



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 1st April 2022

*All published Official Reports can be found on the
official States of Guernsey website www.gov.gg*

Volume 11, No. 6

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

Ms J. E. Roland, Deputy Bailiff and Deputy Presiding Officer

Law Officer

R. M. Titterington, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller)

People's Deputies

C. P. A Blin	D. J. Mahoney
A. H. Brouard	A. D. S. Matthews
T. L. Bury	L. J. McKenna
A. Cameron	C. P. Meerveld
D. de G. de Lisle	N. G. Moakes
H. L. de Sausmarez	R. C. Murray
J. F. Dyke	V. S. Oliver
S. P. Fairclough	C. N. K. Parkinson
S. J. Falla	R. G. Prow
P. T. R. Ferbrache	L. C. Queripel
A. Gabriel	P. J. Roffey
J. A. B. Gollop	H. J. R. Soulsby
S. P. Haskins	G. A. St Pier
M. A. J. Helyar	L. S. Trott
N. R. Inder	S. P. J. Vermeulen
J. P. Le Tocq	

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives S. Roberts and E. A. J. Snowdon

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

C. Foster (Deputy Greffier) (A.M.);
S. M. D. Ross, Esq. (States' Greffier) (P.M.)

Absent at the Evocation

Deputy A. W. Taylor (*relevé à 9h 41*); Deputy Y. Burford (*relevée à 9h 52*);
Deputy S. E. Aldwell (*relevée à 10h 13*); Deputy M. P. Leadbeater (*relevé à 10h 13*);
Deputy A. C. Dudley-Owen (*indisposée*); Deputy A. Kazantseva-Miller (*indisposée*)

Business transacted

Evocation	485
Billet d'État VI.....	485
6. Establishment of a Development Agency – Debate continued	485
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.39 p.m. and resumed at 2.30 p.m.</i>	<i>525</i>
Establishment of a Development Agency – Debate Continued – Propositions carried as amended	526
7. Schedule for Future States' Business – Proposition carried	570
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.57 p.m.</i>	<i>571</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.31 a.m.

[THE DEPUTY BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Deputy Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'État VI

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

6. Establishment of a Development Agency – Debate continued

The Deputy Greffier: Article 6, Policy & Resources Committee – Establishment of a Development Agency – continuation of debate, Amendment 9.

5 **Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Falla.

Deputy Falla: Thank you, Madam.

I, like others, enjoyed Deputy Parkinson's speech yesterday and I think this amendment seems very sensible. It seems a way of putting right the mess we have found ourselves in last year when we failed to accept any of the options expensively delivered by STSB as to the future of the harbours. So in a way, this is making the best of a chunky process that we have ended up with. It is back to the future time.

I regret that a lot of time has actually been wasted because really nothing has moved forward in the nine months that have passed since then. But I would like the DPA to have a get on with local planning briefs and to see some action this term on getting a spade in the ground, doing something with the east coast and regeneration and all those good things. So I am going to support this amendment.

Thank you.

20 **Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Well, unlike Deputy Falla, I will not be supporting this amendment and I will give a couple of reasons why.

Deputy Falla is right, we have had quite a seductive speech from Deputy Parkinson and some exuberance from Deputy Roffey on the same matter. Now I am not going to rehearse the harbour debate here today and I hope no one else does, but it is really about what we can and cannot do.

Now Deputy Parkinson's argument seemed to be wrapped around that you cannot do anything until you decide what you are going to do with the harbour. If we were designing a brand new Island, that would be absolutely correct. If Guernsey was uninhabited, we had not decided where the harbour was and we did not actually have any – we have got quite a few – that argument would be sound. But it is not sound. It is just not sound.

What it suggests is, until we decide what we are going to do with our commercial port and our leisure port, you cannot do anything. It is clearly not correct. If I think back over – and this is only from the top of my head – the argument that we have developed as part of the east coast, I think the previous Policy & Resources contributed £300,000 to the Vallette project. I heard no argument at the time by Policy & Resources that you cannot do that because we have not decided where the port facilities are.

If we look at Castle Emplacement itself – actually in the Future Harbour Development Plan there was an argument, and I think that is still sound because it is maintained today, there is no commercial activity will ever be required on the Castle Emplacement. So, as I have explained to Members, we will bring a policy letter if it is not ... yes, we will bring a policy letter on the matter which appears at the moment to have support from STSB.

That does not mean that we cannot get on with it, but the argument from Deputy Parkinson and Deputy Roffey is if you have decided where the ports are going to go, you cannot do anything. Now that is a 15-year burn. If I remember correctly – I am happy to be corrected – I think in the previous harbour debate there was a capital grant for about £4 million for hydrographical surveys. I think that was right, and I think that was going to take a couple of years, and I think that would then have to come back to the Assembly.

Then, of course, it would have to go through a planning process and, of course, you then go through the scoping process, you then go through securing a tender, and then you would start. We are talking 10 or 12 years. I mean that is the likelihood. If we had agreed it a year ago, we would still be having this debate today about the Development Agency, and the argument now would be we could not have a development agency because we have agreed it. And the other argument is, well, you cannot do anything until we have built the thing.

Now, Deputy Roffey made mention of, I think it was, the car park on North Beach. Well, that could happen now. If we really wanted a car park now, a multi-storey car park, that was not particularly predicated on how you manage the harbour. We did not stop, when the old S.E.A. was looking at the Round Top Pier, I do not remember the argument, 'Oh, you cannot do anything until we have decided where the harbours are.' I do not remember when we were looking at the old States' building, at what it may or may not have eventually been, it still has not been anything, that had nothing to do with whether we had a harbour or not.

So to lock ourselves into that, I can see what would happen. If this is improved, all of the effort in the next two years will be politically driven for us to concentrate on this one thing only. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)** This is exactly what will happen. So Deputy Falla does not actually believe anything will happen unless we adopt this. That is exactly what will happen: nothing.

If you adopt this now, all the focus, all the pressure, will be on development of the port. So to that end, I cannot agree with him because there is as seductive as Mr Parkinson – sorry, through you madam, Deputy Parkinson – was, it makes sense if you were delivering a new Island. Our infrastructure exists, we can develop the eastern seaboard without deciding what we need to do with the commercial or leisure ports.

More importantly, the fact that Deputy Roffey has kind of argued himself out of his own position because if it is true we can make no decisions. His committee is under direction to bring a pool marina back to the States of Guernsey and I have been involved in some of the conversations and I will compliment the Committee for moving it on. It looks like there is every chance it will be coming back to the States in December.

So based on that argument alone, I am expecting him because the argument you cannot do anything without deciding where your commercial ... I am assuming then he is going to pull it. And if he is not going to pull it, then his argument is unsound. It was not logical when it started and it is

not logical today. You can have a development agency that can deliver opportunities for the whole business and it is utter nonsense to say that you cannot do anything without understanding where your commercial and recreational and boating facilities are because it does not pass the test of what is actually happening, or more importantly, what has never happened.

So to that end, Deputy Bailiff and to the Members of the States, I will not be supporting this and I ask people to reject it because I can see exactly what is going to happen. This will be the primary focus of getting a Committee's policy through the States.

A Member: Hear, hear.

Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Taylor, do you wish to be relevéd?

Deputy Taylor: Yes, please madam.

Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, madam.

A little bit of history. I think we had a debate on the harbour development last year (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and we had many options running from a few millions up to nearly, it kept getting onto a billion, depending on how you configure new ports. All the options were thrown out. We did not progress any of them. And what we did is we grabbed the life raft from P&R, which was thrown to us at the time, which was to progress the idea of an agency, and that agency together with other works would come back to this Assembly with proposals as to how we develop the eastern seaboard.

This is not good governance. Deputy Roffey and – unfortunately, with the help of my colleagues in the States you have allowed this debate to continue; I would have curtailed it but that was not possible – you have now brought back onto the table in 1(A)(c) that we are giving directions now, we are going to flip-flop from where we were last year for a £300 million port at Longue Hougue on a beach with six knots tides. Well, you know, anyone would think it is April 1st! (*Laughter*)

So please, be very careful what you vote for here. This will put in stone the fact that we are going to have a new port at Longue Hougue. There has been no press, I have not even been able to get my papers out in time for this debate. This has come in at the last minute on the hoof. So please be very careful when you dictate to other people about good governance and how we should operate. This is not how you should be doing it.

So please, reject this amendment out of hand and lets go back and study. If you want to increase our port facilities for the future, let us look at St Peter Port Harbour, the White Rock and going east towards Herm. That is the most sensible place. If we have got millions of pounds to burn, well then great. Have a go at your fantasy land of a harbour at Longue Hougue. But please Members, my best advice is throw this amendment out.

Thank you very much.

Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, madam.

Deputy Brouard has reminded us of the debate that we had last summer, and I do not interpret the result of that debate in the same way as he does. I think the result was largely based on what I believed to be a bit of a misunderstanding about what a development agency could and should be doing.

Now, yesterday Deputy Ferbrache made a reference – or a criticism, in fact – about not going to talk to the private sector about the people who actually get on and do this kind of work, and that is indeed exactly what I have been doing with respect to a development agency. I have gone on and talked to a range of people, I have been to an ID presentation and outside of that I have had

conversations with people who have been involved with development agencies and with public-private partnerships in various capacities. That has certainly given me a much better understanding of how they work and how they work well and how they do not work well.

I would say that those conversations – I asked the same questions of all of them – one of the responses that came independently from each of the people that I spoke with was that a strategic decision from the Assembly on the future harbour requirements was the cornerstone decision that we need to make, without which the Development Agency cannot do very much at all.

In fact, one of them said to me, 'Well look, if I were involved, if I were on the board, the first thing I would do is return to the States and ask the Assembly to make that decision.' I asked the question whether the Development Agency would be able to bring anything else to that decision, and the answer was 'no'. Given the level of detail that we have already seen in the STSB Future Harbour Requirements policy letter, no further information really could be brought together without significant expense, and of course that expense is a huge risk if there is no direction from this Assembly at the in-principle level. So it is really important that this Assembly does make a decision.

Now, this is not like an amendment that is brought later and on the hoof because the reason people object to those amendments, and I am one of them, is because the States might not have the time or opportunity to make a properly informed decision with the benefit of all the information that goes into a policy letter.

Now, this amendment relates to a policy letter that we already have and that we have already debated in some detail. So it is not the same as bringing a spur of the moment, last-minute amendment from the floor of the Assembly. It is a mechanism through which we could make a decision as equally informed as we could have on the original policy letter.

Now I think also, Deputy Inder's logic – I am sure Deputy Roffey, when he replies to debate, will cover this much better than I can here – but I think, again, Deputy Inder's point is based on a misunderstanding. Deputy Inder seems to think that nothing can be done until the future harbour requirements are implemented but that is not the case and I am not giving way –

Deputy Inder: Point of correction.

Deputy de Sausmarez: It was my opinion, I do not think it can be corrected –

Deputy Bailiff: Sorry, Deputy de Sausmarez.
What is your point of correction?

Deputy Inder: That is not what I said.

It is not my opinion that nothing can happen in the future, it is actually Deputy Roffey's and Deputy Parkinson's opinion. I did not say that, Deputy Parkinson and Deputy Roffey said nothing can happen until the future harbour.

Thank you.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I think Deputy Inder has just proved that that was not a valid point of correction.

That is not what I am saying and I am pretty sure Deputies Roffey and Parkinson can speak for themselves that that is definitely not their opinion either and they are both nodding for the benefit of those that are not able to actually see them in the Chamber. It is all based on the decision because the reason that it has proved impossible to move things forward without that decision being made is because you cannot make, or we cannot make, or the DPA cannot make the decision if it prejudices the future port requirements, whatever they might be. So it is about the decision, not the implementation.

I fully agree with Deputy Inder that the full process will take some time, but it is about the decision-making process. That is why a decision on the future harbour requirements is such an

essential step. I believe this amendment gives us that opportunity and I am happy to support it and I hope the majority of the Assembly will.

185 **Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, madam.

I rise mainly to support the short, concise speeches of Deputy Inder and Deputy Brouard. I am getting confused now, particularly after the speech of Deputy de Sausmarez. You see, I sat through
190 the debate in July. In fact, with Deputy Brouard, we put an amendment to it. And this Assembly made no decision around the harbour. It does not have the endorsement of this Assembly. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

But what we did make a decision about, an emphatic decision about, was around the Development Agency. And to say, Deputy de Sausmarez suggesting and questioning what a
195 development agency is, we now know what a development agency is because we have read the policy letter and we are through a debate. We put some amendments to it around accountability. So we know what a development agency is. And then we all know, and the Deputy Bailiff has ruled, that this amendment goes beyond the Proposition. This is my worry and my objection to it, because in the first sentence of the amendment it says:

In relation of the Island's future harbour requirements, to agree the long-term development plan should include ...

200 So it has been entirely prescriptive. But doesn't this go against what the whole object of the Development Agency is? For the Development Agency to look at things in the round. Are we really suggesting – and Deputy Brouard mentioned the figures from £300 million to going up to £1 billion – are we really going to concentrate on that?

And I also detected in the opening speech from Deputy Roffey, a bit of a kind of holding a gun
205 to the Assembly's head, saying, 'Well, look, we have spent a lot of money and we researched, look, the only real answer is to go along with what is in (A) to (F) in his amendment. We are not going to change our minds and do you know what? Before we get on with anything else, we have really got to do this and I am doing you all a favour by putting in this amendment.'

I mean I *really* do not get this. Madam, I think I have said enough and I will sit down now.

210

Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Burford, do you wish to be relevéd?

Deputy Burford: Yes please, madam.

215 **Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, madam.

I just want to speak briefly. I will be voting Contre to this amendment for the reasons largely given by Deputy Inder and Deputy Brouard. It would be a crying shame if the one thing that we
220 have got going now, which is the pool marina, which seems to be going somewhere, were stopped effectively by this amendment.

So for that reason alone, we should not vote for it –

Deputy Oliver: Point of correction, madam.

225

Deputy Bailiff: What is your point of correction, Deputy Oliver?

