strategy Implementation Board (WSIB) ... the project has been delivered and is working well.

520 So to the Requête it is a brave and necessary part of the process but it is not the final brick in the wall. The amendment is the way forward. Let's examine the proposals. Proposal 1 is to some extent unnecessary – a bit of a froth on the pint of beer, so let's just blow that off and get to the substance. I will come back to Proposition 2 in a moment. Propositions 3 and 4 will be necessary if the Requête succeeds, so they are to a certain extent cost neutral between the Requête and the amendment. Proposition 5 is simply common sense and Proposition 6 will be an unfortunate side effect of the delay which has arisen because of the rejection of the approval to go ahead with Longue Hougue South unopposed.

Now Proposition 2, £800,000 is indeed a lot of money but not when compared to a £100-£200 million cost which will be the cost of the whole programme it is designed to investigate.

530 But remember the STSB will be project managing this, this is what we do, and if I can say so we do well. We can call on the resources under our management. I have already mentioned the Waste Strategy Implementation Board but we also have States' Works, Guernsey Water, we can ask Guernsey Electricity for help – well experienced in handling large projects – and we have not least the Harbour in the Ports portfolio. We can and will – not we can as *a la* Theresa May – deliver a thorough review and report by the promised date, and who knows, the recommendation could be to extend the east arm. It probably will not be the Hydro Port scheme but anything is possible and should not be ruled out at this stage.

535 Deputy Green spoke with force yesterday on the need to make progress. Well please let the STSB carry this forward.

540

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Graham.

**Deputy Graham:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

545 Members of the States, I do not claim to have any wisdom to contribute to this debate at all but it may be worth airing some of the reasons why I am ambivalent towards both the Requête and to the amendment to it.

I think the combination of the Requête and the amendment does actually serve quite usefully to epitomise two interesting approaches that the States in my experience adopts when it comes to major infrastructural events.

550 The two issues that interested me are, on the one hand the debate between holistic versus *carpe diem* and the other one is the degree to which when you are talking about discreet projects anyway we sort of analyse and research to death anything before we commit ourselves to doing it.

555 Now in as far as the first of those two interesting aspects is concerned, Deputy Green took us partly on the journey yesterday by echoing the frustration he feels and almost the sort of conversion he has almost undergone since his early days as a Deputy when he was convinced by the holistic approach but experience has made him a bit wary of that. I have experienced the same journey really, although I think I am probably coming to a slightly different direction when it comes to taking a fork in the road at the end. I am even less enthusiastic about the amendment than he put forward.

560 The holistic versus *carpe diem* approach is interesting. I suppose in the three years' experience I have had in the States it is epitomised really by the way that we approach, or do not approach, the allocation and treatment of the vast States' estate.

565 On the one hand the logic for looking at what we do with our property holistically is impeccable, isn't it? We should look and remind ourselves what we have; what bits of it we need to use; what services are queuing up for somewhere to go; where are the most appropriate places for them and what is the timescale. That holistic approach has logic on its side. But my experience of the last three years is that does not actually work and that we do lose opportunities on the way.

570 Speaking from the point of view of Home Affairs, from the moment we formed up in early 2016, we were looking to get out of Les Vardes House to somewhere more appropriate and we were looking to get out of Ozanne Hall up by the States' Archives. Now just under three years it took us to get out of Les Vardes House for lack of really a sort of practical and 'get on with it' approach from Property Services. We are still in Ozanne Hall with, I think, no prospect of getting out of there in the foreseeable future. In other words, the situation as I see it is pretty stagnant.

575 Now on the other hand there is a danger in doing things by fragment, speaking from the point of view of Education, Sport & Culture, we know that if the States are wise enough in September to approve the policy letter that we will be bringing to you we know that, for example, Les Varendes will no longer be required as a site for secondary education; we know that the College of Further Education sites at Les Coutanchez and Delancey will also come up for grabs and already I hear talk of individual committees saying, 'Oh, we could put this or that in Les Varendes,' and another committee is saying, 'Well we could put yet something else.'

580 Now that sort of fragmentary approach I think has severe disadvantages, and finding the balance between actually moving on and doing something sensibly is a difficult one to come to. I think the combination of the Requête and the amendment epitomises that beautifully.

585 The other area that I was interested in was the degree to which, as I say, we analyse and research things to death before we make bold decisions. Back in 1931 the States' engineer came to the States and said, 'Look, we have got 700 blokes' – and they were blokes in those days – 'unemployed. This is an intolerable level of unemployment. There is an engineering project that we could do. We could connect Fort George with the Town. Why don't we excavate up through the escarpment there and produce a road?' Now no doubt there were those who said, 'Look, we need to look at this a bit more closely,' or 'Why were you thinking of imposing a horrible scar down a beautiful part of the southern approaches to St Peter Port?' but they got on and did it. The irony was that the reason for doing it or the main reason to satisfy the unemployment level soon disappeared. The economy had picked up and the whole thing slowed down because



595 unemployment was no longer a significant feature of the Island's economy. But even so, less than  
four years later the Prince of Wales declared it open. Now that was a classic example really of just  
getting on with the job.

Now that came off but can we say the same of the Requête? Because this is really where the  
Requête comes into my focus. I am not going to say it is unresearched because it clearly has been  
600 researched and to be honest it echoes pretty closely the scheme that the owner of Boat Works  
Plus talked me through two or three years ago. So clearly good minds have addressed this and  
certainly in terms of those with maritime sea going experience who are urging us to support the  
Requête; they are a convincing array of experienced people.

But to me there are a couple of fundamental flaws in it. Even allowing for the fact that costs are  
605 difficult to predict, I think some indicative costs would have actually helped the cause. It may well  
be that the requérants were not in a position to do that sensibly and I do understand that.

There is also really the lack of engineering whoomph behind it. Is it actually feasible? Although  
I do not always necessarily agree with Deputy Roffey on this need to consult outside experts on  
those occasions where we are unsure, and I do understand the logic of what he says, on this  
610 occasion I think the States would be excessively bold, almost reckless, if they signed up to the  
Requête as the only solution and the most appropriate solution to what is undoubtedly a problem  
about which I retain my ambivalence to this moment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby has stood a few times.

615

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, firstly, I really would like to thank Deputies Inder and Paint for the hard  
work that they have done in producing this Requête. I cannot own up to having anything in the  
way of the knowledge of the sea and the Harbours other than a pilotage course a few years ago  
that goes anywhere near what Deputy Paint knows about the local seas and I doubt that there are  
620 very many people in this room who can claim to have any more knowledge either. So the hard  
work that has been put in I think really made me think seriously about signing the Requête.

But I would also like to thank Deputies Ferbrache, Parkinson and Brehaut and their officers for  
putting together the amendment. They could have just ignored it and said, 'Right, let us just fight  
it, it is a stupid Requête, has not got any costings, it is not very good, let's just have a good old  
625 battle in the States.' But that is not what this Government is about and I think really we are so  
quick to knock ourselves on this Island and everything is always really wrong, but we have to  
compare ourselves about the way that we do things here and what is going on in Westminster.  
The production of this amendment demonstrates the importance and the value of having  
consensus government. It is about working together to come up with a solution that we think  
630 could work. Now, in Westminster we have not got that and as I said yesterday everything is at  
meltdown.

Now I was very willing to sign the Requête as I saw it as a catalyst for change. Of course I  
understood the weaknesses in it and the lack of costings and I have no idea whether it was doable  
or not, but really that was not the point. We have been talking seafront enhancement for years  
635 and years and years and now we need action. We have had report after report after report and  
various people who have been involved in the Harbours, previous Harbour Masters, previous  
people who have used the Harbour, there are loads of reports stacked up somewhere down there  
saying about what can be done with it but nothing has happened.

Now the Requête has focussed minds and really led to an informed response from the  
640 committees involved, and I really do thank them for that because I think it really has pushed  
things forward and I feel I can support it, but with one exception and that is Proposition 1.

Now criticism was levelled at the requérants for producing a solution before the fact, but really  
that is kind of what Proposition 1 does by effectively saying maritime activity should be focussed  
primarily on the provision of leisure port facilities at St Peter Port Harbour.

645 Then we get Deputy Lester Queripel who says those who want commercial operations moved  
from St Peter Port Harbour will vote in favour of the amendment; that really defeats the whole

point of then having lots of Propositions on reviewing that is necessary or that is actually achievable. Until we know the facts and whether it is possible how can you? I mean a preference is one thing but whether it is achievable is another. I mean my preference is for the Champions League Final to be held at Footes Lane, (*Interjections*) but somehow I do not think that will be achievable. So really Deputy Smithies says it is just a bit of froth, ignore it, well I want to go straight to the beer, I do not see any point in supporting Proposition 1 at all. I would ask that others do not support it –

Oh, I will let you. (*Laughter*)

655

**Deputy Parkinson:** Thank you, sir.

I think the wording of Proposition 1 could have been clearer but I think it is also pretty clear that they intended when it says St Peter Port it means the historic St Peter Port Harbour. So clearly we are not saying that if a new harbour was constructed to the east of St Peter Port that could not be used for commercial shipping.

660

**Deputy Soulsby:** Thank you, Deputy Parkinson.

I suppose I have come to see Proposition 1 as an amuse-bouche, which gets your taste buds going and thinking about whether it might work, but I do not really give it any actual value at all.

665

Deputy Paint has made clear in his really well-crafted speech on the facts which he knows around the issues over the obstacles about building around Longue Hougue South and issues over the Belle Greve Bay and sewage and all manner of things that crop up, but then that is what the review is for and that is what we really need to focus on. But I think just going down to that and Proposition 2 and a review costing £800,000. We all of us gravitate towards this; it is the easy thing to have a debate about the costs of a review, we did that last month, we will probably do that next month, because we are always reviewing something, and let's face it we have not got the skills for many of these areas to be able to do it ourselves. But I do question that £800,000, given that all the reports that are lying on shelves and virtual shelves wherever they are whether that will be the cost.

670

675

But I do not think that Members here should get fixated over that, we often do and we say well should it be £100,000, £200,000, £500,000. At the end of the day there is a very strong gateway and that is having to go through the whole process of being able to release funds. It is like delegated authority, we might think ... and we might be debating tens of millions of pounds, say with the hospital modernisation, but the processes to be able to get that money are long and sometimes overly convoluted in themselves. So I do not think Members should think this is just *carte blanche* to spend £800,000. So that is not something I can get too worked up about.

680

685

So in summary, I signed the Requête because I wanted action. I think it has achieved that purpose and led to an amendment which apart from Proposition 1 I really can support. The States has been dithering on this for years and years and years, and as usual has left it almost too late. Deputy Parkinson has referenced climate change, sea level change, I was studying it 30 years ago, it is inevitable, I mean the sea has kept rising and it will continue to, and we really need to get our act together not just St Peter Port Harbour but around the coast. It is absolutely critical.

685

690

So we have had a lot of talk about what can be done and we get various people talking about, 'Well we could build this, build that here,' but these are all maybes, or, 'That is nice, that is interesting, perhaps we could, perhaps we could not,' but these are all just words at the moment.

690

Deputy Ferbrache he often quotes his hero Winston Churchill and is calling for 'action this day', and if ever there was a phrase suitable for a debate it is that one for this one and to me actions speak louder than words and let's just get on with it.

Thank you.

695

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Inder, you wish to exercise your right to speak on the amendment at this point, do you?

**Deputy Inder:** I do, sir.

700

**The Bailiff:** You do.

**Deputy Inder:** Well I tell you what, I do not at the moment, I will let Deputy Brouard go first, sir, I will sit down.

705

**The Bailiff:** I will call Deputy Brouard.

**Deputy Brouard:** Thank you, sir.

710

Deputy Soulsby very eloquently expressed her thanks to Deputy Paint and Deputy Inder, and I do the same.

715

The Requête has that raw Guernsey common sense about it (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and it reminds me of two houses down one of the roads in St Peter's – I am making this up by the way – and the first house wanted to build a small garden pond and they dug the garden pond and they moved off about four tonne of soil and then a few weeks later the wife said actually we want a rockery so they imported four tonnes of soil, but the canny Guernsey man living next door did both at the same time, they dug the pond took out four tonnes of soil and put it on the side and made a rockery, and that I think is what the essence of this Requête is. We have got the opportunity to do two things at the same time.

720

Basically the proposed extension of Longue Hougue South which of course is not a given, from the records point of view we believe that we would be better to create land around St Peter Port.

725

Now the amendment from Deputies Ferbrache and Parkinson, well crafted, I believe takes us slightly back a stage. They want that wider exploration of the potential opportunities. But I do not think the Requête prevents them doing that. They too also in their amendment have a preference which winds its way their own comments that St Sampson's or at least towards St Sampson's is their preference. I just want to read a couple of paragraphs from their supporting material on the report, page 3:

The best solution to the space constraints at St Peter Port Harbour might be to make it less busy, rather than bigger. Previous in depth studies have identified the relocation of commercial port activities away from St Peter Port as a viable option.

I think then that is also picked up in their actual amendment proposition, Proposition 2, which says:

To direct the States' Trading Supervisory Board to carry out a detailed analysis of the future harbour requirements, including consideration of any requirement for new [berthing] facilities east of the QEII marina ...

Which is what the requérants are saying:

... or nearer to St Sampson's Harbour, and an assessment of the impacts, practicalities ...

730

The problem for me is I am not convinced that having another report taking the Harbour activities by moving them nearer to St Sampson's will be viable. We have had some emails through from Harbour Masters and ex-Harbour Masters. I think ex-Deputy Harbour Master Mr Pattimore called the area around St Sampson's a rock garden; I think that is a pretty good description.

735

Deputy Paint brought out all the concerns about the rocks around St Sampson's are heading that way. I am not an expert but my early potting days off Houmet Paradis, where the *Seagull* outboard motor could just about hold my boat steady in the tide, reminds me of just how powerful that stream of water coming through is. So I believe that we will end up back at St Peter Port.

740 Longer term, I think as rising sea levels become an issue we will need to think about sea defences or some form of barrage. I am not sure that the residents along Les Banques want a wall in front of their houses cutting out their vista but maybe a barrage out to sea would be able to keep the vistas for all and mitigate sea level rise and may even have opportunities for a transport way on the top.

745 I just want to pick up on a couple of points around what Deputy Roffey made about jumping to a solution. The requérants make no apology of giving a steer or a heading as to the way forward, but as we all know those tasked with undertaking the Propositions have much scope to investigate this issue, so it is not a *fait accompli* but we are giving that steer and if you look at the Requête itself, Proposition 3 talks about exploring, Proposition 4 directs the:

... STSB to consult widely on such plans, including with relevant Committees of the States, the SEA Group, the Harbour Master[s] ...

750 Proposition 5, 'To direct STSB to consult.' All this work is still to be done. The Requête gives the wiggle room that Deputies Ferbrache and Parkinson are looking for. It is already built in, so in my view there is plenty of scope for the STSB to undertake the investigation work that their own amendment is seeking.