Deputy Oliver: The pool marina would not be stopped by this amendment. It could continue, and if anything, it probably could continue quicker because the LPB will be completed.

230

Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Well I thank Deputy Oliver for her intervention.

Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: Thank you, madam.

I know Deputy Roffey and Deputy Parkinson have made this amendment with the very best of intentions because they have a vision. Unlike others in the Assembly, I do not share that vision. I do not want to see any more land reclamation taking place at Longue Hougue. I do not want to see that for several reasons, one of which is because a new port there will not be maintained.

Why would it be when we do not maintain the ports we have got now? It will look wonderful for the first few years, and then it will fall into a terrible state of disrepair. And I say that because the States' maintenance record is absolutely woeful. The gents' pool fell into a state of disrepair due to neglect and was closed to the public.

The Horseshoe fell into a state of disrepair due to neglect and was closed to the public. The raised gardens at La Vallette fell into a state of disrepair and were closed to the public. The only reason they are all open now is because volunteers did an incredible amount of work restoring them to their former glory and as a member of the floral St Peter Port team, I was one of those volunteers. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

There were 10, or maybe it was 12 homes built at the hospital site for people with special needs. I think they were called the Casquets, and they were built not so long ago. And within a few years, the residents had to be moved out because the roofs leaked like a basket.

The Deputy Bailiff: Sorry, Deputy Queripel, what did you say there?

Deputy Queripel: I said the roofs leaked like a basket.

The Deputy Bailiff: Oh, thank you! *(Laughter)*
Do carry on, thank you Deputy Queripel!

Deputy Queripel: Thank you, madam.

I do not think I have ever used unparliamentary language madam, and I do not intend on starting this term! So, the point I was making was those homes were built for people with special needs, and because the States did not maintain them, they were closed and the residents were moved out. There are several other examples I could give. The States' record of maintenance is absolutely woeful. (A Member: Hear, hear.) A new port will not be maintained.

Now yes, I want to see essential repairs to the current harbours carried out, but surely STSB can put an application into P&R asking for that money? And I am wondering why essential maintenance has not taken place in the harbours (A Member: Hear, hear.) in the past and I need clarification from this on Deputy Roffey, please, when he responds madam, because were the States as a whole responsible for that maintenance? Or was a particular department responsible for that maintenance? If the States as a whole were responsible, then I am as much to blame as anybody else, but I would like to know if a particular department were responsible.

Maybe it could have been PSD in the past; and if it was, what happened to that money that was not spent on maintenance? Couldn't that money have come from the ports' holding accounts for example? I would be very grateful for the clarification from Deputy Roffey on those points.

And staying with PSD for a moment, they produced a ports' masterplan which I have here in 2013. It cost tens of thousands of pounds and it was supposed to be for 25 years, although I stand to be corrected on that on whether or not it cost tens of thousands of pounds. I am sure it did. It was supposed to be for 25 years because it states that in the document. But as far as I am aware, very little has been done in pursuit of the objectives in this plan.

285 So PSD at the time must have been confident that they either had or were going to be able to get the money. Or else surely they would not have spent so much time and money compiling the plan? And it is the same with the Hydrocarbons Programme. I have got a copy of that here. It cost over £1 million to compile this, well over – I think it was £1.1 million. And as far as I can tell, these two documents are sitting on shelves gathering dust.

290 I have another one here of the vision for St Peter Port, the Bridge and St Sampson's Harbour. That was driven by the St Peter Port Douzaine and the Vale Douzaine, and the Town Centre Partnership and Chamber of Commerce. I was a Douzenier at the time so I know the amount of work that went into that. It could be said that it was not a States' document but the States had a considerable input into this. I will just list them, actually, because it is extremely relevant to this debate in my view.

295 Involved in the production of this vision was the Offices of the Environment Department, from the forward planning division from conservation and design, and from traffic. Officers of Commerce & Employment from the tourism section, officers of the Policy Council, from Public Services and from Culture and Leisure. Members of the Harbour Authority were involved and the whole initiative was presided over by a senior civil servant. The vision itself was initiated by the Environment
300 Department.

There is a lot of States' time, a lot of States' resource has been put into these three documents and plans. Why can't some of that work be picked up? Why can't it be undertaken? Why do we need more plans and more visions and more strategies to be compiled and sit on shelves gathering dust, when we can surely pick up some of the points in some of the initiatives from the ones we
305 have already got?

I have got a question for Deputy Roffey actually, and it is that if this amendment fails will all of the work that is detailed in these documents go ahead or will they just carry on sitting on shelves? I ask that because it never ceases to amaze me the amount of money the States spends on plans, but idealistic, wonderfully idealistic, terrific aspirations. Totally unrealistic, they are never going to
310 happen.

Surely this time we have got to be realistic? And I am not being pessimistic when I say that. I never have been. I am an optimistic realist. I forever live in a hope that things are going to get better, but I am rooted in reality that they are not just going to happen, a lot of work needs to go into it to make things happen. But you have got to try for the possible and stop trying to aim for the impossible and the idealistic. In closing, madam, I ask for a recorded vote please when we go
315 to the vote.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

320 Deputy Helyar.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, madam.

I will not be voting for this amendment, I voted yesterday to curtail it. I thought it would be helpful if we just roll back through how we arrived where we are. Some of these comments are
325 perhaps relevant more to general debate than in this particular amendment, but I think the background does help in the decision-making for this amendment as well.

There is a jack-up rig in the harbour at the moment which is drilling. It is not drilling for oil as some people have suggested might be a good idea for P&R to do at the moment, it is actually looking at the sub-strata in the sea bed there to work out foundations for the marina. But also civil
330 engineering work which might be of general relevance to the work of STSB going forward in terms of how deep the foundations are on the sea walls and so on. A lot of maintenance, as we know, is required in that area, particularly on the eastern end.

So if we roll our minds back – and I was not a Member of the Assembly at the time – the amendment brought by Deputy St Pier and Deputy Trott to create the agency during the last term
335 of government, Deputy St Pier used some language which I think for him it is fair to say was quite

intemperate. I will not repeat it, but I think certainly expressed in frustration, a lack of ability to move forward in this area.

I think I sense that frustration is still here, but I think to some degree we are all talking at cross-purposes. Certainly, the decision that I made in connection with the harbours debate was not really about the fact that I did not believe in moving the harbour under whichever particular option, five or six, that was there. It was because that work was not finished, it was imperfect.

After the St Pier and Trott amendment failed, the Harbour Requête was the next move, and STSB were tasked with coming back with the work which led to that debate last year. But in my view, that policy letter was wrong. It was founded on an incorrect assumption. STSB is a shareholder, it is not a political committee. Moving the whole of our harbour and all of our freight and passenger operations to a different part of the Island, potentially moving all of our fuel and everything else that has rolled into that, all the traffic consequences, the housing, everything that goes with it is not a matter for STSB. Now that is an incontrovertible fact.

That committee does not have responsibility for those areas. It is a huge undertaking to consider doing something like that, and in my view – and it is just an opinion – that is the wrong committee to be doing it. And that is why we have ended up here debating whether we should have an agency that is capable of delivering a huge project, which may take several decades to complete even if we decide that it is the right thing to do.

Now, I said that the policy letter about the harbours debate is wrong. It was wrong in my view. I think if we were able to – Deputy Fairclough referred in the debate about voting, it would be great if we could fast forward through some of the debates – it would also be brilliant if we could go back in time and start again, because I think certainly if I was sat in P&R looking at that draft policy letter from STSB I would have said, 'Hang on a minute, nobody in our current financial circumstances is going to vote for a partly finished piece of work which may cost £350 million.'

It is just not going to happen. This Assembly will never be minded to do that. There was no evidence of how it could be paid for. There was no evidence of what the commercial opportunities, might be to take advantage of some of the releasing of land to redevelop St Peter Port, to completely change the whole nature of St Peter Port and St Sampson's at the same time. It would be a massive transformational opportunity and something the like of which has not happened since the former Bailiff brought behind you, madam, led the charge to redevelop St Peter Port as we have heard before.

What I would have done if we could rewind it now would have been to come back with that review and say we have done a lot of work but we do not know whether it is possible to move the harbour to these places and in order to complete that work we need that jack-up rig to be moved a little bit further down the coast and do some drilling, and we need to finish the work at Wallingford to model the hydrology of that area to work out whether it is possible for ships to use it at all.

And I think if that piece of work had been added onto the end of the debate on that policy letter and we had been able to consider what the commercial opportunities were that went with it that might possibly offset the cost – because we do not know, all that we know at the moment is that it is a very big figure – we might have been able to say, 'Yes STSB, have some more money, go away and do that work, complete it and then we can make a decision in the round.' So we have sort of ended up down a rabbit hole as a result of the route that we have had to take from there.

Now, one of the things that – you may have got the impression from some of the speeches that have been made by Deputy Roffey and Deputy Parkinson – that this Development Agency policy letter is something that is being done to STSB and that it will become an independent body and it will run off doing whatever it likes. We need to remember, because I was the political chair of the committee which developed this policy letter, that Stuart Falla MBE was its chair, that John Hollis, also a member of STSB, was on that committee as was Mr Holden who was a member of the Ports Board, madam.

These are all people that work in STSB, they understand the ports inherently, they work on those committees. But the important difference is they are not politicians. They know that this work needs to be done and they want to get on with it. Perhaps one of the reasons why Deputy St Pier has

made some criticisms of the quality of the policy letter – and he is perfectly entitled to do that – one of the reasons that this looks different than other policy letters is because it has not been developed by politicians.

It has been developed by members of the community who want to contribute to our future and they are experts in their fields. They have done a lot of work – and I must commend them for that because it has not been mentioned yet, they put an awful lot of work into this – and we went through and wringing our hands as to how do we get this thing through a States which is reluctant, as we saw yesterday, to delegate responsibility to a third-party organisation.

How do we do that? Nearly 100 different projects were reviewed and looked at. All of the things which Deputy Queripel has just been talking about, all those reports that are sitting on shelves, they have all been looked at including the work that was done on the Future Harbours Strategy. All of those can be brought together, but the decision which that group, that subcommittee, made was that we cannot in all reasonableness sit here and go through 94 projects.

We do not have the time in this organisation, 39 of us, to make every single decision which needs to be made in that regard. We need to be able to delegate, and also we need to be able to delegate 20 years hence. We need an organisation which can hit the ground running which can take policy and guidance from us, but not instruction, not fettering its discretion to do things.

Now, I believe because I sat on that committee, that those individuals including the three I named and others, and I really do hope that – one of the things I have the greatest hope for with this Development Agency – is I have already had several letters from people volunteering, from people all over different types of industry, I would really like to see some youth, some new leadership, a great new opportunity for the Island to look forward.

And we can do that if we learn to work together and we learn to trust the third-party organisation in the same way as we now trust the DHA to get on with the job of delivering what we have asked it to deliver within the confines and the strategic direction which we wish to give it. We are politicians. We make policy. We are not administrators, we are not engineers, we are not painters and decorators.

Now, painters and decorators takes me to a memory of a good friend of mine in the 1980's, Chris Le Poidevin, who had a decorating business. His nickname was 'Chiefy' and one of the reasons for that is his business cards had a picture of a 'Red Indian' headdress on it. And his catch line for his business was, 'You have tried the cowboys, give the Indians a chance.'

Really that is what this policy letter is asking you to do. If you restrict and confine this agency by giving it direct instructions, it will not work. That is not the way the private sector works. The private sector will work within the confines of government, it will seek out the views of the public when it is seeking to do its projects, but we cannot confine it and restrict its ability to manoeuvre.

(A Member: Hear, hear.)

So I would urge Members to not just in terms of this amendment, but to reject amendments which seek to restrict, seek to direct, seek to confine, and let us get on with really building something which can make a very big difference to our future.

Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputies Aldwell and Leadbeater, do you wish to be relevéd?

Deputy Leadbeater: Yes please, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, madam.

I will be brief, but I think Deputy Helyar makes some very good points indeed. We have on our eastern seaboard – I do not really like using that term, it sounds so American to me, but east coast – we have between the two harbours and in the two harbours some great historic monuments and

440 buildings. Even my Jersey colleagues say how pretty St Peter Port looks from all angles compared to their capital.

There are obviously some things we want to protect, we want to keep, we want to enhance, we want to do that, and we have been able to do that, and our forefathers were able to do that. I do wonder how our forefathers would have been, I saw recently a picture of Victor Hugo sitting – or
445 standing, I think it was – on his terrace there, as the Castle Pier and emplacement were being built. Now, I do not think that would have happened at all if they had to jump through the hoops that we seemingly today want everybody to jump through.

Now, with or without amendments like this, there are in my view many hoops to jump through; planning, etc. In the past, the way things were done may be not perfect, and there certainly were
450 many mistakes made. When the Braye du Valle was filled in, there was uproar amongst some, but of course they were not able to do much about it. Most people today think it is a good thing and in fact some of the things that we look at in the past would have been considered eyesores by some or an imposition of some foreign thing.

I am absolutely certain that whichever way we go, if we seek to try and limit what any
455 organisation, be it a political or arms-length body, does there will be some problems. However, I would rather, and my preference is, to let this organisation, let it free as much as possible to be able to get on with what it should be able to do and can do, accepting that there may be some mistakes in the process. But if we are so risk-averse that we want to chain them effectively, then I cannot see that we will really be succeeding as our forefathers did in creating the sorts of facilities and beauty
460 and, yes, an opportunity for everyone to enjoy what we enjoy today.

I think last year's debate for me demonstrated why it is so wrong for us, almost as a committee, to try and micromanage this situation. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I mean, I have my own pet ideas and projects like anybody else. I could have laid a whole raft of amendments here and say, 'Well I would like to see this, I would like to see that and the other in there.' We have all got that and the
465 problem is if there are 39 different ideas, and probably more so because several of us would have conflicting ideas in our own individual selves, then we are never going to get anywhere. And where have we been? We have been round and round in circles ever since I was first elected 20 years ago. We have got to decide today to take those risks. To take those risks means voting against this amendment.