755 Now as a requérant and member of the Seafront Enhancement Area Group the Requête to me, and it is similar to what Deputy Soulsby said as well, is that shot of adrenaline into the process. We do at times want to review everything and sometimes you just have to take advantage of listening to the stakeholders and I had that privilege. The advice is extending St Peter Port would be a very good fit for the next century and is the way to proceed.

760 Now unless the cunning plan is to wait for sea level rise to make the rock garden of St Sampson's viable I cannot see another way forward.

765 Just finally to touch on one point raised by Deputy Roffey. We have been I have been and those on the Seafront Enhancement Group – extremely keen, and my colleagues are as well to ensure that we do not spoil the jewel in the crown. The idea of a Jersey waterfront development fills me with absolute horror (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) but a new sympathetic quay as a further arm to St Peter Port in my view is acceptable and will be or can be made in such a way that it does not spoil the vista or the Town itself, and I think as Deputy Graham said, seize the day, let's start putting a few markers in the sand of where we want to go to.

770 Now if STSB do all the consultation and it comes back and it is just not possible because of this reason and that reason, they are perfectly entitled to do so. They are big enough and in some ways ugly enough to be able to come back to the States to do that. So the Requête gives them all the powers that they need to go away, do the investigation and come back. But let's just start putting a few stakes into the ground.

Thank you very much.

775 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld has stood a few times.

**Deputy Meerveld:** Thank you, sir.

I have been somewhat disappointed during this debate in the misinformation or disinformation that has been thrown around almost as distractions from the main debate.

780 The fact is if there are warehouses on this new land – there is nothing in the Requête that says there will be, but if there were – they could be concealed as existing buildings are by a high outer wall.

785 The traffic impact and the disruption in Town, well we built the QEII Marina which is a similar type of development and I do not remember the whole of Town grinding to a halt and Island life ceasing.

We talk about decongesting Town and diverting commercial deliveries etc. and shipping to St Sampson's, but I wonder if Deputy Parkinson was here and joined the numerous debates and a lot of public outcries about the increasing congestion and issues with infrastructure in the north of

790 the Island and yet here there is a suggestion we move all of the commercial and all of the shipping into St Sampson's which already faces massive infrastructure issues.

So, I give way to Deputy Parkinson.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Sir, Deputy Meerveld ignores the fact that the storage facilities for all the freight etc. and the fuel are in St Sampson's and that is not going to change.

795 **Deputy Meerveld:** I thank you for that interjection but I disagree; as Deputy Merrett pointed out earlier, a lot of the deliveries are on demand, food etc. direct to our shops and go through there regardless, so do not go through St Sampson's directly.

800 We are looking at ... we are trying to judge things here on the basis of limited information at the moment. For instance, Deputy Roffey was very critical of the requérants and I will not bother repeating his derogatory remarks. But one of his issues was it was not fully costed.

805 Now for the record and for the public listening at home I will state something that all of us Deputies should know – that we as individual Deputies are self-employed. We are given no direct resources by the States of Guernsey; we are not provided with a desk; we are not provided with secretarial support or assistance. The only time that we can direct civil servants to undertake work and incur costs is when it is under the committee on which we serve. We cannot go in and direct as individual Deputies or even a group of Deputies who are not on a committee, cannot direct a committee to do something unless it is through this Assembly. The only recourse we have as a group of Deputies if we want to influence policy independent of a committee is to bring a Requête.

810 I personally am very grateful for Deputies Neil Inder and Barry Paint's work on this Requête, they have done a tremendous amount of work, they have consulted very widely on it. They have brought this to the States as an issue and, as Deputy Soulsby pointed out, have enabled us to actually debate this and hopefully take some action on it.

815 Now as to the Requête itself, yes it is not costed, and yes it defines one solution. I personally favour that solution.

820 The STSB have used the Requête and placed an amendment which proposes a second potential solution. In most ways I quite like the amendment except for clause 1 where again we are being asked to make a broad reaching policy decision on the back of an envelope. We are being asked – to use the expression other Deputies have used in speeches – to gentrify St Peter Port or turn St Peter Port into a marina without having a policy letter describing exactly what the alternatives will be etc. so the work has not been done on that either, and there is a danger in an amendment like this that we make a fundamental decision on the future of Guernsey's development without due and proper consideration.

825 So whilst I am minded to support options 2, 3 onwards I will do so and I will be asking Deputy Parkinson for an assurance that he will be fully exploring the Requête options plus potentially other options as well.

830 The other issue that has been raised and was discussed quite at length by Deputy Inder's opening speech and subsequently by other Deputies as well was the planning process and whether or not the Law as implemented under the Island Development Plan will prohibit the States from proceeding with a development of this nature.

835 Well it may well do. If it did then I would say that was another indication that our Island Development Plan is not functioning as this Assembly anticipated when it was implemented and that it is overly restrictive and needs to be addressed. If it does not and it enables this plan to go ahead then I would say it is a tick in the box that it has got the flexibility that we were originally sold on. But that remains to be seen.

In short I do not want to see this issue kicked into the long grass or possibly more appropriately, the deep blue sea, and I would like to see a decision made today and therefore I will be supporting the amendment, Propositions 2 onwards but not Proposition 1.

840 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Clerc, you wish to be relevée?

**Deputy Le Clerc:** Yes please, sir.

845 **The Bailiff:** Then Deputy Le Tocq.

**Deputy Le Tocq:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

Sir, I will be brief because some of my fellow requérants, particularly Deputy Soulsby, have articulated what I would say.

850 But I will just pick up first of all some of the comments that my fellow requérant Deputy Brouard mentioned before and just for completeness I think partly for humour's sake but also I think it does illustrate something that we do in Guernsey, he used the illustration of the canny Guernseyman who unlike his neighbour who had excavated, I think you said, four tonnes of soil for a pool and then had the soil taken off and then decided they wanted a rockery, whereas the  
855 canny Guernseyman decided that once he had excavated the soil he would make a rockery with it. I think that is true, but of course the canny Guernseyman did not really want a rockery to begin with, he just decided to do that because he had the soil and he was too ... (*Interjection*) to pay for it to be excavated, or shipped off.

I think, sir, the story of the Braye du Valle comes to mind, because this States, I think, when  
860 Lieutenant-Governor John Doyle decided that the risk of the French invading the northern Island was too high he decided the best thing to do would be dam it at both ends. The States decided that was not a good idea. I think they wanted to make it into a properly dredged sea passage that could go through that. He managed to persuade the States otherwise and we have the Island that we enjoy today with the facilities at the Bridge that we enjoy today and no one would want to go  
865 back. We live with that and we made use of it and it has become very useful land. (*Interjections*)

That might be an argument for doing all sorts of things but I say that because as a signatory to this Requête I am not precious, sir, about what we do with our inert waste. I am not actually particularly precious about Spur Bay either; I would be if it was Albecq perhaps, certainly if it was Cobo. But the point is this: we do need to do things for strategic reasons but it is not always  
870 evident. I am absolutely certain of that.

What I am, sir, very certain about and I want to see is movement in terms of investment in our Harbour at St Peter Port, which is long overdue, and that is the primary reason, as my fellow requérants know, that I signed this Requête. We have not invested for a long time and I think it was Deputy Parkinson who used the term 'quick wins' which is apparently what the Seafront Working Party is working on. Well our quick wins are exceedingly slow in coming forward, we are  
875 not good at doing this sort of thing.

I really do think that St Peter Port Harbour and the presentation that some of us were given by STSB on the condition of the Harbour and the need for investment was enough to persuade me that this needs to be a priority and it needs to be a priority now.

880 Not only that for any of us that have seen the way that systems work at the moment in terms of RoRo and RoPax type of activities there and the need for security which again Deputy Prow and Deputy Paint have been talking about all the situations there that tell us, scream to us, that we ought to be doing something to invest in our Harbour.

Now, sir, this amendment goes perhaps some way towards addressing the inadequacies in the Requête and I accept that there are inadequacies. From my point of view it comes out of an  
885 urgency to see some movement on this, some investment in it. We have the resources to do this, we have support from local businesses and individuals to do it and I believe therefore we should be doing so.

890 So yes, I accept the amendment goes some way, but I could not vote for Proposition 1 on the amendment. That to me would be signing a completely arbitrary restraint ... constraints upon ourselves for starters, sir. When it talks about commercial, commercial can mean lots of different things to different people.

I give way to Deputy –

895 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, can I say in relation to Proposition 1 that I started getting lukewarm  
when I heard the comments of Deputy Tindall at a meeting that she attended. When I heard  
Deputy Soulsby's comments I started getting actually cold. Now I am hearing Deputy Le Tocq's  
comments it is freezing. I am going to personally abstain in relation to Proposition 1 because I do  
900 see the merit of the comments that have been made both before this meeting and in relation to  
this meeting. I do not know if that helps but that is my view.

**Deputy Le Tocq:** Well I thank Deputy Ferbrache for that and I hope others that have aligned  
with his views accept that argument as well, because to my mind it would be very foolish never  
905 mind the apparent weaknesses in the Requête because as others have mentioned we did not have  
the resources as requérants to provide all the information but we can say certainly as three of us  
are on P&R we are equally frustrated that we are not able to invest in a way that we think is  
appropriate in going forward.

So Proposition 1, if that is not carried on the amendment, I am far happier –  
I will give way again.

910

**Deputy Fallaize:** I am grateful to Deputy Le Tocq.

I do not know whether I may have missed it but does Deputy Le Tocq agree with me that it  
would be helpful for some clarification about whether parts of the amendment can be voted on  
separately at the time the amendment is being voted on otherwise Members are going to have to  
915 vote either for or against the amendment and then deal with the component parts of it at the end  
of the debate? I do not know, some direction may already have been given which I have missed,  
because the way that this exchange has developed implies that we will be able to vote on the  
component parts of the amendment separately. I do not know whether we will.

920 **The Bailiff:** I have not given any direction but I seem to recall when Deputy Ferbrache was  
opening that he indicated that if the amendment were to carry, i.e. carry *in toto* then there would  
be an opportunity for Members to vote separately on each of the Propositions. That would be the  
normal procedure.

925 **Deputy Ferbrache:** It is. I can only say how I would intend to vote. I am saying that if that  
happened, as the Bailiff has said, I personally would abstain from Proposition 1, that is all I can  
say. Other people may vote for it of course but I think without predicting, it is very unlikely that  
Proposition 1 will pass. In any event there are a number of people who have said, 'Look, I am  
930 minded to support –'

**The Bailiff:** You will have your opportunity to close on the amendment in due course.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** All I am saying, sir, is that ... I am trying to assist the passage of this  
935 amendment.

**Deputy Le Tocq:** Sir, I think it would be helpful and I am very willing to give way again to  
Deputy Parkinson if he would like to give similar indication that he will abstain on Proposition 1. I  
can carry on talking for quite some time if he would like to do that. He does not seem to – Oh he  
940 is responding, I will give way to – (*Interjection*)

**Deputy Parkinson:** No, I have not actually. I think the Proposition 1 should be interpreted in  
the sense that I have explained that it is talking about the historic St Peter Port Harbour. It is not  
ruling out a commercial port outside St Peter Port Harbour and given what I see as the self-  
evident common sense position, I will vote for the amendment in its entirety and when we come

945 to vote on the Propositions at the end of the debate if a separate vote is taken on what will then  
be Proposition 1, I will probably support it.

**Deputy Le Tocq:** Well, sir, that is really quite disappointing.

950 Nevertheless, and I do not think what Deputy Parkinson said actually speaks to Proposition 1  
particularly, because I do not think any of the requérants are saying commercial activities should  
be restricted to St Peter Port Harbour either; that is not what it says, it is just far too restrictive and  
if that is the case and there is no indication whether it would fail I have to seriously consider  
voting against the whole amendment (*Interjection*) on that basis, which is I think what one of my  
fellow requérants will also do.

955 I do not want to go on because I think everything that needs to be said actually has been said.  
I think the Requête itself – and it was admitted by Members of the STSB at a presentation I went  
to – had achieved a review and welcome review I think they said of their position and the way  
forward on this.

960 Sir, it has been made very clear I think by many who have spoken that there is in this Assembly  
a desire to see investment, not just repairs but investment and future proofing of St Peter Port  
Harbour which our forefathers invested in, as has been said here, somewhat unknowing what the  
future may hold and for me that is essentially what we should be doing now.

965 So I encourage people to seriously consider the things that I have said and perhaps to vote  
similarly unless there is any other indication that Proposition 1 can fail in the amendment.  
Otherwise as I said, sir, I will not be supporting the amendment.

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Can I invoke Rule 26(1), please?

970 **The Bailiff:** Right. Rule 26(1). Will those who have not yet spoken and wish to do so please  
stand in their places. I see eight standing. Do you still wish to proceed?

**Deputy Leadbeater:** Please, sir.

975 **The Bailiff:** I put to Members then the motion that debate be terminated. Those in favour;  
those against.

*Members voted Contre.*

**The Bailiff:** That is defeated.

I will call the next speaker – Oh nobody wants to speak! (*Laughter*)  
Deputy Langlois.

980 **Deputy Langlois:** That is ironic because I did prepare a speech critical of the Requête because  
very few people actually spoke about some of the detailed statements in the Requête that I think  
are extremely flawed. But with requérant after requérant standing up and basically jumping ship I  
do not think there is much point in that.

985 But Deputy Le Tocq said everything that needs to be said has been said; well I actually do not  
think that is true at all. I think what we are witnessing here is a system failure. I think the fact that  
three Members of P&R have signed the Requête is one aspect of it, but the way we have been  
talking it is as if the Harbours have been ignored over the years and now thanks to Deputies Inder  
and Paint we are suddenly taking them seriously. That is not the situation at all.

I mean, in 2010 the 150-page Halcrow Report on our Harbours concluded:

There is sufficient area within the existing harbour boundary to meet the space requirements of today and the forecast  
requirements to 2059. However, reconfiguration of the existing operations will be required.



990 That is what has been going on since that date. We have spent tens of millions of pounds on  
the Harbour, nobody suggested that we needed to extend the Harbour. As the Halcrow Report  
said, it just requires some reconfiguration. If we are really desperate for space we have got the  
whole of the North Beach there. It is going to be a lot cheaper to build a multi-story carpark to  
replace the parking there than it is to spend £150 million plus extending the Harbour to protect  
995 the parking on North Beach.

I have been wondering why, what is the provenance of this Requête, and obviously it is  
generated by the inert waste problem. I was thinking yesterday that if yesterday afternoon's  
debate had been a football match the possession stats would have been inert waste 75%, Harbour  
extension 25%, which I think says a lot.

1000 So we have got what everybody is trying to pretend is this big strategic debate generated  
basically by an argument about what we are supposed to be doing with inert waste, and we are  
sort of ignoring or rather being cynical about the report which is currently on the shelves, not just  
the 2010 Halcrow Report but also the less impressive 2013 Ports Master Plan.

1005 It seems evident to me that STSB, having inherited the operational side of things, is making  
quite a good fist of it. They have set up the Ports Board. I think it is a really good innovation but  
from their reaction to the Requête it is clear that they feel they need some more money and they  
are piggy backing on this Requête to try to get some money. So they are not really following the  
usual channels and it is slightly disingenuous, I think, to put in an amendment requesting over a  
million pounds to try and duck the normal channels – well basically asking P&R and States for  
1010 some money.

I am sure it is needed; whether they need £800,000 or whether they need to investigate  
extending the east arm I am not at all convinced but as I said, we are not going through the  
normal channel we are going through this rather extraordinary process, yesterday afternoon and  
today, and the fact that P&R are involved in it just seems to me an extraordinary situation. I simply  
1015 do not understand what was going through the heads of some Deputies when they signed this  
Requête.

For Deputies now to stand up and say, 'Oh, they always knew it was vague and un-costed and  
there was evidence but they decided to stimulate debate,' I think that is rather disingenuous too.  
So I am quite critical of the ... I cannot join the Deputies falling over to praise Deputies Inder and  
1020 Paint for bringing this Requête because I personally think it is a bit of a waste of States' time and I  
am not hugely impressed by an amendment which tries to piggy back on it to demand money  
without going through the usual channels and the P&R Plan.

So I am sorry to say I am rather cynical about this but I certainly will be supporting the  
amendment because it is slightly better than the Requête, but I doubt whether I will be supporting  
1025 many of the proposals in the amendment.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

1030 **Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you very much, sir.

I just wanted to say, I suppose maybe in defence of the SEA working group, we should not  
overlook the fact that for some months, some considerable period of time, despite the fact that  
the post was advertised, there was no one single person overseeing quite a significant project. The  
two members of staff that provide the papers and do the groundwork at the SEA do it part-time.  
1035 They have other full-time positions as civil servants and they also assist the SEA.

Now, I actually think the Seafront Enhancement Area group have done quite well with the  
Valette. I think that will be hugely successful. We should not overlook the fact that the Tour and  
the Plantation are part of the seafront enhancement, along with Market Street into Mill Street –  
that is part of it.

1040 What it did not have the resources for from the start was the sort of SEA funding that gives you a project officer that takes you that if you like supercharges the SEA, as opposed to supercharging STSB to deliver on the port.

I share the frustration, I have to say, of Deputy Langlois to find that Members of P&R who ask us generally to play by the rules have circumvented processes in supporting a requête which advances a cause that was on no one's agenda. Nobody at the door asked any of us, 'What do you intend to do about the port facilities and infrastructure in St Peter Port?' – not one person.

1050 Now what I think the problem with this Requête is: it is actually not ambitious enough and that is its problem. It is saying that the alternatives to what they are proposing are so great a challenge that you should not even look at them, you should not begin to look at them. Now I suppose every naval officer, every merchant seaman, every trawler man working in the depths of the winter in the North Sea would probably pose the question, 'Could you ever put an oil rig in this environment? Could you ever put, these days, a wind farm in this environment?' The point is it happens because mariners quite rightly advise and engineers provide the solutions.

1055 So with the Alderney Breakwater not so far from us we should remember that the conditions around these Islands are unique, they present significant challenges but there are engineering solutions around them, so it is because the Requête is not particularly ambitious, alluding, if I can to what Deputy Parkinson said with regard to Hydro Port. Rather than having a solution and working backwards they are at least trying to cover a number of the problems that we face.

1060 If I could just read from the Requête – just bear with me while I get my screen shot up, thank you very much – the Requête says, I think it is overlooked that ... if I can just find it, excuse me. Yes.

Your petitioners note that there are no strategic initiatives in place to operationally develop St Peter Port Harbour. This means that the development can take place over a longer period (for example 20 to 25 years) without impeding the normal workings of the Harbour. Your petitioners consider that this makes [sense] a development of this nature an ideal candidate for gradual construction using the island's inert waste [arisings] ...

1065 The idea with a port is that you start with a very firm – just that, a start, and you have a defined construction period that takes you to an end. The idea that you build a significant piece of infrastructure on the availability of a product where the quantities are just never really known at any one time is crazy. So those of you going in to election in 2020 will face this as an issue, the developing port around you, in 2024, in 2028 and 2032 and onwards. You will have in the heart of St Peter Port, dependent on inert waste arisings, a developing port facility with lorries or barges going in and out and we expect the port to be fully operational throughout that period over a 25-year programme to build the port will be fully operational, parking will be hunky dory, there will be a minimum of inconvenience to the public. I just do not see that at all.

1070 I think Deputy Parkinson said I was going to speak, or implied I was going to speak, at length on inert waste. I am not because I do not even need to, I think the notion that you use a by-product of a building process to start such a huge project of this nature over a 25-year period is quite shocking and I am, like Deputy Langlois, frustrated that the Requête has been praised for its endeavour, for its foresight, and for being an intelligent solution to an immediate problem we are facing; it is not. It is a very long-winded uncertain project.

1080 Deputy Inder in his speech built the case slowly; he said it is going to take us on a journey and gave us, to mix a metaphor, the building blocks of why he had arrived at where he is now. It is important to note that the reconfiguration of St Peter Port facilities is not dependent on the construction of a physical port outside. You can do a great deal now around St Peter Port actually but that involves taking tricky decisions: where would you re-site the customer shed; what would you do about the trailer parking; what would you do about car parking? That is probably the nub of the issue.

1085 So if the idea is that to deal with all those things within the busy port of St Peter Port you just append, you have this huge big structure to deal with port management issues, it does not bear a great deal of scrutiny.

Deputy Inder said something very specific. He said that the port barely complies with the security code, the ISPS code, and David Barker, the Harbour Master, informs us that St Peter Port Harbour is fully compliant with the ISPS code. He acknowledges though that having an external  
1090 facility does free off the space which would be an advantage which I think we all understand.

Also in building the argument for the Requête, Deputy Inder said that it was one of the most poorly maintained ports. It is not, that is just not a statement of fact. The Jacobs Report says you are looking to spend between £20 million and £30 million within St Peter Port Harbour. But they did say that actually it is a well-maintained harbour and they also refer to the £20 million on the  
1095 new jetty and the £13 million on the freight berth and the new cranes.

I think what has been misunderstood about Proposition 1 and it is a shame, I understand – believe me I fully understand – why Deputy Ferbrache has taken the position he has adopted because it is important that this amendment succeeds, in my view, but there are other arguments.

St Peter Port has evolved in a clumsy way through that design and flaw. It evolves; you add, you remove, but what we have now is a whole mix of French yachtsmen; visiting yachtsmen from all over Europe; you have tender craft from cruisers; you have the Guernsey pleasure boat owner; you have children, young adults trying to sail, all in the confines of St Peter Port, that is identifying risk and safety issues all the time. So it would make sense, wouldn't it, to take the larger vessels outside of the port somewhere and to take on Deputy Parkinson's point – it is still St Peter Port, and actually with having, I am assuming, Sark boats, Herm boats, bustling, creating that buzz  
1100 around St Peter Port with small pleasure craft.

Now Deputy Inder said on social media that that idea constitutes gentrification of St Peter Port and he said something interesting. He said a port for them – a port for them not you, and actually the very opposite is true. If you did support Proposition 1 you would be giving the port back to the community that could use it, along with the Herm Seaway, with the Sark vessels, but not the big bulk vessels that perhaps create something of a problem.  
1110

Hydrocarbons is often referred to and it has to because of the nature of port development, and I have noticed more recently there is an acceptance of an argument that was not around a year or two ago. I think even Deputy Paint some time ago argued for a fuel berth or off-loading fuel in the Doyle Passage, if not have a ... Other people have argued for a berth outside St Sampson's. We now know with the work done by PwC, the future demand on hydrocarbon the reality is hydrocarbons are going to come in ISO tanks so they can roll-on and they can roll-off and they can lift on and lift off, so we should not obsess over the hydrocarbons but also we should remember there is a huge piece of work that has been done to tell us that because three years ago we would have been building £120 million piers for vessels that could not bottom out.  
1115

I just wanted to deal with the expectations of people who presented to the SEA Group because they are open to interpretation. I was in the same room as Deputy Brouard, I had one recollection, he has another, or rather interpretation. The Guernsey Boat Owners' are saying they want investment in St Peter Port Harbour; I do, I want investment in St Peter Port Harbour, so do they.  
1120

When Mr Guillemette was interviewed by Oscar Pearson possibly two or three weeks ago now on *Radio Guernsey* the presenter said to Mr Guillemette, 'You realise this will happen over a 25-year period?' His response was, 'What are you talking about? It does not take 25 years!' The Requête is telling you that this is a development that will take between 20 and 25 years. The Guernsey Boat Owners' Association want investment in the Port, so do I.  
1125

I will give way to Deputy Prow, sir.  
1130

**Deputy Prow:** I thank you for giving way.

I think what the Requête actually does say is that it would be a phased development which would take up to 25 years.

Also whilst I am on my feet on the question of security there is no suggestion from me, or I do not think any other requérant, that the safety zones currently at St Peter Port Harbour are not compliant, that would be a very bad message to send out. They certainly are. The point that is being made very powerfully is that the infrastructure at the Harbour is struggling and bursting at  
1135

1140 the seams. It is a different point and it also questions whether that security can be maintained in the future.

Thank you, sir.

**Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you.

1145 What I would say to Deputy Prow is he is right, it is gradual, it could be 20 to 25 years, but I can envisage a situation whereby there is a demand on Island for a commodity and actually I just want to note, as it crosses my mind, Deputy Parkinson has always consistently been critical of us describing the inert product in waste terms and I think actually the waste element or the context of it always being waste rather than a commodity has not been overly helpful.

1150 But the point is if you are totally reliant on inert waste you can amend this Requête to say between 30 and 35 years. You cannot do that as if the inert waste does not arise you are dependent on importing stone from somewhere else, then what is the cost of a new harbour if you have to import stone?

1155 Now others have presented to the Seafront Enhancement Area, Guernsey Boat Owners' Association, the retailers, the people who work, they are there today while we are here; the work in the Harbour, they are all saying invest in the port, invest in St Peter Port. I am saying exactly the same thing and the amendment gives you that opportunity.

But it is also true to say that the expectations of the larger hauliers is that they will have their freight shed and their facilities closer to the vessels; and with Deputy Roffey's point regarding the carbuncle, I do not really think that is what the community would like to see necessarily.

1160 Now Deputy Roffey asked for an indication from E&I and STSB of, 'Please tell us the direction that you are looking to go without prejudging,' so that is an issue, this sort of predetermination of things, but appended to the amendment for the context and the information that both STSB and E&I would have to consider, there are two paragraphs which are, the first reads:

The option to relocate the Lo-Lo function to St Sampson's potentially to a deep water –

Sorry, this is from the Harbour Master Plan:

The option to relocate the Lo-Lo function to St Sampson's, potentially to a deepwater pocket berth alongside (to the north of) Longue Hougue or to a berths alongside deep-water fuel structure, would consolidate bulk cargo, aggregate and liquid bulks into an area that is generally industrial in nature, would alleviate current constriction within St Peter Port's handling areas.

1165 – and it is the constriction within the handling areas that is the problem.

Also the Ports Master Plan says:

The Longue Hougue reclamation ... represents the optimum location for the expansion and consolidation of future marine-based activities. Consideration should be given to the potential merits of further expansion and the reclamation southwards or seawards as part of the evaluation of significant infrastructure including deep water fuel berth.

But actually the argument has moved on a little from that.

1170 With regard to Deputy Stephens I will apologise if I do not recall everything she asked. I am nervous about giving costings for obvious reasons but the double handling to stock pile waste at Longue Hougue with the subsequent transfer to St Peter Port is in the region of £1 million to £3.5 million. So those are the loose indicative costs of the project.

1175 My main criticism is, we have arrived at a solution and we are working backwards. So we know what we want and what is the tool that gives you that without fully understanding. Ports are built in 100-year timeframes, so you have to be convinced that you are doing the right thing. So in supporting the amendment and seeing the – as Deputy Parkinson referred to, understanding the issues of climate change – sea level rise, it would be ironic, wouldn't it, if we built something outside of St Peter Port over a 15-, 20-, 25-year period to find we then compromised any development that was necessitated by sea level rise.

So I am going to ask Members to support the amendment.

1180 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Yerby.

1185 **Deputy Yerby:** Sir, in general terms I think my position on this debate is similar to Deputy Le Tocq's as he set it out in his speech. But unfortunately I do not think I can let that take me as far as voting for the amendment, at best I will probably abstain on that vote, because he is right: without Proposition 1 the amendment itself is not worlds apart from the Requête, but the fact of the introduction of the amendment complicated this debate for me in ways that I did not expect.

1190 I do just want to chide Deputy Roffey for opening by saying the Requête came out of a policy vacuum. I mean of course it did, that is what requêtes are supposed to do – they give Members an opportunity to introduce matters into debate that are not reaching the States by any other route. But it is I think a fair criticism of the amendment.

1195 Because what I had expected from early conversations around the Requête with those who did not want to see it come forward was a fairly straight forward, 'No, no, no, this is not a sensible thing to be doing with inert waste. Here are the technical and engineering and scientific reasons why this is not a practical opportunity to pursue.' To some extent Deputy Brehaut's speech addressed that, but it was the first one, I think, in this debate that did that, and I can understand and respect that line of reasoning and expected that I might have been persuaded by it, but what the amendment did was not to knock the thesis out of the water but to say, 'Yes, just do not jump to the Harbour as being the right way to use inert waste; think through some other options first,' and that is a more challenging thing to think through.

1200 I want to borrow Deputy Langlois' requête because I see this albeit in a different way to him as being something of a system failure. I like what the Requête tries to achieve because it says, yes, we have got one problem here which is the disposal of our inert waste and another problem there which is the need to re-develop our Harbour. Now neither one is the optimal solution to the other but bring them together and they are greater than the sum of their parts. I think that is actually quite a good way to try and resolve some of our problems.

1205 The message back is no it is not like that, it is more like one song to the tune of another and in doing so butchers both the words and the tune, but in the absence of powerful arguments saying that this simply is not practical rather than saying it has not gone through the right gateways, it is not the optimal solution to one or the other therefore it is not the optimal solution to both. It is a challenge to turn around and say well the Requête is not the right idea at all.

1210 I will not rue it if the amendment goes through, I think that is still a positive development, but it is difficult to stand up and say, 'Well, no, the Requête was not the right idea,' if what you are then saying is, 'but actually what it proposes is practically feasible.'

1215 Sir, that is not a very compelling speech on my part but I hope at least Members understand my challenge and maybe will have the opportunity to respond to them in closing.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

1220

**Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

Firstly, I would like to be identified with the comments that Deputy Roffey made on Planning Laws. I think it is easy to forget the criticism that the States had prior to it being subject to our Planning Laws.

1225 I will be supporting the amendment. I just wish to make a few comments and try not to repeat too much what other people have said.

On inert waste I think it has almost been talked up in this debate beyond what it is. For example, when the building for the transfer station was there we had to take precautions because asbestos was possibly in the inert waste. It is not a pure product, it is something which comes off

1230 building sites, obviously there is separation at building sites, but it is not necessarily a pure product.