470 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Deputy Le Tocq has almost drifted into another debate.

What is the point of us 39 Deputies if only a small number are really doing the work in making
475 the decisions? That is a different topic. Now, I kind of want to regret in a way that I did not say yes to Deputy Prow's argument that this went beyond because it does, and I will come on to that in a minute. I should not have said the other day too that Deputy Prow wins again, but he did win again, and that is important. I am always told, 'Be careful not to have your microphone open.'

But when you actually look at the policy letter that Policy & Resources Committee have done, it
480 is very clear – paragraph 1.1 in bold letters:

This policy letter relates to the establishment of a Development Agency and purposely not to a specific development and regeneration project the agency may undertake in the future on behalf of the States.

So, the fact that we have drifted in, we have sailed into a harbour debate, is odd in that sense. I do often agree with the 'get things done' attitude of Deputy Inder and I support not just Castle
485 Emplacement ideas but progressing with the pool and I am heartened to hear from Deputy Oliver that nothing we do today will prevent the pool from moving forward. Deputy Helyar made that point too.

I also found common ground with a lot of what Deputy Helyar said. He rightly pointed out the distinguished capabilities of the political subcommittee that he presides, which brought the letter today. He mentioned – well, several Members who served on many States' Committees over the

490 years from Treasury & Resources to Economic Development – he could have mentioned too, a former chairman of Aurigny and various other people.

But when I went through the list with the exception of a lady with a very distinguished name who is a lawyer, it did strike me that they were all of one success bracket and generation and type of person, and if we are trying to build diversity then I do take on board Deputy Helyar's point about
495 reaching out – well, not just across genders and personality types and occupations – but to the younger generation, because there is a real risk that we rebuild in Guernsey in the image of the 1980s and 1990s.

I think there is an intergenerational issue on the Island that the fifty-somethings – well that might not include me – have generally been successful in building up nest eggs, property portfolios, careers, and I am not sure it will be quite as easy for the next lot of twenty-somethings and thirty-somethings. So we have really got to stop any decline by moving forward as rapidly as possible.

Now, I know over the years different Presiding Officers have told Members off if they are reading newspapers in the debate or whatever, or bringing visual aids, but I must admit the recent *Press* headlines 'We have failed you' from a certain Chief Minister President resonated with me because I
505 thought, 'Well I am part of that failure because I have sat in every States since 1997', unlike newer Members with fresh ideas, like Deputy Vermeulen and Deputy Helyar.

And we have gone nowhere. Yes, Deputy Trott made an excellent speech yesterday about private sector-predominant work on Admiral Park and the Royal Site and Savoy Site and the Guernsey Brewery where I used to live, all that. But within the public realm we have not made the progress.
510 And today's front page is even more so. We have Deputy Ferbrache apparently saying why we have failed, Mr Camp looking in search of the truth and the former editor saying we are 'pants' at planning.

Now I was happy about that because I thought it would strengthen my amendment on planning, but they are not talking that kind of development and planning, they are talking about economic forecasting. But the gist of it is clear; we have not managed to put things together. Now I am actually
515 in favour of the pool project and I also take on board Deputy Helyar's advice, although it certainly was not unanimous at the time that Members were very reluctant to vote yes to a project of £350 million, as Deputy Brouard has reminded us, of uncertain technical feasibility at a time of financial difficulties.

So I am not that great a fan of this amendment, but I still might vote for it actually and I will explain why. Because one of the most interesting speakers of the last Assembly was Deputy Hansmann Rouxel and she had a background in the performing arts and theatre and such. And one of her sayings that we remember vividly was, 'We have got to move the story on.' And we are not moving the story on. Even with the construction of this amended waterfront development agency,
525 there is a gap. Deputy Parkinson was spot on yesterday in saying that we are trying to get the Development Agency to do too many things.

If you take his example admittedly of the very peculiar high speed train or HS2, we are not just saying, 'deliver this vehicle', in terms of going through the hoops Deputy Le Tocq mentioned, in terms of planning, in terms of law, in terms of finance, in terms of getting a construction done. We
530 are actually giving this group: 'You have got to decide whether you want to build a high speed train or not, or whether instead you want a motorway or, I do not know, a pathway for squirrels.'

Because we are actually giving virtually no direction to the waterfront development agency. After all these many reports, maybe they failed because they had ended up sitting on a shelf because people were not interested. I suspect they failed due to a combination of our very curious political
535 system and electoral cycles and changes we made to the constitution and that there was no enthusiasm for them for many people.

The real task of the waterfront development agency – and I do support its existence – is to get the consultation done, not with 20 people, the usual suspects turn up to Beau Séjour on a Saturday morning, but where 2,000 people turn up and to actually get a clear view from the public of where
540 we should be going. And hopefully, the people involved with that will work with politicians. I do not think we just do policy, we are there to represent the public and we are there to have vision and a

mission. But to work and to get a coherent vision, preferably part privately financed, which comes back to Deputy Helyar's £350 million in the sea point, and then to make it work.

545 But you have to get the vision first. It should come back to the Chamber. That is why Deputy Meerveld certainly had more than a good argument yesterday, because if we are voting whether to spend £100,000 on electronic voting for ourselves but we are not allowed to vote on a £350 million harbour project or an undersea tunnel or a complete restructuring of our transport infrastructure, that is crazy. So we have to own the policy. So there has to be vision from the people who are delivering it, partnership with politicians, buy-in from the public and then the determination to
550 implement it and cross the barriers and you need a structure that goes beyond one term. But unless you have a drive from the Island for something to happen, you will not see it happening.

We have seen in the last few weeks incredible support for the Ukrainian people from Islanders from all walks of life. We saw Guernsey Together when Deputy St Pier was President of Policy & Resources and we were facing the worst health crisis for many years. We have got to get Guernsey
555 together on this redevelopment.

And I think it is wrong to portray this amendment as being the final cut on us giving our souls away. All it does is ask us to agree that the long-term development plan should include the possibility of the following elements: carrying out essential repairs to current harbours, we would all agree with that, Deputy Queripel made the point on maintenance very strongly; reconfiguring
560 remaining operations in Town Harbour; constructing a new northern port at Longue Hougue South; relocation of all current commercial activity away from St Sampson's Harbour to the new northern port; and converting St Sampson's Harbour to leisure use only.

That gives an opportunity to rebuild what will happen anyway now Leale's Yard is hopefully moving on. A new Town, a new port, a new destiny for St Sampson's. Also by improving the leisure
565 sector offering at St Peter Port and relocating some or all current commercial freight activity.

Now that is an idea, it is a vision. It is not saying this will happen, it is vague, it says 'some or all'. But I think it is essential that the waterfront agency looks at it as a scenario. It may well have all kinds of snags that Deputy Brouard and Deputy Inder pointed out. I do not think it should stop all development. I do not think it should stop the waterfront enhancement, but enhancement by itself
570 suggests minor things. I think we can still work with the pool idea, the Castle Emplacement ideas and many others simultaneously.

But this surely will give a potential direction, maybe the wrong direction. But I do sometimes think it would be better to make some decision even if in hindsight it turns out to be not necessarily the right decision. We have got to do something. Twenty-five years I have been standing here and
575 25 years I have been failing. Well, Deputy Vermeulen does not want any more of this. So hopefully, people from the Guernsey Party and other groups will come together and say, 'We have got to change the way we do things.'

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.
580

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, madam.

Well, I congratulate Deputy Gollop on an excellent speech. I think he has in many ways hit the nail on the head. This is about giving a direction of travel to the Development Agency so that they can go away and look at a programme of work. He referred to the fact that I mentioned in my
585 speech yesterday about, you know, a development agency is a delivery vehicle and it is the sort of thing you might set up if you are trying to build an HS2 or a Crossrail or something. And you tell the body who is doing it that, you know, we need a railway line and it needs to connect Manchester with London or whatever.

You do not set up an agency and say, 'You need to decide whether we need a railway line or a motorway or a squirrel trail and if we do need a railway line, where should it go?' (*Laughter*) You know, you can pick any two places on the map and we will allow you to come forward with plans for that railway line.' No. The direction has to be a political direction of where are we trying to get to? What is it we are trying to achieve?
590

In the case of redevelopment of the eastern seaboard, it has to be driven by ... the cornerstone of it is what are we going to do with our commercial ports? And everything else, all the other optionality around what can happen on the eastern seaboard, and it is a vast panoply of opportunity, will depend on what we decide to do about the commercial ports.

To some extent, the decision on what to do about the commercial ports is a technical decision. You know, we may all have views on what would look pretty and how much we value the traditional waterfront in St Peter Port and all that sort of stuff. But at the end of the day, the commercial port has to function.

And they are absolutely vital because whatever it is, 95% of our food arrives every day on these ships, our energy comes in, our waste goes out, and basically our Island life would not function properly if the ports do not function properly. STSB is responsible for the Ports Board, therefore employs the Harbour Master and the coastguard and everything else to do with the ports. And we consulted very widely with all of those people who are involved in port operations in Guernsey as well as port users to establish what it is they need to enable the ports to function.

And so, we did an appraisal. A pretty thorough appraisal I think, notwithstanding the words of Deputy Helyar, of the options and what would work best and the approximate costs of these options. And we offered the States six alternatives. Now, in our estimation, options five and six were the best options, but of course the States could have decided on anything else.

They could have decided, as Deputy Brouard would like, for the States to decide to build a new port extension to the east of St Peter Port. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Contrary to his opinion though, that would be more expensive, not less expensive, than the option of going to Longue Hougue South, and for various technical reasons it was an inferior solution. But if Deputy Brouard wants to spend more money on a worse solution, that of course is his prerogative.

So, the decision here is not about micromanaging, as somebody has used that word, a development agency; it is about telling the agency what we want to do. It is not about setting out in detail where we need to go. Deputy Gollop has just read out what the Proposition says. It says about creating a new commercial port at the northern end of Belle Grève, about releasing St Sampson's Harbour for leisure use, etc. That is not micromanagement. That is broad brush policy.

It is not saying to the Development Agency, 'we are fettering your discretion', unless you want to say to them, 'go away and recommend anything you like on the eastern seaboard', which seems to be the impetus behind some of the speeches I have heard this morning. You have to tell them what it is as a political decision you are trying to achieve.

And then by all means, I am a complete supporter of the Development Agency. I absolutely believe that there should be a delivery vehicle which has a life longer than the parliamentary term. I believe it should be staffed or managed very largely by people from outside the States and that they should use their commercial nous to try and get the best of the opportunities that the redevelopment of the eastern seaboard might present to us. I am a total supporter of that project.

What I am not a supporter of is the idea of just saying to them, 'Go away and do whatever you like.' Or, 'Come back and recommend whatever you like.' We need to give them some political direction because responsibility for broad policy matters rests in this Chamber. It cannot be delegated.

Now Deputy Inder, who is not in the Chamber, made comments about he did not believe effectively that rejection of this amendment would stymie development and activity around the ports. I have to tell him he is wrong. The reality is that until the Harbour Action Area plans, or local planning briefs to the Harbour Action Area are developed, there is very little we can do around the harbours. What that means effectively, as Deputy Roffey and I have emphasised, is that if this amendment fails, nothing of any significance will be delivered in this political term. At the end of the term, the Chief Minister will be standing up apologising to the members of the public and this Island for the failure of this States. The continuing, ongoing failure of this States.

The reality is that without the Harbour Action Area plans from the DPA, we cannot do anything of any substance, we cannot even redevelop the boat house as I said in a speech yesterday –

Deputy Taylor: Point of correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Taylor.

650 **Deputy Taylor:** It is my understanding, and I might be wrong here, but the political Members of the DPA could override and suggest a development framework could be applicable if they were comforted or felt strongly that that said development would not impact the future developments in any meaningful, large way.

655 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Parkinson: Well that is as may be, the reality is when we consulted with the DPA we were told we could not do anything, so they were not minded to override the system. Now, we will have a debate later on in this meeting, possibly not today, on the IDP update, and I have no doubt a lot of strong opinions will be expressed about the way that Guernsey has hamstrung itself under the IDP. But this is not the debate we are having now, it is personally a view with which I am sympathetic and I for one did not understand what the implications of passing the IDP in its present form were when that was passed. But as I say, that is a debate for another day.

660 We are where we are and, incidentally, for Deputy Queripel's benefit, we are in a new place – a place that is different from the place where all those reports that he referred to on the harbour and the opportunities around St Peter Port were prepared, because back then we did not have an IDP. It has all been changed. The landscape has been changed and we no longer have that freedom to just decide to do what we want to do.

670 So, I need to give some practical examples to bring this issue to life for Members. Deputy Inder is very fond of ideas about redoing stuff around Castle Cornet, about making more use of the Castle Emplacement as an asset for tourism and he has lots of enthusiasm and ideas about what could be done there. Well, we are responsible for much of the Castle Emplacement. The Castle Cornet itself of course is dealt with by Heritage & Culture but –

675 **Deputy Queripel:** Point of correction, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Queripel.

680 **Deputy Queripel:** Deputy Parkinson said all of the plans that I referred to were produced prior to the IDP being implemented. Two of them were, but the Hydrocarbons Plan was published in 2017.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Queripel.

685 **Deputy Parkinson:** Well, I do not think the Hydrocarbons Plan is really central to this issue. The reality is we are talking about the opportunity –

Deputy Queripel: Point of correction, madam.

690 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy Queripel?

Deputy Queripel: It is essential, it is absolutely totally relevant to this debate –

695 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I think to be fair, Deputy Parkinson was expressing an opinion in relation to that.

Deputy Parkinson: And madam, I did not say 'essential', I said 'central'.

So, I need to put some detail around this to explain the problem. Now the STSB is responsible, through its Ports Board, for the bridge which connects Castle Cornet to the model yacht pond area. And, as Members will know, it is in a very poor state of repair. Essential maintenance is carried out to try and keep it safe, but at the moment, for example, the traffic weight on it has to be limited because it is structurally unsound or it is not full strength.