In building – and Deputy Inder actually did make some comments in his opening speech about the problems of building on such a product – there was considerable engineering had to be done below ground levels for the transfer station. There were piles of over 30 m and there was a larger number of piles needed because of the product we were building on. There was significantly thicker concrete which was needed.

1235 There has been a lot of criticism about the cost of the waste transfer station but the location of it and because of what it was built on contributed to the high costs of it. So it is not a pure product, but the important thing is it produced a valuable location for non-neighbour friendly uses, and I think if we were to continue building next to it at Longue Hougue South it will also produce an excellent location for non-neighbour friendly uses, which in a small Island which is densely populated is of immense value.

1240 A lot has been said about the congestion at the Harbour. I think Deputy Green and others talked about the lack of action. I do not think that is totally fair. I think there has been a considerable number of actions over the recent history at the Harbour to improve. You look at one of the most expensive projects, the new jetty, which was to strengthen and to the new jetty ... But in more recent times there are the berths, 4, 5 and 6 and the repair to the concrete decking, the new cranes, and that produced additional space. Rather than store 80 containers it went up to 110 containers that could be stored. So there was an improvement in terms of congestion. Also part of North Beach was used for marshalling for the Ro-Ro traffic so we went up from 90 spaces to 204 spaces. Also in terms of trailer spaces it went up from 45 to 55. There was mitigation in terms of the loss of parking spaces.

1245 Also the cruise passengers were moved away from that part of the Harbour to the Albert Pier, which again removed a lot of congestion at times from that area. So there has been work done and a lot of this was mentioned in the Harbour Action Plan to reduce congestion at the Harbour.

1250 The Harbour Action Plan also talked about options for the future, and one of the options if you look at the Harbour Action Plan is to have two tiers on the car park and considerably shorten the car park and make use of more of the existing car park for freight facilities. So there are options.

1255 Also Deputy Langlois referred to the Halcrow Report. Well, in the Halcrow Report they looked at the location for if you were to move some of the facilities and they looked at six different zones which went from north of St Sampson's right up to St Peter Port Harbour and they analysed each one. In the appendices to that report there is a report on a meeting which was with the Harbour Master, the Master Pilot and the Deputy Master Pilot. They looked at all those locations, and I am quoting from the minutes of that meeting, from Vivian to Flieroque, which is south of Longue Hougue is the:

... preferred location due to natural shelter from north east provided by Vivian rock, reasonable depth water close to shoreline, limited dredging may be required, tidal currents approximately two knots, vessels could approach from southerly direction.

1260 It goes on. They concluded and as I said that was with the Master Pilot and Deputy Master Pilot and the Harbour Master meeting with Halcrow that that was the best location.

1270 So there are other options and there are options which need to be considered, and there have been reports on them. So it is totally wrong to jump to the Requête idea that this is the best location.

Of course I agree with Deputy Roffey's points about aesthetics, and again that is referred to in the Harbour Master Plan about how important the aesthetic of the Harbour is and we do not want to ruin that.

1275 Also everybody has talked about having larger boats but it is a bit like the runway and larger planes, if you have larger boats you have less frequent boats, and there has to be a balance that just actually having larger and larger boats, is it actually in the best interests of the Island? We have these RoPax ships currently which are ideal for the Island because they have predominantly

1280 freight but they also have some passenger facilities. These were built for the Island and it has been said that in future we should have a second one. So it is what is right for the Island. I think we cannot just jump to having larger and larger ships because they were built specially for us and perhaps that is the right way forward.

I will support the amendment on the basis that there are other options which need to be looked at.

Thank you.

1285

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

1290 I entered this debate not knowing which way to vote and I still do not know which way to vote, although the speeches of Deputy Green and Deputy Parkinson make me probably slightly more sympathetic to the amendment than I was at the beginning of the debate.

I think there are problems though with various parts of both the Requête and the amendment. I think Deputy Inder's Requête has started an interesting debate; whether it is a productive debate remains to be seen but an interesting debate.

1295 I do not though think I can support Proposition 1 in the Requête because to ask the States to agree in principle to replace Longue Hougue South as the preferred site with St Peter Port Harbour off the back of what is in the Requête and off the back of what has been put before the States in this debate I think would be irresponsible.

1300 I am not saying that the ideas that Deputy Inder and Deputy Paint have put forward are wrong because I do not have the evidence or information to back up any claim that they are wrong, but I do not think I have the evidence and information before me to agree in principle that St Peter Port Harbour should become the preferred site for the disposal of inert waste.

1305 If the information or evidence is out there I do not think that their Requête has brought it before the States; and, I say this respectfully, Deputy Inder said at the beginning of his speech or during his speech he was going to put the evidence before the States, but I do not think he did. I think Deputy Ferbrache, in an email exchange, said or implied that it would be irresponsible to vote for this kind of scheme off the back of the evidence currently available and I think he is right.

1310 So I think that is a problem with the Requête. I do not think it is necessarily right, but I think I need more information before me to convince me – sorry I do not necessarily think it is wrong but I think I need more information before me to be convinced that it is right.

1315 A problem with the – or two problems with the amendment, however, are I think No. 1 in the amendment and I think the proposer of the amendment now accepts this but perhaps the seconder does not – that Proposition 1 in the amendment really has the same defect as Proposition 1 in the Requête. The amendment is put forward more or less on the basis that Proposition 1 in the Requête is irresponsible, it goes too far without presenting adequate evidence. But then Proposition 1 in the amendment asks the States in the absence of any material evidence to agree that in the future St Peter Port Harbour will be primarily focussed on the provision of leisure port facilities. I do not think the States has any better information before it to agree to that than it does to agree to St Peter Port Harbour becoming the preferred site for the disposal of inert waste.

1320 So I think, like Proposition 1 in the Requête, Proposition 1 in the amendment is an interesting idea but I do not think the evidence base for it is any better.

1325 Proposition 6 in the amendment concerns me because I am not very keen on the idea of stockpiling inert waste. Deputy Stephens referred to this in her speech. The States have known about the exhaustion of the current site for disposing of inert waste for years, and it might be in keeping with the character of States' decision making but I do not think it would be to the credit of the States if we get just a few years just before we reach the point where that site is exhausted and say actually our response is going to be well we really do not know what we are going to do next so we will stockpile inert waste. That is nonsensical.

1330 I had hoped that the debacle over decision making around residual non inert waste was the last time the States would engage in that sort of decision making. I fear that if that part of the amendment, part 6, is approved we will be well down the road of repeating with inert waste the mess the States got itself into over residual waste.

1335 So I think in terms of inert waste – I was absent from the States’ meeting, because I was ill, when the decision was made to identify Longue Hougue South as the preferred site, but if I had been here I would have voted that way. I have not yet seen a convincing case that shows me that Longue Hougue South is not the preferred site, although, like Deputy Roffey, I would regret it if that site has to be used for all of the benefits it brings, but that does not mean to say there is a better site, because if it is the least worst option then we will have to accept that we need to dispose of inert waste and we will have to do it at that site. I think that is sort of where I am with this debate at the moment.

1340 I take the point that Deputy Parkinson made, that although Deputy Inder is critical of the identification of Longue Hougue South as the preferred site because he says no productive use has been identified for it, that may be true but it does not mean to say that there is no productive use for that site *per se*, even though the policy letter off the back of which the States identified Longue Hougue South as the preferred site may have been wanting in that regard –

I will give way to Deputy Inder.

**Deputy Inder:** Thank you, Deputy Fallaize.

1350 I also said that had we known what the cost would be for it now, everyone might have been making different decisions and I think, through you, sir, just remind him, I do not think the real criticism again, and I will repeat that, is actually it is down to the system rather than the people. We are now at something between £42 million, possibly £45 million, north of that; had we known that now would we be doing something different with it? That is where the problem started I believe.

**Deputy Fallaize:** That – Oh, I will give way to Deputy Dorey.

**Deputy Dorey:** Thank you.

1360 I would just like to make clear, the cost of it will be paid by the user of it, it will be a loan; it is not coming out of the Capital Reserve, it will be financed from the users of it. It has been implied that it is the taxpayer paying for it, it is not, it is the user that will be paying for it.

1365 **Deputy Fallaize:** I am happy to give way to Deputy Inder if he – no, he is not listening so I cannot. Okay. In the event that anybody else is I will continue.

1370 Now, both of those are good points. I think what Deputy Inder is saying is although he was always a sceptic about Longue Hougue South I think what he is more or less saying is it might be okay to identify it as the preferred site for inert waste without any identified productive use thereafter if the cost is only whatever million, £25 million, £30 million or whatever; but if the cost is going to rise upwards towards £50 million that may tip the balance against identifying it as the preferred site for inert waste. I think that argument is not without merit.

I also think Deputy Dorey’s intervention is a fair point that there has been the implication, I think that the taxpayer will end up paying for the infrastructure costs and the taxpayer clearly will not.

1375 I will give way to Deputy Inder.

1380 **Deputy Inder:** Just one more. I think he will because if I remember correctly, I might not, the inert waste into Longue Hougue is going at £23 a tonne, at 30 million quid, those are the calculations. Now at £50 million, we are heading toward £40 a tonne. So the taxpayer does pay in some sort of way.



**Deputy Fallaize:** Well no, irrespective of what the cost is per tonne the taxpayer does not pay. This may be a rather (**Deputy Inder:** Okay.) arcane point but the taxpayer is not paying, but the consumer would pay; that is the point that Deputy Inder is making. Okay that is a fair point.

1385 Now, so I am not convinced by the amendment and I am not convinced by the Requête, and I am tempted to vote in favour of the amendment and then against the Propositions as amended if the amendment is successful.

1390 However, in a way that does not really take us any further forward, and my regret in this debate is that ... we are in a particular culture in this States; this States does not like last minute amendments, this States is not very comfortable with doing what I would see as kind of executive governmental business of the floor of the Assembly. It thinks that there is something wrong about – I am not giving way at the moment but I may in a moment – it does not like doing that, it typically has felt uncomfortable with that.

1395 I think this States loses something because of that. I think there are times in debate where you get various Propositions and ideas that are put forward and it is necessary to draw out some of those ideas and then bring them together in some kind of aggregate or composite set of Propositions which can be put before the States.

1400 The last States did it in several major debates and ended up with Propositions that might have been supported by three quarters or more of this States. This States has tended to be more inclined to want ... the opposing sides want to go head to head and fight it out and we will see who can get the most votes at the end of the day.

1405 Now the reason I say that is because in this debate I think, and I might be completely wrong, but I think there is some kind of consensus emerging that the main idea that has been put forward in Deputy Inder's Requête is not without merit but needs much more careful analysis before the States could agree to it whether in principle or otherwise; that at the moment the States does not have enough information before it to designate anywhere other than Longue Hougue South as a preferred site for the disposal of inert waste, recognising that it is a sufficiently compromised site that investigations into other sites may have to continue; that there is probably a need to give much more careful analysis to the development of the port facilities at St Peter Port and or potentially Longue Hougue South in the way that Deputy Parkinson outlines, but that the States does not want to see the son of Little Venice set out all along the east coast.

1415 I have a very major concern about that in relation to the amendment. My concern about the amendment is not so much what is in it but what is not in it and where it might lead. I do not want to see the whole of the east coast developed along States of Jersey Development Company lines if that is what the name of the thing still is or along Little Venice lines. But I think there is some consensus to emerge around those ideas.

1420 The problem is that those ideas are not set out before the States in any kind of motion or amendment that is before them. Now four years ago, if we were in the previous States, I would have said I think what is needed is that Deputy Inder and Deputy Ferbrache need to come together and put their ideas into a single amendment and I would probably have offered to write it for them. But I have tried that three or four times in this present States and generally the States do not like that sort of approach now once debate has already started. I regret that because I think today there would be an opportunity for an amendment which draws together those sorts of ideas and allows the States to leave without having made irresponsible and reckless decisions, without having undone the investigative work around Longue Hougue South that has already been carried out, but having moved substantially forward with a debate that clearly needs to happen around the development of port facilities.

1430 So if my approach resonates in any way with any other Members they can advise me, but I think that would be the best outcome to this debate because I think if the States are forced to vote only on the Propositions before it the only guarantee is that a majority of Members are going to leave the States believing the States has probably reached the wrong outcome.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** Thank you, sir.

1435 Yes, well in my speech and anything I say I will not be speaking on behalf of the DPA, past, present or future, it will very much be my own perspective on this.

I do feel I agree actually with a lot of the speeches we have heard today from Deputy Ferbrache, from Deputy Fallaize, Deputy Green yesterday about the holistic plans not always meeting fruition and Deputy Graham's very thoughtful speech, to name but a few.

1440 But the thing is we are a bit between the devil and the deep blue sea – or maybe it is a deep water berth in this case – on this because we are faced with two sets of Propositions that actually, as Deputy Fallaize has pointed out, rectify the same disadvantages, neither are costed, neither have as yet been through a planning or other kind of mechanism, and of course they both imply an instant final answer that we have to put across.

1445 I immediately, when I saw the Ferbrache/Parkinson amendment, in one sense I was surprised, in another sense I was not, because I was aware that there had been discussions along the lines that perhaps the Inder/Paint Requête is jumping the gun inasmuch that there is a long term body of opinion out there that seems to want to reconstruct the nature of our eastern seaboard so that St Sampson's or Bulwer Avenue becomes more of an industrial port for commercial shipping  
1450 Longue Hougue etc. and St Peter Port becomes more of a leisure facility, maybe full of Pilates, yoga, arts and funky kiosks and whatever, I do not know. There is that game going on.

But the other view that I heard initially in a way from expert opinion was that it was very foolhardy to abandon the Longue Hougue site. Now as Deputy Brehaut has identified today.

1455 Now the thing that astonishes me is that in the last year Deputy Ferbrache and the STSB and the States really as a corporate whole have very much made the case forcefully, really there is no alternative to Longue Hougue.

Now what this Requête sets out to achieve, one of its aims I think, was to say we can prevent the Longue Hougue South extension being done and actually even if it loses today it seems to have achieved that objective. Deputy Inder and Deputy Paint have certainly changed the ground  
1460 rules because back we come with an amendment that really is all about St Peter Port Harbour and St Sampson's Harbour and puts things in a different way.

One of the main problems with the amendment of course is to agree that the distinct character history and setting of St Peter Port Harbour and the surrounding area affords its special and unique status and its attraction and value as a primary centre for commercial, cultural and  
1465 recreational activity would be enhanced if maritime activities were focused primarily on provision of leisure port facilities. Well, here you have got an instant contradiction because it talks on the one hand as a primary centre for commercial activity and then talks about leisure port facilities.

What do we hear? We heard references made to the Port of Stranraer yesterday which I once went through on the night ferry to Larne in Northern Ireland. Now Stranraer is not a particularly  
1470 happy story because at one time it had a frequent train service to Carlisle, but the railway was closed at the height of the Beeching era, it retains to what amounts to a long branch line to Glasgow via Ayr, but it is now downgraded to a kind of multiple unit little train. More significantly, Stranraer was notable as the main commercial port for travelling to Northern Ireland but a new port about six miles up the road at Cairnryan has been built which has taken the car ferries, so  
1475 Stranraer must be suffering a bit of a recession.

This is the downside. If you take, for example, the eastern seaboard of East Anglia, you have modern, very effective ports at Harwich and Felixstowe. Felixstowe was a classic example of a modern port. At the other end of the spectrum you had the declining towns of places like Lowestoft and perhaps the more tourism focussed Aldeburgh and of course there is another port  
1480 there, what used to be a port, Dunwich which apparently in the early medieval era was second only to London but has now disappeared.

The point I am making is we are running the risk of St Peter Port, on a whim, disappearing in many respects as a significant shipping and commercial centre and centre of employment.

1485 Deputy Lester Queripel's arguments which he put very ably yesterday about lorry traffic, I know in the past perhaps Deputy Queripel did question the sort of zeal of former Environment

1490 Departments in their bid to reduce the speed or volume of traffic along the Seafront and yesterday he made very much a case for reducing lorries and other traffic, but of course it goes both ways, because if we relocated much of our port activity in the St Sampson's, Vale, northern area then all the traffic that was going to the south west of the Island and Town would then go in the opposite direction because –

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Prow, I think he is giving way to you.

1495 **Deputy Prow:** Thank you, Deputy Roffey, for giving way – (*Interjection*) Gollop, sorry. (*Laughter and interjections*) I do beg your pardon.

1500 On the question of traffic and traffic flows perhaps one point that should be made which is quite important, the main roll-on roll-off ferry which delivers freight into Guernsey arrives at three o'clock in the morning roughly and whether it was to arrive at St Sampson's Harbour or St Peter Port Harbour, that huge volume of traffic actually is discharged and, as Deputy Merrett has already pointed out, goes directly to destinations where they are intended. So I think that that is quite an important fact, sir, in that part of the debate.

Thank you, sir.

1505 **Deputy Gollop:** I think actually that is a point that has been well made in this debate and also in some television reports earlier along the –  
I will give way to Deputy Merrett.

**Deputy Merrett:** Thank you, Deputy Gollop.

1510 On that very subject that he gave way to Deputy Prow on and I think Deputy Ferbrache said that we would be bringing more things in, I question, sir, why are we bringing more things in?

Our strategy is reduce, re-use, recycle; and as far as I am aware we do not have a strategy for an expedient population growth, so I do query why we would be bringing more things in, and I do query why for all of our children.

1515 I think also yesterday reference was made to baked beans, sir. Baked beans are stored in the warehouses in the retail stores. There is no warehouse. There was a warehouse, admittedly, on Grand Maison Road. I believe it belonged to a supermarket. They no longer store ambient products there; they store it in their store. It is basically very simple and it is called 'just in time'.

Thank you, sir.

1520 **Deputy Gollop:** Oh, yes, well that intervention was just in time.

1525 I think it should be noted that we have seen some of our retailers who have wholesale elements, regrettably perhaps moving their wholesale activities outside of Guernsey, but inevitably that means a greater reliance, as Deputy Trott has always said, on our shipping links as being more crucial, dare I suggest it, than yoga and Pilates – important though they are – at least in a physical sense.

What I am saying here is the 'just in time' element though has of course reduced the need for the kind of warehouse provision that some Members have questioned about being implicit in the Inder Requête.

1530 I will change tack now a bit and do an anecdote that Deputy Le Clerc and others might relate to really and that is we have had the blessing in the last few days of the excellent and very well organised Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference with all delegates from diverse places, we fortunately have great accessibility compared to our friends in St Helena and the Falkland Isles to name but two places. Because I was not particularly involved with it, I did not get to meet as many people as ideally I might have liked and I was really busy on many other things anyway, but I did  
1535 pop up as everyone was leaving to the Duke of Richmond Hotel and I met a few people and there was some *gâche* there which I enjoyed eating, but on my way I encountered not just the Deputy Bailiff, sir, but also a man who was having a tea break from the roadworks. In their wisdom, the

States had about three roadworks going on outside the Duke of Richmond access areas in the middle of a conference, but never mind, and this gentleman said, 'I want major change at the next election to get things ... The trouble with you, John Gollop, is you are no longer a people's man.' Now that was an interesting point because I think that this Requête is about much more than just St Peter Port Harbour – important, perhaps *the* most important issue of our time, that it is.

It is actually about, as Deputy Langlois and Deputy Yerby amongst others have commented, it is about a failure of process of this Assembly. Deputy Fallaize has identified the issues as well to a degree, because there is a disconnect between our role as 40 parliamentarians and the policy that comes out.

We have heard today that although the Seafront Enhancement Area is going relatively well and certainly reports back to the DPA and other committees represented on it by others, Deputy Oliver, Deputy Trott, Deputy St Pier, Deputy Brehaut, and a number of civil servants and a senior figure from the STSB, that despite their good work on medium level projects which will enhance St Peter Port, the really big issues have not been considered yet, due probably to a lack of resources and lack of meetings, rather than any other deficiency.

But you look back, get the historical picture, I know this can get boring, but we started this work in the days of the great Roger Berry's Board of Administration; and then there were plans for the Havelet Bay that never happened; then we went through a phase of big idea from an organisation then called Longue Port and a well-known bank from Scotland I think to have the Little Venice which did not get off the ground; then we had support at that time from Commerce & Employment; then we had a lot of activity in Frossard House from very senior figures who wanted the infrastructure done and there was talk of pipelines going into the middle of the sea and the reorganisation of St Sampson's despite the rock base; then we had the Port Master Plan. I even represented Social Security on that, I do not know why, for a while. But we have been going round in circles and yet we know shipping is getting bigger. Our economy in some ways in some areas is not as robust as it could and should be and we are losing relatively speaking the population and commercial activity that St Helier and other places appear to be gaining. We have to act now.

The fact that we may have too complicated a planning system to make decisions easily, the fact that we do not have a waterfront enterprise board structure, the very fact this Requête is before us reflects the frustration of Deputies on behalf of themselves and the community that our system is slow moving. It is like the Forth Bridge being painted – nothing much is happening.

The extraordinary other truth that has come out of this is that we have had, for a decade or more ideas on a senior level on all of these issues and yet it came as a complete shock to most politicians and most members of the public that the thinking was drifting towards taking away commercial activity from St Peter Port and moving it northwards. What a story. Where has the political involvement been with that?

Deputy Parkinson admitted that there is this Euro Port or whatever scheme. The thing is I do not know anything about this company. I found a company with a similar name based in a small town in Lincolnshire. I have no idea what their track record is. More to the point, although I read about it in *The Guernsey Press*, I think an article by Mr Richard Digard, I certainly did not know of any presentational work on it. That is another problem we are operating in smaller and smaller, ever-decreasing circles with perhaps a gap between the senior presidential figures and the men or women on the ground. So that is another problem that we are wrestling with.

Also the very nature of the Policy & Resource Plan and getting things going and motivated, and the budgetary framework for this. Because we actually, before this Requête –

**Deputy Parkinson:** Sir, I would just like to emphasise to Deputy Gollop that the Hydro Port proposals emanate from a private consortium which has nothing to do with the States of Guernsey. They were not commissioned by the States of Guernsey. Had this work been undertaken by or on behalf of the States of Guernsey, of course Members of the Assembly would

1590 have had full information and presentations, but we have no control on the Seafront Enhancement Working Group what Hydro Port do with their proposals.

**Deputy Gollop:** I accept that, but the system in this Assembly has not made it easy for Members to engage. As always with these things, there is an incredible split politically of responsibilities between STSB and –

1595 I will give way to –

**Deputy Inder:** Thank you for giving way, Deputy Gollop.

1600 I may have made some of the same mistakes as Deputy Gollop because this Hydro Port crew seem to be, I will use the word loosely, masquerading as though they have got some kind of official capacity. We are hearing that they have seen the States, the media have said that but maybe possibly after this we could seek some clarification from possibly Economic Development, possibly Deputy Ferbrache, to find what Hydro Port actually are in any official capacity if at all.

1605 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, again if Deputy Gollop would just give me an indulgence I would be grateful.

I know nothing about them other than what I read in the paper and neither does the STSB.

1610 **Deputy Gollop:** I think all of this illustrates perhaps some of the mysteries and the failure to really get the agenda of the future of the freight ports and everything for our Island at the top of the political debate. Deputy Ferbrache is probably right: this is one of the two or three most important issues of our time. Deputy Inder would agree with that.

1615 I am going to put another spanner in the works and talk here about our ferry links. I asked a few questions yesterday which included the current provider Condor. Now I think Deputy Roffey rightly said that St Peter Port Harbour is not just a jewel in the crown but it is one of the best places in the world really to come into.

But of course it is not just Mr Pye from Sark who comes in the boat or party revellers from Herm, it is also currently people are enjoying the Liberation – well maybe not – the Condor vessels and coming in on the clipper or whatever.

1620 Now it has to be implicit, if not explicit, in the amendment that it is possible, if not probable, that the freight-only Ro-Ro vessels and maybe the combined passenger Ro-Ro vessels will be relocated somewhere other than the current Cambridge Berth type area and they could go northwards somewhere round about the Bridge, St Sampson's, the Vale, Longue Hougue. That has to be a possibility. Now that of course will significantly change elements of our tourism, of our retail trade, of the day trip market; it would have all kinds of consequences, and we have to factor that in.

1625 Now the one bit of the amendment that appeals to me is it does go out for further significant consultation, but that is kicking the can down the road. But to be honest anything we decide today will not be a final answer because there will be lots and lots and lots of work to do on it.

1630 But I do not particularly relish spending another one a half million really on these reports. We just turned down a report on the runway last month and we are spending some on Condor anyway, on the strategic ferry link argument rather.

1635 So I have to say in order to create a galvanising force and guarantee the future of St Peter Port – although I will vote for the amendment if it is passed, as Propositions, except for Proposition 1, I think – because of its ambiguity – I would prefer at this stage to support the Inder/Paint Requête because I think that has been bold in saying St Peter Port does have a future and we need to prioritise St Peter Port and work forward to separate, yes, the freight and the passenger, but that can be done within the new aim.

1640 As Deputy Paint and Deputy Inder have said, St Peter Port has been a Harbour for 2,000 years since the Roman wreck found – a bit unlucky – back in the day of the Gallo Roman Empire whereas St Sampson's poses significant difficulties, as the boat owners have said, at night with the

rocks, with the lighting, with the tidal currents. We need to listen to our marine experts, our home-grown Guernseymen and women rather than just rely yet again on consultants to give us the answers.

So I say fair play to the Inder/Paint requérants and I feel I should back them at this stage.

1645

**The Bailiff:** Well, Members, I have been advised that there is another amendment that is to be laid. I have been asked if it can be distributed now.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Yes please, sir.

1650

**The Bailiff:** I think it would be helpful if it could be distributed now, but of course we cannot open debate on this amendment in the midst of the current debate.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** No, I appreciate that, sir.

1655

**The Bailiff:** So I think it will just have to be distributed –

**Deputy Ferbrache:** It would be at the leave of the States anyway to suspend the Rules. What it does do is delete Proposition 1 of the current amendment proposed by me and seconded by Deputy Parkinson and renumber them to 1 – in other words it just deletes 1 and renumbers the others. Nothing else, and it –

1660

**The Bailiff:** You cannot open on it now, no it might be –

**Deputy Ferbrache:** I appreciate that. If it is supported, it will be seconded by Deputy Prow.

1665

**The Bailiff:** Yes. So I do not know if anybody else wishes to speak on the current amendment now or whether people wish to sort of reflect on where we are over lunch. One option might be to take an early lunch break for people to consider where we are consider this and either come back at 2.15 p.m. or 2.30 p.m. or if anybody wishes to speak now on the current amendment, we can do so.

1670

I think Deputy Merrett, do you wish to speak now?

**Deputy Merrett:** Yes, sir.

1675

I would appreciate some clarity actually because I think one of the questions in debate so far is that if the amendment become the main Propositions or replaces the Requête we would be able to vote on separate Propositions. If that is the case, I do not understand why we have an amendment removing one Proposition.

**The Bailiff:** Because some Members have said that they would reject the current amendment because it contains Proposition 1, even though they might favour Propositions 2 to 6, so I think that is why Deputies Ferbrache and Prow are giving people who hold that view the option to vote for this amendment.

1680

**Deputy Merrett:** So, sir, for clarity what I am asking is that if the amendment is passed, amendment 2.1.c etc. –

1685

**The Bailiff:** You mean the current amendment?

**Deputy Merrett:** Yes. Will Members be able to vote separately on the Propositions?

1690

**The Bailiff:** Yes, because those (**Deputy Merrett:** Thank you, sir.) Propositions in the current amendment will replace the original Propositions and people will be able to vote separately on them and who knows, people could even amend the Propositions. Once they have been approved, it will be the normal business as usual.

Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, given that the only difference between this amendment that is being circulated now and the Ferbrache/Parkinson amendment is that Proposition 1 is removed from it, the existing Proposition 1, but to get into this amendment it is going to require opening a new debate which might take hours of debate, wouldn't the most simple thing just be to allow the States to vote separately on the Propositions in the Ferbrache/Parkinson amendment? (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Because I remember a recent States' meeting where you had ruled that that was now acceptable even though it had not been done in the past.

**The Bailiff:** What I said previously –

**Deputy Fallaize:** That would foreshorten debate, wouldn't it?

**The Bailiff:** I have permitted it previously where the proposer and seconder of the amendment and the President of the Committee concerned were all in agreement that they were happy for that to proceed. I have noticed that Deputy Parkinson is not the seconder of this current amendment so I do not know what his view on that is. But if Deputies Inder, Ferbrache and Parkinson were all to agree that, yes, we could take Proposition 1 on the amendment separately from the others then that would seem to be a sensible and practical way of proceeding.

**Deputy Parkinson:** That would certainly be my view, sir.

**The Bailiff:** That would be your view. In that case then we do not need to lay this, we will proceed then on the basis that – Deputy Inder has not acknowledged, but Deputy Inder has indicated that he agrees with that so that would be consistent with what we have done previously. So the proposer and seconder of the amendment and the lead requérant all agree that we can vote in that way and therefore we will do that, and when we get to the vote on the amendment we will take Proposition 1 of the amendment separately and then Propositions 2 to 6 in a second vote. Thank you very much.

In that case we can continue.

Anyone else wishes to speak? Deputy – oh, both of you are jumping up, but Deputy Tindall.

**Deputy Tindall:** Thank you, sir.

Sorry, I just wish to – I was looking at the other amendments so I just wish to align this.

I do start by thanking the requérants for laying this Requête and the hard work undertaken to do so, both by the Deputies and also subsequently in respect of both the Requête and the amendments to the staff of STSB and of course the planning service.

I do agree with Deputy Soulsby that this has provoked action. I think that has been sorely lacking so far as observed by Deputy Parkinson who is not a member of the Eastern Seaboard Working Group.

I start with my observation about Proposition 1. We have had the agreement that we can vote at the amendment stage in favour or not. I am not going to go into the reasons because I thank Deputy Ferbrache for giving a fair representation of my views regarding the use of St Peter Port as primarily a leisure port.