Now of course, there are various ideas as to what might be done about that bridge. One would be clearly to rebuild it. It does need complete reconstruction to rebuild it exactly as it is, but then there is another body of opinion that says we should rebuild it at double the width of the present bridge so that buses can access the entrance to the Castle Cornet and bring tourists up there and enhance the visitor opportunity there. And that is an option.

Another school of thought would say, 'Well, hang on. We do not know if we are going to turn the whole of the pool area in St Peter Port into a marina and maybe what we need to do is actually replace the bridge with a solid wall to contain water or to exclude waves to protect a marina area in the pool.' But none of those ideas can be developed or taken forward because we do not have a Harbour Action Area plan so we do not have any planning basis on which to decide ... Gosh, this is going to be a long –

The Deputy Bailiff: Sorry, Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: I am so sorry for doing this, but it is a point of correction.
The pool marina can take place because of the amount of technical reports –

Deputy Parkinson: I am talking about the wall.

The Deputy Bailiff: Sorry, can Deputy Parkinson allow Deputy Oliver to make her point, please?

Deputy Oliver: That the amount of technical reports and the environmental impact assessment and then the only extra thing that will need to happen is the TIA to complete it, so it actually is saying that it cannot go anywhere else. That is why that is the only thing that can actually continue without the LPB.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Parkinson: Madam, I was talking about the bridge at Castle Cornet.

Anyway, so essentially we do not have a local planning brief for the Harbour Action Area and therefore we cannot decide what to do with that bridge. All we can do is maintain it as best we can as it is. No development there will take place until there is a local planning brief for the Harbour Action Area. That is just one example.

Now, Deputy Oliver has mentioned the pool and others have mentioned the fact that there has been a rig in the pool. Deputy Helyar, I think, mentioned the drilling rig in the harbour which has been exploring how deep the silt is and how far you have to go down to reach bedrock. The answer is apparently five metres in places. And of course, what the structure of the rock is underneath because if it is very fractured, that has engineering complications if you are going to build pilins on it, etc.

But the bottom line here is – and we are continuing to work on the pool marina project and a report will come back to the States – but of course, one of the major constraints on a marina in the pool is how much of the harbour needs to be retained for the manoeuvres of the large ferries? Because if the ro-ro ramps were not where they are, a much larger area of the harbour could be developed as a marina, and potentially the whole harbour.

So again, until we decide where the ro-ro ramps are going, where the main ferry operations are going to take place, you cannot really decide what you are going to do with the pool marina. Yes in principle, there could be a pool marina, but how big will it be? What are the implications of that

750 for the breakwaters that will be needed? And practical stuff like where will you take the people off the boats ashore?

Now, they could come ashore the Crown Pier as they do now, but in many ways there would be better opportunities and better facilities if we can bring them ashore on the Cambridge Berth. The opportunity is much, you know, we can build some marina facilities on the Crown Pier, but actually
755 we could do something much better and bigger on the Cambridge Berth. But we cannot decide that because we do not know what the Cambridge Berth is needed for.

So everywhere you look around the harbours – and it is not just St Peter Port, everywhere you are looking around St Sampson's, Leale's Yard is an example – the opportunity for doing stuff is constrained or determined by what are you going to use the port for? And so that decision is
760 absolutely fundamental.

You do not need to deliver the new commercial port facilities. Deputy Inder sort of suggested that this might mean we all have to wait 10 years or more to do anything – that is nonsense. What you need to do is have a decision about where you are going. If we knew where the new commercial port facilities were going to go, all the other decisions would filter off that and we could start to
765 say, 'Alright, well if that is the case then we can think about a pool marina which is this size and where the passengers or the boat users come ashore.'

This is very much of the today. The reality is if this amendment is lost, and by the sound of it there is a significant prospect that it will be lost, nothing of significance will happen around the ports during this States' term because what that means is the Development Agency will be set off
770 like an unguided missile to come up with proposals around the eastern seaboard at the cost of a million quid, and that will take them, I think it is predicted about a year.

And when they come back, presumably that will be presented to the States for a debate. And when we approve the general direction for travel which they have set out, then the instructions can be given to the DPA to go away and start creating local planning briefs around the direction of
775 travel which the States has adopted. And we know that undertaking that work will involve a public enquiry, it will involve 18 months or so, it will cost another million pounds. Then presumably once those plans have been put in place, maybe that has to come back to the States for another debate. I do not know. (*Interjection*) It does.

But the reality is that programme is a three-year programme which means that before any
780 spades can be put into the ground of any significance, we will have come to the next General Election. This Assembly will have failed again to achieve anything of significance. And so to an extent this is very much up to Members. If we want to go down in history as the States of procrastination, the States of failure, fine. Let us do that. But the reality is this amendment is the only amendment on the table in this debate, which would allow us to get significant work done during this term.

785 Yes, of course we can do minor redevelopment within existing structures and so on. It would be possible to do another slaughterhouse, it would be possible to do something with the old States' officers on the North Esplanade within the confines of the building, but nothing of any real substance. And do not tell me the Round Top is a project of massive substance.

The reality is we can tinker around the edges and we can repaint the doors and what have you,
790 but nothing of any real significance will be done. And major decisions like what can we do with the North Beach area, what can we do with the whole of White Rock will all be deferred and there will be no significant development there.

So it is up to Members really. At the end of the day, Deputy Roffey and I decided that we had to give the Members another chance to actually do something in this political term. But if you do not
795 want to do anything in this political term, that is fine. You know, at the end of the day we, as has been pointed out, are not a policy making body, although we as politicians have a role in making policy.

I do not think the Development Agency is an appropriate policy making body either. It has no democratic legitimacy at all, and whatever you may think about the mandate of the STSB, it is a
800 committee of the States, a majority of the Members of the committee are Members of this

Assembly, and there is some democratic legitimacy to it. There is no democratic legitimacy to the Development Agency whatsoever.

So, it is up to Members. We are not trying to fetter discretion as people keep saying. We are simply trying to provide a general direction of travel so that work can start. If Members do not want to support that, fine. The Development Agency will set off with no direction as to travel and events will take their course, events which will bear no fruit in the life of this Assembly.

So there we are. I am sure Deputy Roffey will deal with all the other points that have been raised in debate so far, but that is my contribution on it.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, madam.

I was not going to speak but Deputy Helyar, and to an extent Deputy Roffey, have got me to my feet. One of the things that I think is missing in this policy letter is an appendix, if you like, which updates us or gives us outcomes of the work of the committee that has been operating for all of this political term, this seafront enhancement or whatever, I am sure that is not quite the correct name but I think everybody knows what I mean.

Ninety-four projects apparently, I am told. It would have been nice to actually see a bringing together of all the work that that committee has done, the research they have looked into, the ideas – not to vote on, not to pick and choose, not as some kind of menu, but merely just to understand some direction, to have some picture.

Because I feel as though I have got a book and all the pages are blank with this Development Agency policy letter. That is why listening to Deputy Gollop, or at least to the second half of his speech, in one of his infamous ‘which way is he going’ speeches, (*Laughter*) I agree with every part of the second half. I think Deputy Gollop, more than most politicians in here, has a real ear and nose, shall I say, for the feelings of the common people out in Guernsey.

Not the stakeholders that we give titles to who have got business interests or anything, but the people of Guernsey who, on a day-to-day basis, do not pay too much attention to what is going on in here because they have got their lives to lead and things to get on with. But suddenly, when something catches their imagination, they will mobilise and they will come and tell us in no uncertain terms what they think. And I think without giving this Development Agency a steer and a direction, I think that that danger is all the more increased.

The other point that Deputy Gollop made which I agree with is the freeing up of land up at St Sampson’s. I think Deputy Roffey touched on that in his speech and I think this is absolutely vital to take into account when we are considering telephone numbers of £300 million or whatever it might be, to think, ‘But what comes back?’ – and it is incalculable in terms of being able to free up areas that have just developed over time and have bits plonked on them because it was suitable and there was this space – and to do something much more cohesive and to really create a really quality public realm.

Particularly for St Sampson’s that I think has been neglected for far too long, I think the opportunities are huge if we were to take commercial shipping out of St Sampson’s and make it much more into a leisure port. I think there is also positives there because certainly I know back in my last term when we were working on issues of sea levels rising and surge flooding that the Bridge is a particular area and so therefore, that this is something that would be able to be incorporated. I know I am probably not seen as part of the business community like some of the Deputies in here would be, but I do speak to people in that community.

Two people in particular whose names would probably be known to many people in this Assembly have separately made comments to me about the Development Agency, and the comment was that it lacks direction and needs to be a strategic view because developers are going to be exceedingly wary of just trying to come up with something themselves because there is always the risk that if there is a public backlash, that a requête can come to this Assembly, and then all of a sudden the Assembly is involved again and the brakes go on and we are back to zero.

So I do think that this amendment gives us the best opportunity today to actually become the, you know, action this day rather than action next term which I really think – or possibly the term after – is the risk if we do not support this. So I would actually urge everyone to support this amendment and actually start things moving.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you, madam.

I am quite torn on this amendment because I can see the positives of this amendment where it gives the Development Agency some direction and therefore the DPA can actually crack on with the LPB. I can also see some of the negatives which people have pointed out where it is much better for the – and I think Development Agency is actually the wrong word, it is more like a think tank almost – to have a clean sheet of paper and come up with ideas and then go forward.

But if this amendment does pass, then the LPB can start straight away and it can be finished hopefully within 18 months, probably sooner. No work can actually go on with the boat houses, it was said, because the location where it is, it would actually have an implication on the LPB and it would actually pre-prejudice that. So unfortunately that. And I think actually, what Deputy Burford, I do tend to agree with her and last term the seafront enhancement came up with some objectives. There were only five objectives and they were quite broad brush and I actually think they would have benefited to have been in this policy letter because it says – I am just going to read them, they are only short ones:

To provide infrastructure that is of exceptional design and enables the efficiency of functioning of the Island and gives opportunity for economic growth; to take advantage of opportunities that might mitigate the current and future threats to Guernsey; to achieve a mixed use of land that supports Guernsey as an economically strong, social, inclusive and a healthy Island; to maintain and enhance connections between the main centres along Guernsey's east coast and waterfront; and to provide an environment that celebrates Guernsey's maritime culture and encourages people to live, work and play in that area.

Now, that would give the Development Agency at least a good steer or some high-level objectives that it can actually work to because at the moment it is very much sort of there is the east coast, make it economically viable and socially attractive and that is it. And I think that it is either going to be, as Deputy Parkinson says, which I actually think is probably much more likely, is that nothing will get done in this term because even with the pool marina, if we had the LPB, it could be finished a lot quicker than without the LPB because of the amount of extra work that needs to go on to prove that that is the right place.

Even things such as traffic, and you would think, well, why the hell does a pool marina need a traffic impact assessment report? But it is because you are going to have cars going to and from and then suddenly you have got, if the main harbour is going to stay there, you are going to need to take some more of the car parking space because at the moment they do not have enough space in that area to actually work ... it is a very tight space they are working to. So you take some of the car parking spaces. 'Oh hold on, you still need more car parking spaces for the pool marina to get there and back.' Everything is interconnected.

That is why some part of me is just going, 'you know what, it might not be the right decision but at least a decision has been made for this amendment. So I am quite torn on it because I can see the practicalities. If we just did it, then my committee could get on. If we do not, it is just going to get delayed further and further and I do not know when the Development Agency will actually come back with a decision of where the harbour should be so we can actually then plan and say, 'Right, this is the LPB, then you can get on with work.'

There is something within the committee that we do have a certain amount of power that if we think the project would not prejudice the LPB, then we could say potentially that the castle embankment could go ahead. But, I would just remind Deputy Inder that unfortunately, Planning

900 Law comes a lot higher than anything that the States say. So if ED gives a direction and says, 'this is what is going to happen', Planning Law will still trump whatever the States actually say and it still has to go through that process.

So, thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Moakes.

905 **Deputy Moakes:** Thank you, madam.

I would obviously love for this to all be resolved tomorrow. Wouldn't that be amazing? But it is just not going to happen, this is incredibly complex. Let me give you a couple of reasons as to why it is so complex. The east coast is a really diverse area and it tries to fulfil several roles. It is a population centre, it is a commercial centre, it is a retail centre, it is a tourism centre and it is also a cultural hub. And let us not forget that it is also home to our two main harbours and they themselves juggle with passenger movements, imports and exports, fishing. That is not to mention the increasing numbers of leisure boats too.

910 The second complexity is the fact that different committees are responsible for different parts of the east coast. I will give you one example. The Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture is responsible for Castle Cornet. The Committee *for the* Environment and Infrastructure is responsible for the bridge connecting Castle Cornet to the harbour, and the States' Trading Supervisory Board is responsible for the harbour. How on earth do you join all this up? How on earth do you get multiple committees to agree that this is a priority or that is a priority?

920 The answer is you cannot because it is just too complicated and if you want proof just look at how little has been achieved in the past. So think about jigsaw puzzles. All of those different things I mentioned there are pieces of the jigsaw puzzle. The only way you can bring these jigsaw puzzles together is by creating the East Coast Development Agency, and it will be responsible for developing and implementing a long-term plan for the east coast. Where and what our harbour is is a key component of this plan, but it is not the only component as I have just demonstrated. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

925 This is why the Development Agency is so important. It will bring all of those elements together, it will work with all of the responsible committees and it will be like a jigsaw puzzle. It would be bringing the different committees and the different elements together, all of those pieces, and hopefully the Development Agency will then be able to pull all of these pieces together to develop a joined up plan for the future of Guernsey. As I say, I would love for this to happen tomorrow, but I would rather wait for a little bit to ensure it is done properly, and in 10 years, 50 years or a 100 years, it is the right decision rather than making a knee-jerk reaction together.

Thank you.

935 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, madam Deputy Bailiff.

940 I believe the Development Agency will need some strategic direction. It cannot just be sent off and told, 'come back with your own ideas'. We may have a Little Venice before we know it. We all know how popular that was.