Whilst I do consider the idea has its merits I do not wish to make a decision without evidence. That leads me to the basis of why evidence is needed and why the planning process set out in Law is of such importance.

1745 Deputy Ferbrache summed up superbly, if I might say, the basis of the rule of law and the problem with taking a gung-ho approach. I hope he will not mind me using elements of his speech at a later date, as I have a feeling I might need to.

1750 On the point about the ease of changing Planning Law, I would like to read from the policy letter dated 26th November 2004, debated in January 2005 regarding the proposal for the introduction of the 'compact and integrated 2005 legislation' far more so than the UK legislation being a conscious decision to create a law which was tailor-made for Guernsey, and I quote:

An aspect of the legislation that has become increasingly important is to ensure that the planning system complies with human rights Legislation which is soon to be given effect. In order to achieve this, care has been taken to provide procedures in policy making, the control of development and the special protection of the environment that are clear and transparent and, crucially, provide for the proper involvement of the public. In addition, it will be possible for aggrieved applicants to challenge all decisions taken under the legislation in an appropriate manner.

The new legislation has been designed to be more flexible than the existing Law. The main enabling legislation sets out the basic powers and principles. Most of the procedural aspects of the Law will be implemented through Ordinances which can be amended quickly by the States.

This for me shows the intention of flexibility to adapt the process, but combined with necessary safeguards. We may be able to change the Law over time, but we are not above considering human rights of the people – *all* the people – of Guernsey, including evidence and consultation.

1755 Overcoming the evidential problem is complex and I do not think a sledgehammer to crack a nut is appropriate. However, this is not a problem because we are assured repeatedly by Deputy Inder there is the evidence of his preferred option, so there should be no fear of approving the amendment to the Requête. Deputy Kuttelwascher gave some excellent reasons to do so.

1760 I will go to Deputy Roffey's reference to the development of strategic importance and policy S5. I would like to reassure Members that the officers of the DPA actively promote the use of this policy and have done so where applicants were unaware of the policy. The policy says:

Proposals for development that is of Strategic Importance and which may conflict with the Spatial Policy or other specific policies of the Island Development Plan but which is clearly demonstrated to be in the interest of the health, or well-being, or safety, or security of the community, or otherwise in the public interest may, exceptionally, be allowed where: a. there is no alternative site available that, based on evidence available to the Authority, is more suitable for the proposed development; and ... the proposals accord with the Principal Aim and relevant Plan Objectives.

1765 Apologies, sir – another point raised by Deputy Ferbrache in his excellent speech is the movement of lorries. I was advised of the many years that it would take to fill this facility and the years of lorries going into and out of St Peter Port and, as I understand it, inert waste that was disposed of in 2017 was less than half that in 2008 – I am not giving way – this would mean many more decades added to the already long time to fill the reclamation site at St Peter Port before it can be used.

1770 I wish to see the enhancement of the Seafront not an eyesore and there for generations to come. I agree with Deputy Lester Queripel about Proposition 5 and to a certain extent I wanted to remind myself because we have had a few changes in the Propositions now, so Proposition 5 of the amendment is to direct the Policy & Resources Committee in respect of the management and delivery of the Seafront Enhancement Area project, but I am unsure if it is a fact. I would like reassurance because will this actual review delay matters because it says it is coming back at the end of 2020? I mean we are already delaying and I just really feel very strongly that we need to get on with it. I mean we have had some quick wins but actually to get on with it would be great.

1775 I also reiterate Deputy Parkinson's point, it was for the working group to have brought any recommendations to this Assembly having effectively ostracised the DPA at the outset by not inviting a Member on to the group, although obviously that was subsequently rectified.

1780 I agree that this Requête has urged action and the potential to vote in particular on Proposition 4 of the amendment. We need to get on with an EIA and I hope this Proposition at least will be supported.



I would also like to refer to Proposition 3 of the amendment which actually raises a new concept in planning terms, and that is of a local development strategy. This is a mechanism which, and I quote from an officer's email addressing this point which was sent to me:

... will allow significant economic social and environmental developments to come forward in the St Peter Port Harbour action area ahead of some of the bigger infrastructure decisions to allow some pieces of the jigsaw to progress ahead of completing the bigger picture.

1785 What is apparent is that there are multiple significant and overlapping programmes and  
potential workstreams at the moment focussed potentially on one area of the Island, the east  
coast. There are the infrastructure requirements for energy policy, hydrocarbons supply, inert  
waste, infrastructure to address climate change, potential new ports infrastructure, plus the  
1790 Harbour action areas at St Peter Port and St Sampson. These will all need to come through the  
same policy route so would result in at least six local planning briefs and separate inquiries in an  
unco-ordinated way which does not maximise potential or support investment choice and  
informed prioritisation. A holistic overarching plan to encompass all of these elements at a high  
level is a better option strategically.

1795 Having said that, we are conscious that different programmes are at different points of  
development and we will never be in a situation where all will be ready for delivery at the same  
time, hence the concept of allowing elements of the bigger picture, for example St Peter Port  
Harbour action area to come forward where appropriate and beneficial and where they would not  
prejudice the bigger picture. Therefore rather than adding a layer that is potentially the  
mechanism to ensure co-ordination under one high level plan whilst bringing forward  
1800 development more quickly in some areas without the need for the planning inquiry process.

For me, I think that is an excellent solution and would strongly recommend that Proposition  
being supported.

1805 With respect to what was discussed with regard to Proposition 1, I would just like to add that I  
am glad that we have got a resolution on that in particular, as I particularly noted what Deputy  
Paint said a while back, that we do not want to leave this Assembly without something. I really do  
feel very strongly about that. I think we need to – and obviously for me it is about supporting the  
amendment itself.

1810 So for me I look forward to working with other committees on this, but also seeing this major  
action towards improving our eastern seaboard by getting the analysis. The collation of all this  
evidence – there is loads of evidence around not necessarily making a decision of where we do it  
but that we need it and what we can do with it.

More importantly for me is the EIA and I therefore, sir, support this amendment.

Thank you.

1815 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you, sir.

Does Deputy Merrett want me to give way? *(Laughter)*

Thank you, sir.

1820 Obviously at this stage of the debate it is really a question of pulling together some of the sort  
of disparate strands because a lot has already been said.

1825 Just to take a sort of overarching view for a moment, there was a lot said I think in Deputy  
Inder's speech, he put a lot of emphasis on the need for a strategic vision and I have to say this  
has been my problem with the Requête – that I felt that that was what was lacking in it. I think just  
saying it is strategic does not make it strategic and actually in terms of what it is suggesting  
unamended it is no different to what is being proposed at Longue Hougue really.

You are saying, 'Well, I think we should create some land and we will figure out how to use it  
later,' kind of thing. So I am very sympathetic to the people who have already stood up and said

1830 we are arriving at the conclusion and retrofitting everything else behind it and that does make me uneasy.

So just on the Requête in particular, Deputy Prow helpfully pointed us to Proposition 3 in the Requête but actually that is one of the Propositions I am struggling to get my head around, in fact, because if we look at it closely it says:

To direct the States Trading Supervisory Board to develop detailed plans for a phased development of the St Peter Port Harbour using the Island's inert waste, as set out in Proposition 1, exploring in particular:

And then it lists a series of opportunities and then Proposition 4 is:

To direct STSB to consult widely on such plans ...

1835 So it is asking the STSB to develop plans; well is it asking the STSB to develop plans or to explore the opportunities. To me it is a very uncomfortable fit. I cannot really get my head around what it is actually asking us to do, and I think the problem is again that the conclusion has been arrived at first. This is the cart before the horse, we have done this in the wrong order if this Requête is to be successful unamended. So that is a problem I have with the Requête.

1840 The amendment there has obviously been a lot of conversation about Proposition 1 and I take Deputy Fallaize's point that actually that has the same weakness, Proposition 1, and of course that is what the latest amendment and the discussion about voting on that first Proposition separately seeks to redress, is that again that could be interpreted as arriving at a conclusion and then retrofitting everything before ... But actually I would like to ask the STSB that in the event that that  
1845 first Proposition in the amendment is not carried, so the amendment is carried but not Proposition 1, that they will actually interpret that not as meaning that the States is against that idea but merely that we are not constrained –

I give way to Deputy Ferbrache.

1850 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Exactly, exactly that, exactly as Deputy de Sausmarez said. It just does not put it in the focus, it would be something that could be considered but it would not be the focus, it would not – to use Deputy de Sausmarez' phrase, well I use my phrase – be sort of putting something first and then trying to fit everything else around it. So absolutely it would be considered.

1855 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** I thank Deputy Ferbrache for that clarification, I think that is really helpful and I welcome that.

Yes, I am very sympathetic to Deputy Green's description, which I think Deputy Graham also said. I too experienced exactly the same journey of this holistic vision Utopia and then increasing  
1860 frustration building up behind that, but I do think that the Requête, certainly unamended, goes too far the other way. I think that does not legitimise just jumping straight to a conclusion. I think that would be unwise. I think someone used the word 'reckless' and actually I am inclined to agree with that interpretation.

Deputy Yerby's analysis was, as ever, insightful and interesting and my view on it, I completely  
1865 take her point that actually what the Requête seeks to do is not to find the perfect solution for both challenges but to find a compromise, I accept that but my interpretation of the problem is actually slightly different. The way I see it is the inert waste solution, if you like, and the port infrastructure challenge are actually mutually incompatible at a fairly fundamental level in one sense, in that at its most basic you want an inert waste site to last as long as possible and you  
1870 want your port infrastructure to be developed as quickly as possible. I mean I think you can actually put it that simplistically.

I think Deputy Yerby was also right to say, well of course it has come out of a policy vacuum, that is what requêtes are for, but what has really surprised me in this debate is that we have heard from a couple of Members of P&R standing up and talking about the urgent need for this kind of

1875 infrastructure development at our Harbour where I am pretty sure P&R have just commissioned, well yes, received a report that they commissioned into our sea connectivity and I am just very surprised that if this was such a pressing need that P&R did not take the opportunity to add in some Propositions in the debate that we had maybe a month or so ago. So I do find that a little surprising.

1880 Yes, I think that will do thanks.

**The Bailiff:** Is this a very short speech, Deputy Merrett, to finish by 12.30 p.m.?

**Deputy Merrett:** Yes, sir, I will try my best.

1885 One minute 20 seconds – I will go for it!

Okay, so first of all because I concur with what Deputy de Sausmarez says, most has already been spoken about so my concern, sir, in the amendment, the Proposition says we are looking near St Sampson's Harbour or nearer St Sampson's Harbour; is that code for filling in Spur Bay, Longue Hougue South? Because if it is can we just use the terminology so our community actually knows what we are talking about. Because our community at this juncture have not even been engaged with this, there has not been enough time for our community to understand what is before us today in line with the amendments and that is of great concern, sir.

1890 Further, Deputy Dorey mentioned asbestos. I was quite concerned when he mentioned that, sir. We cannot throw inert waste containing asbestos in the sea. We have Laws, we have a Population (Guernsey) Law 2004. I am very concerned if the public believe that is a possibility, if people listen to the debate – apparently they do – and think that is appropriate. It is not appropriate. We cannot be dumping asbestos in the sea, and if there is some at Longue Hougue South I hope that we know exactly where it is and we are dealing with it appropriately as we need to under the Law.

1900 If Deputy Tindall, sir – oh five seconds over – had given way to me I would have asked her to comment on Policy S6 which is strategic opportunity sites, if indeed, we could use that policy to bring this forward and I will quote it and I will be incredibly quick.

Proposals for development that is clearly demonstrated to be capable of delivering strategic objectives of the States of Guernsey may, exceptionally, be allowed on specific sites identified by the Authority as Strategic Opportunity Sites that are, or are becoming, obsolete ...

Arguably our crumbling infrastructure does cause us some concern:

... for their intended purpose or are underused in their current form provided that:  
it can be demonstrated that the proposals would meet a specific social, economic or environmental objective ... it can be demonstrated that the proposals otherwise meet the Principal Aim and ... relevant Plan Objectives and relevant General Policies ... c. proposals for development are in accordance with an approved Local Planning Brief etc.

So I wanted to ask Deputy Tindall or –

1905 Deputy Oliver, you would like me to give way? I certainly will.

**Deputy Oliver:** Thank you, sir.

1910 You still, even with that policy, have to demonstrate that that is the best location for that, so you would have to go and see that that is the best location, you cannot just say it is strategic so therefore you have got to do it. You are not above the Law.

**Deputy Merrett:** I really thank Deputy Oliver for that interjection, because that is under S5 actually which is (a) which says:

There is no alternative site available ...

1915 That is not under S6. So I would have liked that clarity but we may not get that, but over the lunch recess potentially we may. It would be appreciated.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** We will rise and resume at 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.32 p.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

**Requête –  
St Peter Port Harbour Development –  
Debate continued –  
Propositions carried as amended**

1920 **The Greffier:** Article VI – continuation of debate on the Requête and amendment on St Peter  
Port Harbour Development.

**The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak? No.  
Deputy Trott.

1925

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, I have not a great deal to say on this (*Interjections*) but I did, in typically  
joined up fashion, ask my good friend before lunch, Deputy Ferbrache, if there was anything he  
would like me to say. He did have something he would like me to say. He would like me to advise  
the States that I have not quite attained his level of wealth yet. I am happy to go along with that  
because it is true, sir, but give me time, Deputy Ferbrache, and who knows.

1930

Now there were some questions about why three Members of the Policy & Resources  
Committee signed this Requête. Particularly bearing in mind that the three Members have a  
combined States' experience a year short of half a century. The answer to that question is simple.  
It is because we have been here long enough to know that a Requête is a perfect organ to have  
this sort of essential debate.

1935

There is no doubt that our community out there – Deputy Gollop covered this admirably this  
morning – believes that we have not spent enough on our infrastructure in some areas in recent  
years. But there is also no doubt in my mind that the majority in our community consider that  
dearth of investment to have been focussed around St Peter Port Harbour in particular rather than  
let's say St Sampson's or the Airport for that matter.

1940

So if the intention was, and it certainly was from my perspective, to stimulate debate and to  
ensure that this matter was thrust to the forefront, it has been successful.

One of the interesting comments – and it may have been from Deputy Soulsby, Deputy de  
Sausmarez in fact who reminded us, as many others had, as to the value of inert waste and the  
fact that it should not be squandered. But I remember Deputy Berry standing in this very seat  
about 15 years ago, and I think Deputies Lowe and Gollop may remember, saying that he had  
another solution to help our friends in Jersey and at the same time assist ourselves, because he  
said a lot of the problems that we have with our sea links whether that is a delivery of freight at  
three o'clock in the morning into St Peter Port Harbour, a matter touched on by Deputy  
Kuttelwascher, or changes in schedules for Guernsey passengers, is around the inappropriate  
nature of some of the sea infrastructure in Jersey, and he said why don't we accelerate our land  
reclamation by offering to take their dredged material from the approaches to St Helier which  
would enable them to have a deeper facility and at the same time enable us to accelerate our land  
reclamation. It was a typically sensible and generous offer from Deputy Berry and it might be one  
that as part of this process can be revisited.

1945

1950

1955

The debate has been a good one. It has stimulated lots of public interest and as others have said, I think many in our community are going to be surprised by some of the views expressed – some of the thoughts, some of the possibilities that exist.

1960 But the debate has also enabled me to conclude that on balance the amendment brought by Deputies Ferbrache and Parkinson is absent of Proposition 1 – the better way forward, all things taken into account, and it is with that in mind that I shall vote against Proposition 1 but in favour, along with the President of the STSB, to the other Propositions contained in the amendment should the amendment be successful.

Thank you, sir.

1965

**The Bailiff:** Anyone else? No.

Deputy Inder next and then Deputy Ferbrache, because you have not yet spoken on the amendment.

1970 **Deputy Inder:** That's right. I have interjected enough to make a speech, but anyway.

So, I am just going to go through some points, most of them have been wrapped up by Deputy Soulsby and Deputy Trott who are far better orators than I am, but I am just going to pick up a few points and try not to be too controversial.

1975 Deputy Ferbrache does say that this is supposed to be the most important debate that we have had in the last three years. A bit of me ... I am still back to where I was ... I do have some confidence in Deputy Kuttelwascher, Deputy Smithies and Deputy Ferbrache. I come from a world basically where you kind of eat what you kill, we have never had any resources around us, you work hard, you work fast and you do things by the end of the month at a client speed.

1980 Now I understand picking up some of the points from things like Law, that it does not always work like that, so I do not like having a gun to my head and it feels like it sometimes, when you work in organisations like this where we put our process before, I do not know, progress sometimes, it just it kills me personally, but I have to accept that that is a fact of the system that we work in.

1985 Now Deputy Ferbrache confirmed that. I think what he said is if ... I just find it incredible that we could potentially make a decision now to put a harbour where our Harbour is and a Planning Inspector might say that is not where your harbour should be. It makes no sense to me at all. I understand concepts of governments should not put tower blocks in the wrong places, dig up fields, I understand that, but there is nothing I can ... it just does not compute that a Planning Inspector with no maritime knowledge at all could say, 'Sorry guys, you did not think about Fouquet Valley, Talbot Valley, Albecq and because you have not done that St Peter Port could not be developed.' It makes no sense to me as a Guernseyman and it will not make any sense to anyone out there in our community. It may make sense in 'Planet Government' but it makes no sense to anyone out there. But that is where we are and that is what I have to accept.

1995 The risk of course by not looking at this amendment seriously is that ultimately all the work conducted by Deputy Paint and myself – and I must commend Deputy Yerby and Deputy Merrett – that we have done over the last year or so could be lost, and I think wasn't it Deputy Prow who said we could be snatching defeat from the jaws of victory. Potentially the amendment could get voted against, that leaves the Requête in play, the Requête could get voted against and we end up where we started here. Is not wanting Longue Hougue South and Longue Hougue South still being in play. The pragmatist in me says unfortunately that I think in this instance ex of Proposition 1 the only solution seems to be to vote for the amendment.

2000 What else is there? I must pick up – I am not going to go through absolutely everything, but I just want to pick up a couple of things that Deputy Parkinson said, and this is his vision. I knew this was rattling around in his head because I think he said it in a couple of presentations I seem to remember a media conversation about Longue Hougue South and where it could be something else. I knew this existed and I think in a conversation, Deputy Parkinson touched on it in a meeting that we had, there seemed to be a little bit of a, what I see as, a fixation for Longue

2005

2010 Hougue South, if nothing else spending hopefully a small amount of money will either prove Deputy Parkinson absolutely correct and Longue Hougue South is the place to put effectively our third port, or – and there will be no *schadenfreude* from me – that hopefully very quickly we will establish that Longue House South is not the place to put the port.

2015 Deputy Parkinson mentioned tidal ranges and depth, and I think what he said, I think he mentioned he saw somewhere effectively in the channel between Guernsey and where Herm effectively starts rocks, he saw a depth of 10 m. But just think about that for a moment in engineering terms. So that is 10 m at your lowest section astronomical tide which is your chart datum, so that is 10 m to the bottom of Guernsey, that is 10 m until you hit the seabed; on top of that you have got to consider your tidal range which is another 10. Now that is when you get to the highest spring tide. Of course on top of that you have probably got about another 10 m for effectively the deck of the pier for boats to go along side. That is 30 m now, to put that into perspective, without any of the foundations at all. Stand underneath Victoria Tower as you go home tonight, that is what effectively a 10 m chart datum tide means. If you want to put piles into the ground or whatever structure it is, your 10 m at sea level go another 10 m to take in tidal range and add five or seven on top. You are looking at a pier's depth of effectively Victoria Tower plus – and that is just depth.

2025 Now if it is where I think he means, we are looking at about half a mile of that. If you have got Bahrainian oil money and you want to build something like Dubai next to you it is possible, but we do not have that kind of cash and to me if it is where I understand it to be where I saw the 10 m on the 807 maritime chart it is going to cost us millions and million and millions and millions and I genuinely do not think it is going to happen and I hope this will be disproved through this process. I just cannot see that happening.

2030 So Deputy Parkinson said which I found interesting was actually I believe what he said – I am happy for him to correct me – is I think thankfully it appeared not to happen that he was putting pressure on the original inert waste strategy to use it more strategically. I believe that is what the initial inert waste strategy policy letter, if I understood him correctly, he wanted that to be used in a more strategic way and I did not get the impression he was initially for Longue Hougue South. Is that correct or have I completely misquoted him?

**Deputy Parkinson:** Yes, I am afraid you have slightly misquoted me, Deputy Inder.

2040 **Deputy Inder:** Sorry, I will give way.

**Deputy Parkinson:** What I said was it is a shame that the original inert waste strategy did not specify a use for Longue Hougue South and by implication, yes, I agree that the inert waste should be used strategically.

2045 **Deputy Inder:** Okay, well that is –

So the debate has brought us somewhere by accident or by design, but I will take no criticism from anyone whatsoever for us starting where we started. We did not like what we saw, the price was going through the roof and we thought let's use it somewhere else.

2050 No, I do not know what kind of evidence people want packaged up. I know the evidence from people like me is not the evidence that people want to see and they like it in pretty PwC wrapped up packages and it has to be detailed, but the evidence or at least the basis of your evidence is here, your pilots are telling you something, your masters are telling you something, your ex-harbour masters are telling you something, your logistics firms are telling you something. So the basis of your evidence that St Peter Port is currently taking up the concept and they may be thinking only in the world where they live that we have problems down at St Peter Port and I will just read something from a previous Harbour Master that we got overnight. I will not carry on talking about St Peter Port, it is fairly clear where I think it should be but this is from one of our professionals, these are people with master tickets and we got this overnight:

Regardless of any future Harbour requirements review anyone with any maritime knowledge will know that moving some operations to HSS/Longue Hougue ...

2060 Which I think he meant SSH, St Sampson's Harbour,

Longue Hougue, will not only be hugely expensive as there is zero infrastructure, it is navigational suicide.

And if you were going to listen to no one else today – Deputy Dorey you are sitting there shaking your head please tell me everything you know about that, through you, sir, if you want to pitch against masters, pilots, stand up and tell us everything you know about running ships into harbours. Not up beaches, into harbours.

2065

**Deputy Dorey:** I do not know anything about it but what I did was I read from the Halcrow Report which I explained in my speech which is from a meeting that was held with the then harbour master, the master pilot and the deputy master pilot and they looked at all the different locations: there were six different locations ranging from the north of St Sampson's Harbour down to the QEII Marina and they said the preferred location was between Vivian and Flieroque. So that is what they said and that is a minuted meeting that they obviously saw the minutes of.

2070

**Deputy Inder:** Okay, all right, okay well that is a couple of people that – oh sorry.

2075

**Deputy Oliver:** I think what the previous Harbour Master is actually talking about is going into St Sampson's Harbour because that would be much more difficult and that does require a special pilot's licence to do that.

2080

**Deputy Inder:** Yes, you are absolutely right that you need a special pilot's licence. What he has actually said, I will read it again:

St Sampson's Harbour/Longue Hougue will ... be hugely expensive as there is zero infrastructure, it is navigational suicide.

2085

That is just the one overnight. In the opening speech I read to you information shared from other harbour masters, you have had pilots, the evidence is effectively there. It is there if you want to see it or the base of the terms of whatever report happens over the next few weeks or so. It is there if you want to see it. It may not be delivered by the person you want it to be, but it is written large and if anyone wants to get out an 807 and walk it through with me, I will go through it line by line.

2090

So we are where we are at the moment. From my point of view I cannot risk losing what I believe to be true. I am hoping that the money spent by STSB, if it is then granted and this is then successful, will be spent wisely. I am confident that Deputy Jan Kuttelwascher said to me he thinks we could either quickly prove or disprove our assertion that St Peter Port is – I wonder if possibly when Deputy Ferbrache tidies up, we are talking about coming back in 2020, I wonder if he might be able to help this Assembly with some interim reports on the way to that pass so we see where we are actually going.

2095

So in the round, sir, I would ask certainly the signatories to the Requête to approve the amendment minus Proposition 1.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

2100

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, let me say again, as I think I said at the beginning of my initial remarks and let me also say this, that because of the way that the debate has developed my closing remarks are going to be much briefer than I anticipated initially that they would be.

But the passion put in by Deputy Inder and the knowledge of Deputy Paint has made a considerable contribution to where we are now (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) because we would not be where we are now.

2105 We have had many good speeches, I thought, and I mean no disrespect to anybody else the most impressive was Deputy Paint's speech yesterday (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) because he has so much knowledge and that would be factored into any decision the States makes.

Now let me say this because I do not like jargon and people tend to use it. I mean I always used to say harass, now it is harassed, I do not know why we have to do that but we do. But I have  
2110 come on a journey with Proposition 1 of the amendment. I originally was in favour of it then I said I was agnostic in relation to it and I was going to abstain now. I am actually going to vote against it, because ... and I invite others to vote against Proposition 1 of the amendment but obviously to vote for the rest of the Propositions of the amendment because Deputy de Sausmarez said, 'Well look, does it mean it is gone?' and the answer I gave to her is, no, it does not it means it is  
2115 included but it does not mean you start with a predisposition of a preconception, it just means that you are able to factor that into the equation without starting with a conclusion.

What I would say in relation to this is we have got challenges, boats are getting bigger, the cost of purpose building boats for our main Harbour is prodigious and will become more difficult, because when I was President of Economic Development there was a discussion about if we  
2120 purpose built some boats to replace the Condor boats, if there was that kind of emergency, even if you could get them, to get the shipyards to order them and for them to be able to start building these boats would take years and years and years. So If you cannot get the boats you have got to perhaps alter the Harbour.

We are not saying through this analysis that we are not going to come – well not me, whoever comes to these conclusions – to the conclusion that Deputies Paint and Inder said. I think it is unlikely but that is for others to test.

Deputy Roffey asked a question and said well where do STSB and/or Economic Development think that there would be another harbour. The truthful answer is we do not know. I can only express my own view – and it is my own view, it is not the view of the STSB, it is not the view of  
2130 Economic Development – that because we are looking at something that we should be doing that is so iconic and that is going to provide for the next two hundred years, we should actually be building a third commercial harbour or a third harbour which is a commercial harbour somewhere. I do not have the knowledge. I am not suggesting it is Longue Hougue because Deputy Paint has highlighted problems about rocks and tides and drafts and all the other things  
2135 that he ably said and I think he referred to, was it, Socrates in his speech – was it Socrates? (*Interjection*) I thought he played for Brazil in the 1970 World Cup (*Laughter*) but I have now got –

**Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, point of correction. It was 1982 and 1986. (*Laughter*)

2140 **Deputy Ferbrache:** I take that because of course that is from an Arsenal supporter and it is a distant memory of when they last played in the Champions League. (*Laughter*)

In connection with all of that, the point is that I do not know, is the answer, because I looked at the statement that I gave to the States by way of an uplift and by way of an outline back in October of last year and it is the one I think that Deputy Inder referred to, and it referred back to  
2145 the December of the previous year when the STSB – and I was not a Member of it then – and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure brought a joint policy letter to the States setting out proposals for the future management of inert waste. And it went round and they looked, the policy letter outlined proposals for – and I am quoting now:

the policy outlined proposals for future inert waste disposal once the current Longue Hougue site is full. The proposals that were set out followed a review of options carried out by a working party involving various States' committees with a role or interest in this area. They began with a list of around 50 potential solutions and possible sites ...

– and it described what those were, listed them saying what the criteria were, and it went on:



That process is important as the Waste Disposal Authority is required by Law to demonstrate that any site it recommends for the recovery or disposal represents the best practical environmental options.

2150 Now bearing in mind there the passion of Deputy Inder, when he was opening his closing  
remarks just before, was saying, 'Well, a planning inspector – how is he going to know? What is he  
going to say – it should be so and so?' Well, that is not the way the planning inspectors' system  
works. The planning inspectors are always people of ability who deal with planning inquiries  
2155 everywhere, they do not have to come from Poole to deal with a planning inquiry in Poole, they  
do not have to come from Guernsey to deal with a planning inquiry in Guernsey. They have all the  
information before them, and they have it before them, they would have to have regard to the  
Law because we all have to have regard to the Law and they would have to have regard, before  
they could decide that a particular site was the chosen site for inert waste disposal, that it met all  
these criteria otherwise they simply could not approve that site as being the inert waste disposal  
2160 site.

It went on and looked at various options and it also looked at the particular location that  
Deputy Inder has referred to, it had regard to that and decided that was not appropriate after due  
consideration. What it did say because we have been saying, 'Why don't we get on with it?' but  
2165 bear in mind the STSB is not a policy making body. What I said yesterday it helps shape policy, it  
does not make policy.

We have been brought into this. I am grateful we have been brought into it by Deputy Inder  
and Deputy Paint because of their Requête. It said get the STSB to do it rather than the Seafront  
Enhancement Area Group because they were not doing anything.

I think it is a little unfair to say they do nothing because they have done little things, as Deputy  
2170 Brehaut I think said, and they have done other things and I think Deputy Brouard also made the  
same point. They are under resourced, they cannot do these major tasks because they do not  
have the body of people to be able to do it.

If the States had passed the Requête I was going to say we simply could not do it. I would not  
be saying to our officers at STSB, 'Drop everything else – all the other valuable work you are  
2175 doing.' Even if the States had made the decision or makes the decision to pass the Requête I  
would be saying to those officers do not do it. I know Proposition 7 of the Requête says go off to  
P&R and get resources, so we go to P&R and say tomorrow morning please produce, because we  
would need, four experienced officers with the relevant knowledge and ability to hit the ground  
running immediately to ... and they still would not be able to do it by December 2019. But that is  
2180 what we would need. Now where are you going to get them?