Our harbours are key. Deputy Parkinson and Deputy Roffey have both alluded to it and told us that they bring in about 99% of our goods. Only 1% comes in by air. And of course they transfer a lot of people as well. Our harbours are the keystone. Deputy Moakes has just referenced a jigsaw. 945 When I do a jigsaw, I start off with the corner pieces, build around the edges and then try to fill in the middle. For me, our harbours are the corner pieces. We must get those right first and build on that.

I find it absolutely amazing that we are the States, and it takes the STSB to raise an amendment to get essential maintenance approved. Essential maintenance should be happening all day, every day. (Several Members: Hear, hear.) We have woefully un-invested in our infrastructure – key

infrastructure – that is relevant to this day because it brings in passengers, food, freight, everything that we rely on. Part of that essential maintenance is the breakwater that goes out from the castle.

I will give way to Deputy Ferbrache.

955 **Deputy Ferbrache:** I do not want you to give way, a point of correction. I am grateful anyway to Deputy Gabriel.

I am the immediate past President of the STSB, I do not know any reason at all why we need an amendment to do essential maintenance work. If that was the only issue, there is absolutely no need at all to bring an amendment to this Assembly for essential maintenance work. So if that is the basis
960 of Deputy Gabriel's speech, it is a complete misconception.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Ferbrache.
Deputy Gabriel.

965 **Deputy Gabriel:** Thank you, Deputy Ferbrache.

I suppose you had better take that up with the current President. Some of the thrust of my speech is around that breakwater, which goes from Castle Cornet east. That breakwater I believe – and I have seen cracks of it myself at low water and patching up maintenance that has tried to happen on that – if this amendment fails and that essential maintenance is not approved, our
970 Development Agency might as well be developing Atlantis. Most of our eastern seaboard will be underwater.

And again, part of E&I's mandate is coastal infrastructure and repair. We have been working on that. I would also like to see the bridge work happen and the St Sampson's leisure option, which I am pleased to see in this amendment as well, along with the Longue Hougue South development.
975 We have already had plenty of arguments and debate around our harbours and we should not be going down that rabbit hole again, but I will be supporting this amendment.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.
980

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, madam.

The wording of this amendment seems curiously familiar to me, and of course the reason for that is it has been plagiarised from the St Pier/Helyar amendment of June 2021, which in fact was not debated in the end. Deputy Helyar gave a sort of historical analysis of how we got to where we
985 have got to, and perhaps it is unsurprising that it sort of began with the debate in June 2021. In fact, he began his analysis a year earlier with the August 2020 St Pier/Trott amendment that did not get debated in relation to the Development Agency. And he then said, 'And then we then went to the STSB's policy letter of June 2021.'

But what he did not go on to analyse is how we got to June 2021. He said the STSB were the wrong people to bring that policy letter. But of course they were directed to do so and they were directed on the back of a requête and, forgive me for giving this information but I am aware that half of the Assembly were not here at the time, and I think it is important to understand because it should help inform us make this decision today.

That requête was led by Deputy Inder and was debated in May 2019. Of course it directed the STSB at the time, of course led by Deputy Ferbrache at the time, and there was overwhelming support that the amended Resolution, the amended Proposition from that requête directed the STSB to produce the policy letter that was then debated in June last year. So I think it is important to understand that it was not just Deputies Roffey and Parkinson off the top of their heads dreaming up these various schemes in the new term and bringing them. A lot of work had been done and
1000 presumably that work had indeed been started under Deputy Ferbrache.

And of course another point that Deputy Helyar made was not only were STSB the wrong people to be considering it because they were the shareholder, but actually one of the whole reasons we

need the Development Agency is because we need good non-political commercial input into this process.

1005 Deputy Ferbrache absolutely recognised that when under his leadership the STSB established I think what was then called the Commercial Ports Investigation Board – we always do like a snappy title, don't we in the States? (*Laughter*) – which was chaired, I think, by a non-States' member; presumably one of Messrs Falla or Hollis or Holden and I think all three have been referenced as being involved in that process.

1010 So the policy letter that was debated last year had all of that commercial input and I think that was a point that was made by Deputy Roffey when he spoke, but I think has been lost in this debate in recognising that the proposals that were brought to us in 2021 have been led by the commercial sector through, if you like, a shadow development agency, namely the Commercial Ports Investigation Board, at considerable expense and the work has been done.

1015 And I think, again, it is worth emphasising the point that Deputy de Sausmarez made from the comments of those in the private sector, Messrs Dorey and Falla – of course Guernsey men with considerable not only local experience, but relevant experience, relevant development experience, and in the case of Mr Dorey, of course, the experience of having sat on a significant board for an infrastructure fund – advising that the Development Agency is going to need a decision on this very issue, putting the edges to the jigsaw, as Deputy Gabriel said, in order to proceed.

1020 I was clearly looking at this amendment thinking it was very familiar, and therefore it must be attractive to me because I helped draft it in its original form with Deputy Helyar a year ago. But actually, notwithstanding that Deputy Oliver is undecided, actually her speech has decided me what to do with this amendment, which is to support it for the very reasons that she cited. The Development & Planning Authority, who I think have been, since 2016, a Cinderella committee of the States and I think if I certainly have one regret in this process of getting us to where we have got to has been the side-lining of the Development & Planning Authority through the last term of its involvement in this. I know that the previous President did express strong views on that at the time and I accept the responsibility for contributing to that situation.

1030 But I think we do need to acknowledge that the Development & Planning Authority are absolutely critical in this because of the very Law that this Assembly has put in place, that we constantly as a group seek to push against but recognise it does provide a framework and constraint upon us and we do need to recognise and operate within that, and we need to take the advice of the President of the Development & Planning Authority very much into account. The fact that this will help short-circuit and speed up the process and enable the local planning briefs to be delivered within hopefully less than 18 months, I think, if I am not misquoting what Deputy Oliver said, I think is really key.

1040 A phrase that was used in a different context this week, madam, I shall use again, that we cannot allow perfection to be the enemy of the good. I fear that what we will do with this decision is, yet again, find a reason to kick it a little bit further off and I think the 'action this day' mantra will simply need to be amended and have to be transformed into 'action next term' if we are not very careful.

1045 And I think the other consideration is, of course, Proposition 1 does provide that the Policy & Resources Committee, not the STSB, the Policy & Resources Committee, albeit in consultation with the STSB, will need to present for approval by the States options for Guernsey's future operational harbour and commercial infrastructure requirements.

1050 So we are going to have this debate at some point and I think if we are truly committed to action on this then, in light of Deputy Oliver's comments, in light of the advice from the private sector, that they are going to need a decision in this area, in light of the history of their involvement in getting us to this point, I think that the amendment which Deputy Helyar and I lodged in June 2021 that is re-presented today is a very good way to move us on and for that reason, persuaded by Deputy Oliver, I will be supporting the amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Fairclough.

1055 **Deputy Fairclough:** Thank you, madam.

I have to admit, I am between the White Rock and a hard place. *(Laughter)* I appreciate and understand that development agencies are or can be nimbler than Government in delivering construction projects, but as ever this is about getting the balance right between setting the strategic direction and allowing unfettered delivery against those strategy objectives. I would like to quote from the policy letter section 5.4 when talking about development agencies elsewhere. It states:

A critical component that is being missed in some other jurisdictions is the need for clear, strategic direction set by Government.

1065 And for all the reasons elucidated already, I think priority has to be given to our harbours. It was a point I made when asked to comment during the drafting stage of this policy letter. However, are A to F of this amendment, the elements I would have chosen? Possibly not. And that is the problem I have.

But I do know we need to get on with these planning briefs and I know as Amendment 1, which I apologise for referring to but which I will be supporting, states:

1070 This can only follow a decision of the States, which provides direction as to the future development of commercial port infrastructure for Guernsey.

So I would appreciate it if someone, perhaps Deputy Roffey when he is summing up, could clarify if, when and how regardless of whether this Amendment 9 is successful, that direction will be given. Thank you, madam.

1075 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, madam.

1080 I want to quote Deputy Burford. I was not going to speak but I was drawn to my feet by some subsequent speeches to the ones that she referenced. To quote Deputy Oliver, I have been very torn about this amendment too. I have to say, I think it has been an excellent contribution from those who have spoken so far. I think my speech will be less so because I am just picking up on various points, but it has really helped me in clarifying where I should go on this. Because I have been torn and I did not necessarily understand the point of having this amendment previously, but the speeches have been really helpful in giving me that direction and the detail.

1085 I think it was actually Deputy Burford that spoke about that which made me really think about this. She has referenced the Seafront Enhancement Area Group, or whatever it is called now, and did not know what it was doing and would it not be good to have had an appendix? I think she is right. I mean, it is a question that I asked before the publication of the policy letter, and it seems to me very little and I think it is doing very little at the moment because it cannot do very much until it has got some direction. And it is just waiting for this States to actually make a decision. For me that was an important part of all this.

1090 We talk about pet projects and I hear a Deputy talking about how he has got pet projects, everybody has got a pet project on this. Well I have not actually, I really just do not. I just want to see something happen and actually make the seafront fit for purpose. The question is what purpose is that because we do not know.

1095 We have not made any decision on that at all. We just say, 'Oh, just pass it all to a development agency and they will sort it out.' But I think as for the various reasons that have been said, I think Deputy Oliver in particular put this across very well, and Deputy Parkinson's, in particular, speech really gave the detail that we needed on that to say they will be flailing about not knowing what they are doing, unless they get some sort of strategic direction as Deputy Fairclough is talking about.

But for me, the big issue is coastal defences. We talk about car parks and the need for a pool marina and some other lovely great big building we can all put our name to and open with a ribbon, but it is the coast defences that are suffering here. The longer we leave it, the more of a sticky situation we are going to be in because as far as people, hopefully everybody does appreciate, we are seeing sea levels rising and that is not something that we can just hold off by not doing anything. So for me that is why it is crucial that we do not leave things forever and we actually make a decision.

And I thought it was interesting because both Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Falla and Deputy Gollop, all of whom have said why they would support this amendment, all went to the ID debate the other month. I thought it was really interesting. The impression I got from that – well not just an impression, it was very clear – was the need for direction. The States just cannot hand it all off and say, 'Well, it has nothing to do with us, you just go off and do it.' I think that really brought it home to me and I think it was very useful. It was a shame there were not more Members there because I think it really did give a lot of context.

But I think Deputy St Pier was absolutely right. It is not as if this amendment has come out of nowhere, it is not a couple of Deputies at the last minute thinking, 'Right, I know what I want to do, I want to move that there and this here and here we go.' We have seen enough of that in the past, but we have not got that right here, right now. This has been going on for years and years. We have been debating and debating it for years and years. And we could continue debating it probably for as long as we have been debating electronic voting – that was a few decades. I can see that happening because nobody feels strong enough to be able to make a decision.

I absolutely understand the concerns on that front. It has been really a whole sorry saga and I do think if we do not support this amendment, it will be a long sorry saga for many years to come and I totally agree with Deputies Parkinson and St Pier that we will not see any action at all in this term if we do not support it.

So I will be supporting this amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: Thank you, madam.

What really brought me to my feet was what was a point of correction or give way from Deputy Ferbrache on Deputy Gabriel's speech, because for me in this whole issue of harbours all I really want to see is the harbours get repaired. My one regret from the Future Harbours debate was I was so focused on not getting the Longue Hougue harbour that I kind of glossed over the whole, 'what do we do instead?' and that is a regret.

So, I can say reading this amendment, 1(A)a is the carrying out of essential repairs to the current harbours. Now Deputy Ferbrache has said that we do not need the amendment to get on with general maintenance, and I would be inclined to agree with that. It makes sense. So the question I would be kind of posing to Deputy Roffey is: is this just in there as a technicality because it was already in the previous paper that you copied and texted from or how would that maintenance take place?

Is it a case of, 'Okay we finally agree that yes, we need to do the maintenance but it will have to wait until all the Development Agency is going on?' Because listening to the debate, and I can hear the way the mood is changing in a way, the points raised by Deputy Oliver and Deputy Parkinson, with the exception of getting spades in the ground, it will be shovels in the ground, I would agree completely on those points. The Planning Law – as much as I just like all of those processes and bits we have to follow through – they will trump all of this. Unless we go through the effort of changing all the Planning Law and processes – which will not be done this term, it will take yonks and yonks – we do have to follow those processes.

So I am attracted to this amendment in that –

Deputy Dyke: Can I make a point of –?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Dyke, you have to wait until Deputy Taylor has given way before you start speaking.

Deputy Dyke: Sorry.

Deputy Taylor: And I give way to Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: I am not sure if it is a point of correction, I thank him for giving way.

In terms of our Planning Laws, there is a slight misconception that I think we all have that there is some sort of tablets from God that cannot be changed in any way. It is possible, if we wish to, to change the Planning Laws in the way that we can change any other Planning Laws and in fact as a point of information that Development & Planning board is putting forward a policy paper which will make changes easier and more streamlined.

So if we do get that through and we find blockages that are stopping things happening at the ports, we may be able to make specific changes to the Planning Laws which will help us get this through. I hope that was helpful.

Deputy Taylor: Madam, I am in two minds as to whether to give way to Deputy Ferbrache because he does not normally give way to me! *(Laughter)* And yesterday I gave way to him, even when he had a really angry face and I knew he was going to give me a telling off and I still gave way. *(Laughter)*. But seeing as he is smiling and hopefully he will take those comments on board I will give way to him.

Deputy Ferbrache: It was only to ask a question of Deputy Taylor because it will influence what I am going to say when I speak.

Did he say that he was against a harbour at Longue Hogue? I did not hear him clearly, so that is all. So I am very grateful for him giving way and I may give way to him in the future, but I do not make that promise for sure.

Deputy Taylor: I am glad I gave way to Deputy Ferbrache there. Treat others how you wish to be treated and all that. *(Laughter)*

No, I do not think I had got onto that but that absolutely is one of the points and that is what will hold me back from voting for this amendment: I categorically object to a new harbour being built. I just do not see the justification. I do not want to go through that debate, we have had that debate. I have given my reasons, but that would be the reason I could not support this amendment.