I often look out this window when I make some of my speeches and say I cannot see any  
money trees. I also cannot see any trees that grow people with that degree of experience and  
ability. Every department, Health department, has got a shortage of qualified people, and we are  
very fortunate, I have got to say, because I knew nothing about STSB until I became its President.  
2185 We are fortunate in having top quality people doing top quality jobs but there are not enough of  
them. They work very hard. I regularly get emails or documents from them over the weekend I  
regularly get material from them at eight o'clock, nine o'clock at night so they are not there from  
9 a.m.-5 p.m. as is the traditional impression about civil servants. They are thinking about things  
and sending me information which I have then got to understand and that takes me a long time!  
2190 So the point of all of that is that this has got to be a considered process.

Deputy Graham said there is a difference between seize the day and the holistic approach.  
Well you can see there are occasions when you seize the day and seize the day and there are  
occasions when you have to have a holistic approach. This is not a seize the day in the sense that  
some might mean, approach – I do not like – how many times have I stood here and said I do not  
2195 like rules and regulations particularly because when I am in my last moments I am not going to be  
thinking of Section 210 of the Companies Act 1948. Part of the Companies Act 1948 does not exist  
anymore now but I am not going to be thinking of that, I am not going to be thinking of the Rule  
against Perpetuity, I am not going to be thinking of anything like that. Laws have to have a

2200 function but here when you have got a system and what was being proposed in the Requête set the thing in motion but it did not have the structure that is necessary.

2205 Deputy Inder asked, just before I think he sat down, would I give an update and I think that is absolutely right. I think if the amendment less No. 1 is successful then I should be, in December, giving an update saying this is where we are. I should in April, because I think that is the last States' meeting before we go off to Election, be saying that is where we are. After that of course it is not my responsibility because the States dissolves in June of 2020. I do not think I am going to say any more in relation to that.

2210 Deputy Lester Queripel sent me an excellent note about traffic movements and that we could free the Town from all that. Of course he is right because if we keep any vehicles out of Town that has got to be a good thing because it has not only got however many thousand traffic movements in the day, people going on bicycles, cars and lorries just normally going through Town, it has also got lots of pedestrians going through Town, it is the busiest area during the day in the Island where people are around. If you can keep traffic away from that as best you can, whether it is a big lorry or a trailer or anything else, that has got to be a good thing, hasn't it? I am not talking about people coming in to shop and all that kind of stuff, albeit hopefully they can come in on the excellent bus service that we have got.

2215 But in relation to all of that, we must come to a decision. I would commend to the States the Parkinson/Ferbrache or Ferbrache/Parkinson, does not matter which, amendment less No. 1 which I will not be supporting.

2220 **The Bailiff:** We will vote then on the amendment and we take first Proposition 1, which for the benefit of anyone listening is:

To agree that the distinct character, history and setting of St Peter Port Harbour and the surrounding area affords it a special and unique status, and its attraction and value as a primary centre for commercial, cultural and recreational activity would be enhanced if maritime activities were focussed primarily on provision of leisure port facilities.

**Deputy Meerveld:** I would like to request a recorded vote.

**The Bailiff:** We vote first on that Proposition with a recorded vote.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Not carried – Pour 3, Contre 33, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 4*

2225

<b>POUR</b>	<b>CONTRE</b>	<b>NE VOTE PAS</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Deputy Brehaut	Deputy Ferbrache	None	Deputy Mooney
Deputy Parkinson	Deputy Kuttelwascher		Deputy St Pier
Deputy Smithies	Deputy Tindall		Deputy Le Tocq
	Deputy Tooley		Deputy Dudley-Owen
	Deputy Gollop		
	Deputy Lester Queripel		
	Deputy Le Clerc		
	Deputy Leadbeater		
	Deputy Trott		
	Deputy Le Pelley		
	Deputy Merrett		
	Deputy Stephens		
	Deputy Meerveld		
	Deputy Fallaize		
	Deputy Inder		
	Deputy Lowe		
	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
	Deputy Hansmann Rouxel		
	Deputy Graham		
	Deputy Green		

Deputy Paint  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Yerby  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Oliver  
Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

**The Bailiff:** Well the voting on Proposition 1 of the amendment was 3 in favour, with 33 against. I declare it lost.

We vote now on Propositions 2-5 of the amendment. Sorry 2-6, I cannot count.

2230

**Deputy Fallaize:** Can we vote on 6 separately please?

**Deputy Ferbrache:** ... [*Inaudible*]

2235

**The Bailiff:** Is there any objection to that from the proposer and seconder, Deputy Inder? No. So we will vote then on Propositions 2-5 inclusive. Can we go *aux voix*? Sorry?

2240

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, we have not – the actually amendment talks about, ‘To delete all the Propositions,’ which is not a Proposition in itself, so are we going through all this now and then voting whether we support all this –?

2245

**The Bailiff:** Well this is the discussion that we had this morning – that was the original intention. We are now being asked to take these separately so, if any of these Propositions carry they will delete all the original Propositions and replace them with whatever Propositions carry with this amendment, is my understanding. I see Deputy Ferbrache nodding.

Sorry, Propositions 2-5. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** I declare those carried.

Proposition 6, which is to deal with the management of inert waste. Proposition 6 of the amendment: Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

2250

**The Bailiff:** I declare that carried.

So now the original Propositions have been replaced with Propositions 2-6 inclusive of the amendment.

Deputy Inder, you have replied on the amendment. Is there anything further you wish to say before we go to the vote?

2255

**Deputy Fallaize:** We have not had any general debate, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Well we have had general debate and debate on the amendment both together. That is what we agreed at the beginning of the –

2260

**Deputy Fallaize:** I thought we agreed that we were debating the amendment.

**The Bailiff:** And general debate together.

2265 **Deputy Fallaize:** Oh. But the Propositions have now been amended.

**The Bailiff:** That is what we said at the beginning.

If it is the wish of the Assembly that we now have – is it your wish that we now have further general debate? Those in favour: those against.

*Members voted Contre.*

2270 **The Bailiff:** Right. Apart from Deputy Inder then, who will reply to the debate if he wishes to.

**Deputy Inder:** It is only briefly, sir.

We are effectively ... Oh gosh, I am about to say, we are where we are! I am in danger of repeating effectively my summation for the amendment. So I am just going to stop there.

2275 But I am going to make special thanks to those of us who actually helped me and Deputy Paint to get to our point, and they are many and numerous. Actually Deputy St Pier is not here, Deputy Ferbrache was in the original emails, Deputies Le Clerc and Soulsby and I think I mentioned Merrett and Yerby.

2280 We do come round in strange ways to get to places that we need to be. I hope this has been an interesting debate. I hope it will get us to a place where I believe that we need to be, and if it has actually sort of pulled out from under the carpet the intentions of what we actually want to do with our Harbour, possibly our east coast and actually put it where it probably should be sitting in the STSB rather than the SEA then so be it.

So, sir, I would like to move to the vote and thank everybody, Members.

2285 Actually, no, one more. I think I would like to thank the public who have supported us through this quite hugely. All those people, all of the mariners, the pilots, and the people who have actually felt freer now we have opened up the conversation, who seemed to not be able to say anything before the conversation opened up. It is only by accident that we were looking at one place and we moved to another that we had the pilots start talking to us, we had Harbour staff, for want of a better word; and as I mentioned in my opening speech, I am grateful to the officers of STSB who have been absolutely open with us, and the main office in the Planning Department.

2290 So, sir, I would just like to – (*Interjections*) No I am not giving way – that is it, I am just going to move to the vote please.

Thank you.

2295

**The Bailiff:** We vote then on the Propositions

**Deputy Fallaize:** Sorry, sir, but I have a question which relates to what we are about to vote on.

2300

**The Bailiff:** Right, Deputy Fallaize.

2305 **Deputy Fallaize:** Can somebody please advise me that in the event that Proposition 6 is carried or not carried what is the status of Longue Hougue South as the preferred site for the disposal of inert waste with or without this Proposition being turned into a Resolution? Because that has not been addressed directly in this debate. My assumption is that it would continue to be the preferred site, but is that your understanding of it, sir?

2310 **The Bailiff:** I do not have the original Propositions in front of me. Deputy Ferbrache, are you able to –?

**Deputy Ferbrache:** Yes, sir, it would, in my opinion, clearly be that Longue Hougue South would continue as the preferred option.

2315 **The Bailiff:** There is nothing here to revoke that Proposition.

**Deputy Ferbrache:** No, not at all.

2320 **The Bailiff:** So although I have not got it in front of me I would have thought it still remains an extant Proposition. I see others nodding in agreement.

We vote then on the Propositions as amended, which allow Propositions 2-6 of the amendment –

Deputy Lester Queripel?

2325 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Could I have a recorded vote on all the Propositions please, sir? We could take 3 and 4 together, I presume, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Is anybody wanting a separate vote on the Propositions? Or can we take 2-6 *en-bloc*?

2330

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** I would like a separate vote and a recorded vote please, sir, on all the Propositions.

**The Bailiff:** You want a separate vote on what?

2335

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** All the Propositions, sir. (*Interjections*)

**The Bailiff:** So take each one individually?

2340

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Well you could take 3 and 4 together, sir, I presume.

**The Bailiff:** Okay. So you would like a vote on 2, then on 3 and 4, and then 5, and then 6. Four votes. Can we go *aux voix* with some of them?

2345

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** No, sir, recorded please.

**The Bailiff:** Right. We now have a recorded vote on Proposition 2.  
Deputy Yerby?

2350

**Deputy Yerby:** Sir, you have previously invited Members who wish to be counted as *Contre* or abstentions to stand in their place. Would that work?

2355 **The Bailiff:** We have done that. I mean if people want to have on the record who it is voting against, the only way to get their name on the record is through a recorded vote. It is not as if we are short of time it is 10 past three in the afternoon. If it takes until five o'clock we can be here.

**Deputy Merrett:** In that case, sir, I would like a recorded vote on Proposition 2 and not 2 and 4 together. Thank you.

2360

**The Bailiff:** Well it was 3 and 4 together. (*Interjections*)

Well I said 2 of the amendment, 3 and 4 of the amendment, then 5 of the amendment and then 6 of the amendment. I hope that is clear.

Proposition 2 of the amendment.

2365 *There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 31, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 4*

**POUR**

Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Tooley  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Stephens  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Smithies  
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel  
Deputy Graham  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Oliver  
Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

**CONTRE**

Deputy Merrett  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Langlois

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Yerby

**ABSENT**

Deputy Mooney  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Dudley-Owen

**The Bailiff:** Well voting on Proposition 2 of the amendment is 31 in favour, with 4 against and 1 abstention. I declare it carried.

2370 We now vote on Propositions 3 and 4 as they were numbered in the amendment. Propositions 3 and 4.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 32, Contre 3, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 4*

**POUR**

Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Tindall  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Tooley  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Leadbeater

**CONTRE**

Deputy Paint  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Langlois

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Yerby

**ABSENT**

Deputy Mooney  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Dudley-Owen

Deputy Trott  
 Deputy Le Pelley  
 Deputy Merrett  
 Deputy Stephens  
 Deputy Meerveld  
 Deputy Fallaize  
 Deputy Inder  
 Deputy Lowe  
 Deputy Laurie Queripel  
 Deputy Smithies  
 Deputy Hansmann Rouxel  
 Deputy Graham  
 Deputy Green  
 Deputy Dorey  
 Deputy Brouard  
 Deputy Soulsby  
 Deputy de Sausmarez  
 Deputy Roffey  
 Deputy Prow  
 Deputy Oliver  
 Alderney Rep. Roberts  
 Alderney Rep. Snowdon

**The Bailiff:** Well the voting on Propositions 3 and 4 was 32 in favour with 3 against and 1 abstention. I declare those Propositions carried.

2375

Proposition 5 as numbered on the amendment, we will vote on next. Proposition 5.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 27, Contre 8, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 4*

**POUR**

Deputy Ferbrache  
 Deputy Kuttelwascher  
 Deputy Tindall  
 Deputy Brehaut  
 Deputy Tooley  
 Deputy Parkinson  
 Deputy Lester Queripel  
 Deputy Le Clerc  
 Deputy Leadbeater  
 Deputy Trott  
 Deputy Le Pelley  
 Deputy Merrett  
 Deputy Stephens  
 Deputy Meerveld  
 Deputy Fallaize  
 Deputy Lowe  
 Deputy Smithies  
 Deputy Graham  
 Deputy Green  
 Deputy Dorey  
 Deputy Brouard  
 Deputy Soulsby  
 Deputy de Sausmarez  
 Deputy Roffey  
 Deputy Oliver  
 Alderney Rep. Roberts  
 Alderney Rep. Snowdon

**CONTRE**

Deputy Gollop  
 Deputy Inder  
 Deputy Laurie Queripel  
 Deputy Hansmann Rouxel  
 Deputy Paint  
 Deputy de Lisle  
 Deputy Langlois  
 Deputy Prow

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Yerby

**ABSENT**

Deputy Mooney  
 Deputy St Pier  
 Deputy Le Tocq  
 Deputy Dudley-Owen

**The Bailiff:** Voting on Proposition 5 was 27 in favour, with 8 against and 1 abstention. I declare it carried.

Finally, Proposition 6 as numbered on the amendment.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 20, Contre 12, Ne vote pas 4, Absent 4*

2380

<b>POUR</b>	<b>CONTRE</b>	<b>NE VOTE PAS</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Deputy Ferbrache	Deputy Tindall	Deputy Yerby	Deputy Mooney
Deputy Kuttelwascher	Deputy Tooley	Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy St Pier
Deputy Brehaut	Deputy Leadbeater	Deputy Prow	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Stephens	Deputy Oliver	Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Parkinson	Deputy Fallaize		
Deputy Lester Queripel	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy Graham		
Deputy Trott	Deputy Green		
Deputy Le Pelley	Deputy Paint		
Deputy Merrett	Deputy de Lisle		
Deputy Meerveld	Deputy Langlois		
Deputy Inder	Deputy Roffey		
Deputy Lowe			
Deputy Smithies			
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel			
Deputy Dorey			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Soulsby			
Alderney Rep. Roberts			
Alderney Rep. Snowdon			

**The Bailiff:** Well the voting on Proposition 6 was 20 in favour, with 12 against and 4 abstentions. I declare it carried.

That concludes the voting.

## **POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

### **VII. Schedule for Future States' Business – Approved**

*Article VII.*

*The States are asked to decide:*

*Whether, after consideration of the attached Schedule for future States' business, which sets out items for consideration at the Meeting of the 12th June 2019 and subsequent States' Meetings, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.*

**The Greffier:** Article VII – Schedule for Future States' Business.

2385

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, I have nothing to add to the report other than to remind Members that there are two substantial items of business. It is likely to be a full agenda.

2390

**The Bailiff:** Can I just add for Members' information that I will be issuing a Billet for the election of two Members of the Development & Planning Authority. One to replace Deputy Tindall who has been elected as President and the other to replace Deputy Leadbeater who has handed me a letter of resignation this afternoon. So there will be an election for two Members of that Authority at the next meeting.

2395



Just for your information there will be a States of Election on Wednesday 17th July. The Billet for that will be issued on 7th June. Nominations will open on 7th June and close on 28th June. So that is just for information.

We vote on the Schedule for Future States' Business. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

2400

**The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.

That concludes the business for this meeting. Thank you everybody.

*The Assembly adjourned at 3.21 p.m.*