But a lot of logic in terms of the strategic direction that we need. I think if we did not have this amendment we would just be going around in circles. It will not be STSB, it will just be a board with a different name will be going away doing a whole load of lovely things. They might come up with some lovely ideas, but it will all come a cropper because of planning issues.

Taking on board the comments by Deputy Dyke when I gave way to him, again I do not disagree with Deputy Dyke. Yes, this Government can bring changes to the Planning Law. But no one has done it. I have not got the knowledge, I do not understand it enough to be able to make those changes, and the people who do understand it enough to make those changes are busy doing other things such as planning exemptions and all bits to bring those changes.

So I feel we are a bit stuck, although I do agree with him. I do not like all the Planning Law but that is what we have to work within, as much as it pains me to say that. So, I feel this amendment would have been better and maybe I should bring an amendment – I do not know what Members would think of this – if it was basically the same wordings but insert this that we would go with option two from the Future Harbours, which would be giving us our strategic direction to say that we are going to work within the confines of the existing harbour, we can reconfigure and we will get on with the repairs.

1205 That might be a better amendment, I do not know. But I really would be grateful to Deputy Roffey in his summing up, or maybe Deputy Brouard, if I gave way to him.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you very much for giving way, Deputy Taylor.

1210 Just to say that myself and Deputy Prow, if this amendment is successful, we would probably be asking the States if they would accept an amendment that would also look at the alternative of configuring the port expansion at St Peter Port. So, in other words, Longue Hougue would not be the only issue in Town, it would also expand it to looking at what we have already got at the harbour at St Peter Port which may help him in that direction.

Thank you.

1215

Deputy Taylor: I am grateful to Deputy Brouard.

I will wrap up because I do not think I have really got any more that I can add to it. Just to, I suppose, back up Deputy Oliver and Deputy Parkinson on the issues we will have if we do not vote for this amendment, you know the planning issues and how it will hold us up, but to say that I really do not think that I can support it because of that whole Longue Hougue issue that I just think is totally unnecessary. So I will take back to my seat and look forward to a response from Deputy Roffey.

1220

The Deputy Bailiff: If nobody else wishes to – oh, Deputy Haskins.

1225

Deputy Haskins: Thank you.

I did not want to come to my feet to speak because I thought that the amendment was pointless. I do not support it. I am here stumbling for words because I think the whole argument now has changed. But I just wanted to point out something to Members that paragraph F in the amendment says it is combination five or combination six.

1230

So combination five is some commercial activity, moving up to the northern port if indeed ... this is what we are deciding is to have a northern port, that is what we are deciding here. Now combination six is all freight, fuel and international passengers, so ro-ro. That is also going to go up there. But do not forget, it is tidily restrictive up there so that is why we have got it in here as an option.

1235

But if you do reconfigure the harbour, you need to make the decision between five and six before you then say, 'Right, now are we going to have the whole of St Peter Port as a leisure facility and we can build new flats or we can have that direction.' You are going to need to make that decision between five and six anyway, and how long is that going to take? Because you need to do more detailed, we covered that off last year. That is why this does not make any sense and I absolutely cannot support this.

1240

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

1245 **Deputy Matthews:** Thank you, madam.

I also was not going to speak on this amendment, but I think that a couple of things have made me want to do so. I will be supporting it after, actually, what Deputy Brouard intervened with just before, and that is because I do feel that the Development Agency does need some sort of direction. We have had an awful lot of talk about how nothing has happened because politicians and Deputies over the years have been interfering and wanting to have their say and wanting to decide the colours of doors and what should be served in restaurants and things.

1250

Well, I do not think I have made any decisions regarding what sort of doors or what the dado rail will be. Absolutely, it is a false narrative. We have not made any decisions at all, and the only debate that we did have in relation to this was the debate regarding the future options for the harbour and I entirely follow Deputy Parkinson's argument. That is really – and Deputy de

1255

Sausmarez, I think, described it as a cornerstone before you can really make any decisions about what you are going to do with the rest of the seafront.

And I think that we are losing sight to some extent of what is really needed in the Island and what people outside of this Chamber really think that we ought to be doing. We are spending an awful lot of time talking about how politicians and Deputies want to interfere with things, and the thrust of things seems to be, well instead of having politicians involved with it, we will get business people involved and they can make decisions about what we are going to do with the east coast instead and they can have a decision about how we are going to run the Island.

And I think we do often lose sight of the fact that in the real world we have got things like a housing crisis happening where young people cannot find houses to live in and there is an awful lot of land there that is tied up that could be used.

Now, in the harbours debate I cannot remember the option numbers as they were numbered at the time, but I supported the Deputy Prow/Deputy Brouard amendment to build the harbour there and I shall support this amendment, Amendment 9, on the basis that there will be a subsequent amendment to also consider alternately locating the freight harbour away from Longue Hougue. But I think something needs to happen, we need to make some decisions and we need to really get some strategic direction and I do not think that the right approach is just to simply say, 'Well politicians have not decided anything in the past, we will give it all to another group to decide something instead'. I think there needs to be a direction there. So I shall support this amendment.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Murray.

Deputy Murray: Thank you, madam.

I certainly was not going to get to my feet, but I think the last two speakers have certainly suggested to me that somebody has to put this back into context. Yesterday we rejected an amendment that took a lot of political involvement in decision-making off the table and now what we are doing is actually allowing individual politicians to put back in their particular wish list of what they want to see included in what we tell the agency to do.

Now, I completely accept that a major decision is where the harbour goes. That is absolutely fundamental and from the DPA's perspective it is why we have laid our own amendment, because we cannot get on with local planning briefs if we do not know where that particular harbour is supposed to be. And that will create a delay, which is why our amendment has suggested that we would need 18 months when that decision is made.

But what we are now basically doing is hamstringing the decisions of the agency by suggesting what we as individuals – and I am talking about individuals – would like to see. I understand Deputy Brouard's approach saying, 'Well if you do that, I will do this.' Now this is going to take us right back around to where we actually were before. We cannot carry on doing that, it is just not practical and pragmatic to do it. We have to think about this in the round, and we are not capable of doing that individually without putting forward our own preferences and prejudices. So I suggest that we do not try to hamstring this agency with our own ideas about what they should and should not do, and I would reject this out of hand.

Thank you.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, madam.

Like other speakers, I was not intending to speak on this amendment but the call to approve this amendment has driven me to my feet. I did have other Members request yesterday that I support

this amendment and it prompted me to go back and look at the June 16th debate last year on the Future Harbours development.

1310 That was a long, hard debate with a lot of amendments. One of those amendments, Amendment 6, that formed Proposition 6, was actually the precursor to this Development Agency being established. Because what the Assembly decided in that meeting after a very long and difficult debate was to reject the proposals that were in this amendment and to form a development agency to go away and consider this in the round.

1315 And if I give you the voting on the substantive Propositions that covered what is in this amendment; 1, Contre 21, Pour 13; Proposition 2, Contre 20, Pour 14; Proposition 3, tied at 17; Proposition 4, Contre 22, Pour 12. So basically a two to one majority against what is in this plan, and yet there was a vote 24 to 9 in favour of instructing P&R to come back with a proposal for this Development Agency.

1320 But effectively we are backtracking here and going back and saying, 'Well, we will approve that plan now without really debating again and considering all the issues at the time right now just to give direction to this agency.' Well this agency was being established because that plan was rejected. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) So I am not quite sure of the logic and the good governance in this process.

1325 So I will not be unfortunately voting for this. I do appreciate Deputy Parkinson's position in his speech. As I said yesterday, I thought his speech on the failed Amendment 8 was the best, even though he was voting against it and I absolutely follow his logic and the requirement for this Assembly to give direction to the Development Agency for it to be able to function, but I do not think agreeing this proposal on the fly when it was so roundly rejected the last time without proper consideration is the way to go.

1330 Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: No one else wishes to speak on the amendment, I invite Deputy Ferbrache as President of P&R.

1335 **Deputy Ferbrache:** So I really am – I am not just saying it – grateful for all the contributions because it stirred up debate. Although my respectful view, correctly ruled by the Deputy Bailiff, not that she needs my respectful view, that this was outside the terms of the policy letter, I voted for it to be debated, it was the right thing to do, we have had some excellent speeches particularly if I may say so from Deputy Parkinson.

1340 I think the last speaker hit the nail on the head. He looked at the debate, he went back, he took the trouble last night or whenever he did it to look back and he has referred to the votes, and they were clear votes against these proposals. And yet on the hoof, we are looking if we approve, and I will come to the actual wording of the amendment in due course, to tell the Development Agency – because it is unequivocal, it is prescriptive, it is not permissive – that they must follow that particular line. Again a point very well made by Deputy Haskins in his brief speech.

1345 So we are telling them what to do. We are telling them because the cost, if I remember for that policy letter, was about £300 million-£350 million. We are telling them to spend £300 million-£350 million without any proper debate.

1350 Now we talk about flip-flop government, and I was very attracted to the initial point made by Deputy Brouard. He blotted his copybook a bit at the end when he interjected and said, 'If this amendment passes, I and Deputy Prow are going to bring another amendment.' And it looks as though the two of them would be in total conflict if the States passed two of them, I do not know what ... The Development Agency would go to the moon to get some common sense because they would be in total conflict with each other.

1355 But can I just remind Members, we are talking about flip-flop Government but about five o'clock or thereabouts last night we passed I think unanimously, but certainly overwhelmingly, what was then Amendment 3 which was proposed by Deputy St Pier who is now going to support this

amendment, but yet proposed this amendment that was successful last night supported by Deputy Helyar which reads as follows:

1360

To delete Proposition 1 and insert the following:

"1. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee, in consultation with the States' Trading Supervisory Board, to set-out the options for Guernsey's future operational harbour and commercial port infrastructure requirements for approval by the States.

We passed that at five o'clock last night, and yet Deputy St Pier, who is very much in favour of good governance, stands up and makes a speech in favour of – I am not going to give way, I am saving him getting to his feet. I would have given way to Deputy Taylor because I owe him one but I do not owe Deputy St Pier anything! (*Laughter*)

1365

So in relation to that, we just passed that amendment last night. No debate, yes, yes, yes. I stood up, said P&R supported it, absolutely, and everybody else voted for it. And yet here we are, we are saying something completely different at 11.41 and 32 seconds the next morning.

And also, I think I have got considerable respect for Deputy Gollop. We started working together as States' representatives in 1997. I always enjoy his speeches, I am never quite sure where they are going to conclude, but I do enjoy his speeches. They are all erudite and they are certainly interesting.

1370

But what Amendment 9 says, it is totally prescriptive. There is no wiggle room at all because all it says is:

To insert a new Proposition 1A, after Proposition 1:-

"1A. In relation to the island's future harbour requirements, to agree the long-term development plan should include ...

– not could include, *should* include –

the following elements, as described in the States' Trading Supervisory Board's policy letter dated 6th May 2021 entitled "Future Harbour Development" ... which was debated by the States of Deliberation in June 2021: a. Carrying out essential repairs to the ...

1375

– harbour, b, reconfiguring, etc. –

c. Constructing a new northern port at Longue Hougue South;

So if the States passes this amendment, it will become a substantive Resolution and if it is then voted for at the end of this debate, what will happen is that there will have to be a new harbour at Longue Hougue, without any debate at all. We had a long debate, as Deputy Meerveld said, a considered debate. We came to a vote, just nine, nearly 10, it is April now, I should remember, Deputy Brouard made me think about 1st April, it is a date I have always got to remember because it is my daughter Briony's birthday, so there we are, that is in *Hansard*.

1380

So in relation to that, will we say we debated it properly, we had all the papers before us, all the reports before us, we gave it due thought, we thought about it a lot and we rejected it. But now on a whim, we are going to debate it, we are going to tell the Development Agency it is going to have to spend £350 million, it is going to have all the problems that Deputy Inder in particular talked about I think in June of last year, of tidal things etc. none of which I really understood.

1385

And I find great affinity for the STSB, I really enjoyed my presence in the STSB. I really like working with the officers, I really like working with my colleagues. They were a constructive lot. They were probably the most constructive band of people, save for the present composition of the P&R Committee, of course, that I have ever worked with in the States, they wanted to get things done.

1390

But where is the consultation? I sat with Deputy Roffey last Friday – and with Deputy de Sausmarez, and I except her from this criticism – I sat with him at a Housing Action Group meeting where we were giving a presentation to the States. I sat there for about, I think we were there about an hour and a half or so, left, and then I get home and I find that the STSB are going to bring this amendment.

1395

Now bear in mind as Deputy Helyar said, and look at paragraph 2.3 of the policy letter, the subcommittee created by P&R had on it Stuart Falla who is a leading member – not a States' Member, a leading member – a long-term member of the STSB, John Hollis who was a long-term member of the STSB who came off quite recently, and Stuart Holden who was a member of the Ports Board. So, those three people were parties to the policy letter.

It had so many iterations and variations and I think one of the comments that Deputy St Pier made in a different context when comparing it with the Ukraine policy letter, it was written by too many people and therefore if you write things by too many people you do not actually get sometimes the totally coherent response that you should have. It is still not bad, it still gives the real elements of what we are looking at.

But Deputy Roffey and the STSB, knowing that this was in their mind, could have spoken to P&R. They could have said to P&R, 'We are going to come, we are going to have these views, we are going to discuss it with you. What are your views?' We might have still come to the same conclusion that by a majority we are in disagreement with the STSB today, but we did not have that courtesy.

Now Deputy Roffey, I remember I had the audacity to express a personal opinion 18 months or so ago about housing matters in a debate, in speech I was giving at the – where was it, one of these posh hotels – OGH, that is it. It was not that, it was a posh hotel, the OGH.

So, I remember him being there and outraged. His dignity, he said, 'How dare you express a view that is contrary to my view and how dare you not discuss things with me?' And here he comes along, £350 million, a mere bagatelle, perhaps, to Deputy Roffey, but to me it is quite a lot of money, to the States of Guernsey it is a lot of money. A mere bagatelle. Just come along and we will just have on the hoof a £350 million harbour without any due proper consideration at all.

Deputy Oliver thinks that is alright, I have got to say I do not agree with her from Planning because I think it should go through a proper planning process, it should be properly considered. What we should do is go back to the amendment that we have passed at five o'clock last night unanimously and say that these things should be done in consultation and discussion between the STSB and the Policy & Resources Committee.

But 'no, we are going to do it this way', it is something that Deputy Roffey and Deputy Parkinson feel passionate about.

As Deputy St Pier said, I was actually President at the time the genesis of this all came about, but I realised that we got to go through something like this due process. I agree with Deputy Gabriel, the harbour, obviously, because the harbour is the key and the harbours are the key on any development along the eastern seaboard, they should be properly done and they should be quickly done. I think it is an absolute nonsense to say 'essential repairs' if this amendment passed, complete rubbish, because essential repairs have not been done over a period of time because there has been no money to do them.

One of the examples that Deputy Parkinson gave was the pier and the steps, the passageway outside of Castle Cornet. Now, we did not do that when I was at STSB because we did not have the money. It was going to cost millions. It would have cost millions. Did it come out of Education's budget? Did it come out of so-and-so's budget? It could not have come out of STSB's budget because we did not have millions of pounds to do it.

So that was the reason it did not get done. It needs to get done and in a very careful and understated way, a very proper way, Deputy Parkinson pointed out the urgency of the need for it to be done. I do not think it needs this amendment to get that done. We have got to decide what we are going to do in relation to maintenance, they should decide what they are going to do –

I give way to Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Well the other thing we need to do is decide what the purpose of that bridge is. Are we going to create a solid wall to keep the sea out or is it a bridge and if it is a bridge is it double the width of the current bridge so that buses can get up there? We could just repair it, but is that the right thing to do?

Deputy Ferbrache: I think that is a fair point, I accept that completely, but it is part of the overall package. We have got to get things ... Deputy Roffey in his speech said it is always great to be the last speaker because you can always then disabuse everything else that everybody else has said. But in relation to that, there needs to be development in the harbour. It is a mess. We need to have a proper policy. We need to give direction to the Development Agency.

Go back to Amendment 3 as it was last night agreed by us at five o'clock. Why would we change it? I know we have got a reputation, both this States and previous States, for making a decision one day and challenging and changing it the next. But that is generally a figurative distinction, while in this case it will be an actual decision because we would have changed something on the hoof.

I have got to say, I have got great sympathy. I want to see the harbour developed. I want to see the eastern seafront developed. The way to do it is through a development agency to do it on the hoof because we want to get things done today is –

I give way to Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: I take the opportunity of a slight change in Deputy Ferbrache's tone and I sense that he might be slightly more amenable to giving way, so I am grateful to him.

Does he accept that voting this amendment would in fact be a discharge of Proposition 1 under the amendment that he is referring to? It might not be the discharge that he would like, but it would nonetheless discharge that part of the amendment that he refers to.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, I never questioned the integrity of any States' Member and I do not in this case, but does Deputy St Pier really believe what he has just said? Because how can it be? What consultation has there been from five o'clock last night till 11.50 and 22 seconds between STSB and Policy & Resources? The answer is absolutely none.

It is a nonsense to say that there is so how can it be a discharge of that? I do not think that anybody could realistically suggest that it is. But we must – and I do not want to go outside of the terms of this amendment because quite rightly the Deputy Bailiff would restrict me – we must get on with letting the Development Agency go forward.

We must, between P&R and STSB, which is not a political body. I had Deputy Roffey say it to me when I was President of the STSB, I have had other people say it to me when I was President of STSB, 'You are not a political body, step out of politics and set out a policy. Your job is to act as a stakeholder, as a shareholder, for the various incorporated and unincorporated entities of the States such as Aurigny, etc.'

So I respectfully ask my colleagues, madam through you, to say, as alluring as the very able speeches made particularly by Deputy Parkinson, to reject this amendment, otherwise you would be putting the development in a strait jacket and you will be committing the States on the hoof to £300 million-£350 million worth of expenditure without any idea where that money is going to come from.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, Madam Deputy Bailiff.

It has been a slightly weird debate because those people, or most of those people, who have argued against this amendment have put forward really cogent arguments that I think support this amendment. Because their basic ethos, their basic philosophy, has been, 'Do not fence in this new beast that we are going to create, this new Development Agency. Let it roam wild like a migrating gnu down the East Coast of Guernsey. (Laughter) What is the point of having it if you are going to fence it in?'

Do not pass this amendment, and it is heavily fenced in, because we will not be able to proceed with drawing up the local planning briefs for St Sampson's Harbour and St Peter Port Harbour, which is where the vast majority of the opportunities exist and therefore they will not be able to do anything. So they have argued absolutely against their own wishes really.

Deputy Ferbrache just said this amendment is prescriptive. Yes it is. It is asking the States to make a decision, and when you make a decision on something you prescribe that that is what you want to do and not other stuff. Others have pointed out that a similar proposal lost, as did every other proposal, I have to say, about what we want to do with our harbours last year. It did. The STSB, or certainly Deputy Parkinson and I, feel that that was a wrong decision, we think that it is quite clear we are setting up this agency that a prerequisite is getting on with the harbour planning briefs and therefore we need to make a decision, and we are asking you to change your mind.

And to some extent, you could decide something else. You could decide to stay within the parameters for the current harbour. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) You could decide, you would be bonkers, you could decide east of the current harbour. But for goodness' sake, make a decision. I am depressed when I hear that if this amendment is carried, we will have another amendment to add in another option.

That means we will not have made a decision. We will be keeping it completely open. I would rather that somebody brought one that actually did away with the STSB's preferred stance and replaced it with something else because at least then the DPA would know what this Assembly wants and be able to get on with the job.

Let me go through some of the individual points. Let me just deal with maintenance for a start. Deputy Taylor was partly right that the reason maintenance was mentioned is the fact that it was lifted from what our preferred stance was in the Billet, the Ports Billet that came last year. Deputy Ferbrache is of course right. You do not need a proposal to do essential maintenance. But this really comes back to the question that Deputy Queripel asked, which is who was responsible for the lack of maintenance over the years? Was it the Public Services Department? Well, partly. Partly it was the Board of Administration. It goes back decades.

I am not sure it was meant to happen, there has been investment, of course, but there has been underinvestment and there is a need to catch up. And to be honest, there is no money in the Ports Holding Account to allow that to happen and at the moment that account is running at a deficit, having to borrow money and an overdraft and pay interest to P&R. So there is no prospect of it just being done unless you really want to quadruple more in fees and landing fees for all the goods that you will push up the price of inflation and everything else in that way.

I will go through a couple of the other comments. Deputy Inder said he did not accept it was true, that we cannot move forward until we have decided what to do with the harbours. Well, yes it is as Deputy Parkinson said we know from better experience, it is absolutely true and it will apply just as much to a new Development Agency as it does to a States' Committee. He said North Beach can be released now, we do not have to decide what we are going to have to do.

Well, no we cannot. If the ro-ro ramps are going to remain there, it is quite clear, talk to the harbourmaster, actually not only can it not be released, but probably the security area is going to need to move further west, encompass more of North Beach and the rest of the environs of the harbour because, to comply with international regulations, we will actually have to do that. We have a dispensation at the moment, if the authorities can see that we are aiming to provide a port elsewhere, we might be able to maintain that dispensation. If they believe we are just going on doing what we are doing, then it is very likely that not only will we not be able to release that area, but we will actually have to take more of the public realm for ports activities.

Deputy Brouard said that we were asking to do a flip-flop. Absolutely. That is what we are asking you to do. But flip-flop not from a decision, that you took a decision and then now make a different one. We failed last year to make any kind of decision at all and we want to flip-flop to making a decision. That is actually quite a positive flip-flop in my opinion.

Deputy Prow said we made no decision last time, he is absolutely right. He said we are holding a gun to the Assembly's head by saying that nothing could really happen unless we vote to decide what to do with our commercial ports. That gun, it is not our gun, it is just a gun that exists. It is just the truth. That the Development Agency will not be able to do anything meaningful until the planning briefs have been drawn up and we know, and we are going to go onto Amendment 1 later

today supported by P&R, that DPA will say they cannot start work on that until they have got the decision on the harbours and it will then take 18 months.

1555 Deputy Dyke was under the misapprehension that the pool marina would be stopped by this amendment. It will not. However, I have to say I am a big supporter in principle of the pool marina. We do not know whether it will ever even happen yet, that is what the £1.8 million is being spent on, on doing the investigations in the harbour. It looks like the piling will be quite expensive because of the five metres of silt, but it looks like it is achievable. Not everybody will like it aesthetically because a high tide, the piles will not be that noticeable; at low tide, they will be very noticeable as
1560 you come into the harbour but it looks like it can be done.

This amendment will not stop it, but what I would say is that of course I am passionate about the leisure marine activities in our harbour, that is an important part of the mandate. But at times over the last year or so, it has looked as if that has been the main driver, the most important thing for this Assembly about providing enough leisure berths. It is really important, but it pales into
1565 insignificance compared with the importance of the infrastructure for our commercial shipping. And the main fact that we have, luckily as we become more affluent as a community, had more leisure activities inside our harbours, has just emphasised the need for proper commercial facilities elsewhere.

Now, why is STSB suggesting we go back on our non-decision and make a decision it should go
1570 on Longue Hougue? It is not my vision, I can tell Deputy Queripel that. I was not involved in drawing up those proposals, nor was Deputy Parkinson – not directly of course. The STSB had reports from time to time. It is not one person's idea on the hoof you are being asked to do it. The proposals were done at the behest of this Assembly and I can tell Deputy Helyar that the reason the STSB did it was because we were told to do it by this Assembly.

1575 And although I accept we are not a policy making body, sometimes the people who control the staff, who have got the expertise and the professionalism, who actually discharge those duties every day, are best placed to advise on policy, and that was I think the reason why the States gave it to us to do.

It was driven by people like the harbourmaster. It was driven under the chairmanship of
1580 somebody who is very commercial, it has been pointed out, Deputy Stuart Falla, who has, incidentally, let me know in no uncertain terms he is fully behind this amendment. It used all the best technical minds in this area of commercial shipping and commercial port provision that we have in the Island, and it drew on technical assistance from elsewhere.

This is not Roffey's folly. I have got no particular desire to see a port at Longue Hougue south;
1585 in fact in some ways I regret the fact that some of the natural attributes of that area might be compromised. I am the messenger bringing to you, saying that the real professionals are saying after consultation ... may not have done it over the last few days, but it has been done and we all know it has been done, with all the main stakeholders that overwhelmingly that is the right place to put our commercial shipping.

1590 It is only when we actually have the courage to either accept that and vote for it, which is what this amendment is about, or reject it and make an alternative decision that we will actually be able to start the planning process that will allow us to develop the east coast in the way we all want and to set this Development Agency free.

In fact, I have no idea who is going to be in this agency – professional people, but the idea that
1595 they would have the expertise of the people who looked into this during the ports investigation, beggars belief. They will not have that expertise. But being good professional people, they will go to those people, the same people that we went to, and say, 'Please give us advise.' So it is vanishingly unlikely they will come up with a different solution.

I do not know, he is not in the Assembly, I am not sure how many of Deputy Queripel's tangential
1600 issues I should ... The lighthouse walls were not maintained. They had a design fault. The hydrocarbons policy was very helpful in informing the ports policy, but anyway as he is not here I am not going to bore Members by going through all the points that he raised.

Deputy Helyar said that when we came back to the States, the work was not finished last year. We were not sure whether option six could be practically done. That is absolutely right. That is why we will say we are absolutely sure that option five can be delivered because you do not need to use that sort of port at high spring tides or low spring tides; you can time the delivery.

It may well be possible to get a bigger bang for your buck by doing option six. But it is chicken and egg. It will take quite a lot of money to investigate to know for sure whether six is deliverable or not, and before moving to the next stage we wanted to find out whether the Assembly as a whole had an appetite to put the new commercial port where all the experts, who have looked at it for 18 months, spending three quarters of a million pounds of your money when you have told them to go away and do it, said it should go. If you do agree, then somebody – it probably will not be us, it will be passed on from us – will get on to finessing exactly what sort of port can be achieved there.

Deputy Le Tocq said do not limit the new agency. That is exactly what I am trying to do – not limit them. He said we all have our individual ideas. This is not my individual idea, not in any way, shape or form. But I think Deputy Gollop is right. He has sat in this States for a very long time, he is the Father of this Assembly and he has seen that our biggest fault is gagging at big decisions, not being able to move forward and, I think this is a classic case in this particular case as well. And I am glad that he is willing to actually go with it.

What we are talking about here, if we make the decision, I think will be absolutely landmark. I am really delighted that I am being invited next week – and I am sure we all are – to a presentation of something that might transform the Bridge and it is the one with the Leale's Yard development. Just imagine what news it would be for the people living around the Bridge. For the Douzaines there that have always been behind making St Sampson's into a leisure harbour, if within a couple of weeks two big decisions are taken, one in principle to turn St Sampson's Harbour to remove the blight of dirty heavy commercial shipping from that harbour and move it into a deep water harbour and then realistic plans for Leale's Yard development coming forward. It will be transformational.

This Development Agency needs to get it into something. It needs not only the development plans to remove the planning blight, but it actually leads to tracts of land ... really be able to deliver the sort of stuff that we have been talking about and then millions of pounds, not just of capital benefit but economic benefit that that activity on those sites around those harbours will actually provide. We need some vision. I am amazed actually that Deputy Ferbrache is mindful not to vote against this. I mean listen to him over the last –

Deputy Ferbrache: Point of correction, I am mindful to vote against it.

Deputy Roffey: Yes, sorry, I beg your pardon.
I am amazed at that fact.

Deputy Brouard: Point of correction, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Deputy Roffey said that he would move the heavy industry shipping from St Sampson's to a deep water harbour. But Longue Hougue is not a deep water harbour, that is why it is tidal and that is why it is restricted. So could he just make the correction?

Thank you.

Deputy Roffey: No, there is no correction.

The tidal element relates to the fact that the tide runs strongly past the entrance. It is the current St Sampson's Harbour which is tidal in the sense of actually drying out. The data shows quite clearly that there is sufficient depth of water, otherwise why on earth would the harbourmaster and everybody else been suggesting that it is a credible alternative? So that is entirely wrong.

1655 No, I am amazed at Deputy Ferbrache. He is a man of action, he is a man of decision, he is a man of resolution, but he is not going to take one today. I think he is right, he is failing the people of Guernsey. I thought he was wrong yesterday when he said that or the day before. I think he might – I give way. I am trying to come to an end really but –

1660 **Deputy St Pier:** Well, that is precisely why I am standing now, because I am sensing you are drawing to an end.

Deputy Ferbrache said that he always liked to speak last because it meant that he could – I cannot remember his phrase – debunk everything that has essentially been said. I do not think that was the word he used (**Deputy Falla:** Disabuse). Disabuse, thank you Deputy Falla.

1665 But fortunately he is not speaking last so it allows me to pose the same question to you that I posed to him, which is do you agree that this amendment would discharge Proposition 1 in the sense – I take Deputy Ferbrache's point that it would not deal with the matter of consultation between P&R and STSB – but in the sense of making a decision on the matter of the commercial port, infrastructure or commerce for approval by the States? Effectively that will have been done by this amendment today.

1670 **Deputy Roffey:** I see it rather differently. I see it that quite often we are faced with a whole suite of amendments and we actually think, well that is the best one, but the one that comes up first is moving in the right direction and therefore you vote for it to improve things. It does not mean you are flip-flopping if you then vote for another one that takes it further. If this amendment fails and
1675 we stick with the one that was approved last night –

Deputy Inder: Point of correction.

1680 **Deputy Roffey:** No, I have stopped giving way –

Deputy Inder: Point of correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: What is your point of correction, Deputy Inder?

1685 **Deputy Inder:** Point of correction is Deputy Roffey's lack of knowledge of what a tidal harbour is. A tidal harbour is effected by tides and access to the tide. It has got nothing to do with the currents at all. So his point of correction to Deputy Brouard is actually incorrect. A tidal harbour by definition is 'access is affected by the tides' of which option five was.

Thank you.

1690 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I am really not sure that is a point of correction.
I have been quite clear –

1695 **Deputy Taylor:** Point of order, madam.

Deputy Roffey – that low and high spring tides –

1700 **Deputy Taylor:** Point of order.
Apologies.

The Deputy Bailiff: Is it a point of correction. Sorry, I did not hear what you said, Deputy Taylor.

1705 **Deputy Taylor:** A point of order for 4(1)(d).

Where there are no financial implications to the States, the estimate of the financial implications, blah-de-blah. In the amendment it says there are no additional financial implications to the States for carrying the proposal. Deputy Roffey just said it would cost a lot of money to develop these ideas. I just want to ...

1710

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Taylor, this amendment has already gone through the gatekeeping process that allows the amendment be put forward by the States so that process has gone forward. So it is not necessary for me to rule on that now.

So, carry on Deputy Roffey.

1715

Deputy Roffey: I am not sure who to carry on with. *(Laughter)* I am certainly not going to give way again, which will only tempt everybody to make points of correction.

Anyway, the fact is that I have been absolutely clear that, yes, there is an issue at high and low spring tides about accessing the harbour. To that extent it is tidal, it is very different to the existing St Sampson's Harbour which actually dries out. But more to the point, and ask the Douzaines of that area, that although it is in the St Sampson's, it takes it out of the nucleated settlement that is so precious to the people in the north and can actually allow transformation, absolute transformation, of the north of Guernsey and likewise, it will allow such valuable land around St Peter Port Harbour to actually be released for this new Development Agency to be able to move forward with.

1725

As I say, I think I could be Deputy Ferbrache here today saying so strong vision, let us have some action today because without it we know we are going to pass Amendment 1. Nothing at all can happen in this Assembly. As Deputy Parkinson says, it is really down to Members; you can lead a horse to water, you cannot make them drink. Please at some stage make a decision, and it is going to be a big decision and therefore it is going to spook you whenever you take it, whether it is today or in six months' time, or a year's time. The only difference when we do it in a year's time is you will make sure that nothing significant can be achieved in this political term.

1730

I hope that is not what you want, I hope you will vote for this amendment.

1735

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

States Greffier, there has been a request for a recorded vote.

There was a recorded vote.

Lost – Pour 15, Contre 19, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 3.

POUR

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Trott
Deputy Burford
Deputy Bury
Deputy Cameron
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Falla
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Matthews
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Roffey

CONTRE

Deputy Taylor
Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Blin
Deputy Brouard
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Prow
Deputy Queripel

NE VOTE PAS

Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep.
Snowdon

ABSENT

Deputy McKenna
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to Amendment 9, there voted Pour 15, Contre 19, there were 2 abstentions and 3 absentees. I declare the amendment lost.

1740

[Amendment 11.](#)

To insert a new Proposition 1A, after Proposition 1:-

"1A. In relation to the island's future harbour requirements, to agree that the development agency should investigate, as a priority, how the long-term development plan could include the following elements, as described in the States' Trading Supervisory Board's policy letter dated 6th May 2021 entitled "Future Harbour Development" (Billet d'État XIII of 2021), which was debated by the States of Deliberation in June 2021:

- a. Constructing a new northern port at Longue Hougue South;*
- b. Relocation of all current commercial activity away from St Sampson Harbour to the new northern port, and converting St Sampson Harbour to leisure use only;*
- c. Improving the leisure sector offering in St Peter Port Harbour; and*
- d. Relocating some or all current commercial freight activity from St Peter Port Harbour, as described in Combination 5 or Combination 6 in the Policy Letter entitled 'Future Harbour Development' (Billet d'État XIII of 2021)."*

and to request the Development & Planning Authority to regard this direction to the development agency as a strategic indication of the States' preferred option for the location of any possible future commercial ports development, and to use that as guidance in drawing up the Local Planning Briefs for the Harbour Action Areas.

The Deputy Bailiff: Amendment 11.

Yes, Deputy Roffey.

1745

Deputy Roffey: I suppose my observations were getting closer.

I cannot raise the same enthusiasm for Amendment 11 as I could for Amendment 9, but I think it does move us slightly in the right direction and the same direction. And, as I hinted when presenting Amendment 9, we unashamedly, Deputy Parkinson and I, put this forward, because P&R had indicated that this sort of amendment, couched these terms, were as far as they were prepared to go. Whether that remains the case today, you never know with P&R do you? So we will see whether they actually support it on the floor of the Assembly.

1750

I think it is a strategic indication of the direction of travel and I think that is better than being rudderless. But it will not give the crystal clear strategic decision that the DPA may need to crack on. I do not know whether this will be sufficient for them to start work on the development briefs, I fear it probably will not. But it will at least start to give some sort of direction to the new agency, and actually to P&R and STSB who will now be charged under the amendment passed at whatever time it was last night to consider the options.

1755

It is a slightly pale imitation. I still think it is better than what is there at the moment, which gives no indication at all what we want to do with our ports, but I leave it for Members to debate.

1760

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Oh, sorry Deputy Prow.

Deputy Gollop: Madam –

1765

Deputy Prow: Does the amendment have to be seconded, madam?

The Deputy Bailiff: Oh I am terribly sorry, you are absolutely right.

1770

Deputy Prow: I want to raise 24(6), but it needs to be seconded first.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes.

Deputy Parkinson, do you formally second this amendment? Thank you.

Deputy Prow.

1775

Deputy Prow: Thank you, madam.

Please can I raise Rule 24(6)?

Thank you.

1780

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Prow has raised 24(6) which is that this amendment goes beyond the original Proposition.

Therefore, we will put the motion to the Chamber that the amendment does go beyond the original Proposition and if that motion is passed, it means it will not be debated and no vote will be taken on it. So those who support a motion under 24(6) indicate Pour; those against.

1785

I am afraid that is too close to call. We will have a recorded vote.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 18, Contre 14, Ne Vote Pas 0 Absent 7.

POUR

Deputy Taylor
Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Blin
Deputy Brouard
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Prow
Deputy Queripel

CONTRE

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Burford
Deputy Bury
Deputy Cameron
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Falla
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Roffey

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Trott
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Deputy Matthews
Deputy McKenna
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

The Deputy Bailiff: The motion under Rule 24(6) that the amendment be not debated and no vote be taken on it as it goes beyond the original Proposition, there voted Pour 18, Contre 14, there were no abstentions, there were seven absentees; therefore, the motion is carried.

1790

[Amendment 12.](#)

To add the following Proposition:

“6a. To agree that the development agency, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, should identify and include in its development of the strategic direction the most viable option for taking through-traffic off the surface level of the road between the South Esplanade and the North Beach roundabout (or whichever points along the stretch of seafront through St. Peter Port that the agency considers more appropriate) in order to realise greater potential economic, social, and environmental benefits in this area of the public realm.

b. To direct the Development & Planning Authority to take this aspect of the strategic direction into account when developing the Local Planning Brief for the St. Peter Port Harbour Action Area.”

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez, are you laying Amendment 12?

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes please, madam

1795 I would like to lay Amendment 12 in place of Amendment 10, just for clarity so no one is confused if they are still referring to their paper copy of the agenda.

Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez, would you like the States' Greffier to read the amendment?

1800

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes please, madam.
Not least because it will give me time to plug in my laptop.

The Deputy Greffier read out Amendment 12.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

1805 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you madam, Deputy Bailiff.

To confirm, Amendment 12 has the same effect as Amendment 10, but because the original Propositions have been changed by the successful Amendment 3 yesterday, the wording in Amendment 10 needed to be tweaked slightly to align. So really it is just a technical adjustment.

1810 The main difference is that what is now Proposition 1(A) tasked the Development Agency with preparing a strategic direction for approval by the States, so the wording of this Amendment 12 simply reflects that.

1815 Section 9.3 of the policy letter lists the objectives and priorities about strategic direction and the very first bullet point talks about setting the parameters for the provision of infrastructure. This amendment speaks to that point. It is about parameter setting, or more specifically about the scope of our ambition for our seafront, our Town, and the Island as a whole.

It boils down to this single question: do we want to restrict our seafront to its current primary function as a vehicular thoroughfare or do we want to broaden our horizons and expand that range of potential use, exploring other opportunities for our economy, our people and our environment?

1820 Voting for this amendment does not commit us to any particular option, and in fact it does not even commit us to any particular outcome. It simply provides the Development Agency with a clearer parameter for the scope within which to explore various options and means that when the strategic direction returns to the States for approval, we will have the information to make a better informed decision.

1825 This amendment seeks to insert a Proposition that invites the Assembly to agree that the economic, social and environmental opportunities of taking through traffic off the stretch of the seafront running between the harbour and the Town are explored and the most viable option identified.

1830 It was, I suppose, inevitable but frustrating nonetheless that this amendment has largely been framed in the media and subsequent public discussion as being about a tunnel, because that is not its focus. The objective is to explore and exploit the potential for other uses opened up. If there are alternatives to using that stretch of land as a vehicular thoroughfare.

1835 Currently, the road typically carries between 16,000 and 18,000 vehicle movements on a weekday, a little bit less over the weekend. That provides some access to Town and some access through Town, both of which bring associated benefits of course. That vehicular access and through access is an important factor, and I will return to that later.

1840 But that traffic also has some downsides. It has a visual impact. Approaching Guernsey by boat, people are met with a pretty stunning vista, in my admittedly biased opinion, Castle Cornet standing proud over the granite-hemmed harbour, with tall town houses lining the front and spilling up the hill behind, punctuated by the steeple of Town Church on one side and Victoria Tower on the other, and fringe for the healthy smattering of green trees. While the visual impact of the traffic is probably the most of the road's downsides, it does detract from the aesthetics.

As Members know, *al fresco* dining along the front has proved very popular with one of the restaurateurs describing the quay to me as the box-seat at St Peter Port looking out at the Castle

or Bréhon Tower through the masts of the boat in the harbour over the green-blue sea to the islands beyond. Now, *al fresco* is popular in spite of, not because of, the traffic along the road, which, as well as having visual impact, limits the available space and generates unwelcome noise, smell and air pollution that *al fresco* diners would probably happily forego.

And then there is the physical access between the harbour and Town, which the through flow of traffic makes less convenient and less safe for those crossing from the piers and back on foot, especially those with young children in tow. These are arguably all downsides that we certainly can, and already do, live with. They are the price we currently pay for vehicular access to and through the seafront, and it is important that these remain considerations. So it is all about access.

But the biggest traffic impact of all is opportunity cost. If we did not need to use that land as a vehicular thoroughfare, how else might we use it? Events like Seafront Sundays and the Harbour Carnival give us a helpful taste of some of those potential uses, if only for one-off occasions. But they serve as a useful reminder of just how much space there is along the front and how differently it can be used when it is free from through traffic.

There is room to socialise, to sit, to stand, to relax, chat, eat, drink, grab a Guernsey ice-cream. There is room for children to play and people of all ages to enjoy live music or Crown and Anchor or browse stores of local art and craft and cake and all manner of other goods on offer.

Now those are of course one-off events and a permanent traffic-free seafront would be a different proposition. But like those one-off events, it would be a more people-centred space with plenty of room for social, recreational and commercial activity. We do not actually have to look very far for ideas. Thanks to the DPA, the St Peter Port Regeneration Area's Development Framework process has already done much of that work for us. It draws on waterfront regeneration projects elsewhere to identify some of the exciting potential for our own seafront.

The Development Framework envisages a wide promenade with new seating areas, these are all potential uses of course, including spill out seating from buildings and frontage activity along the harbourside to maximise opportunities to enjoy the views. It suggests potentially a covered open air pavilion with seating and outdoor space to support the potential for things like markets and performances. It envisages more planting, including features like raingardens, which would not only introduce greenery and support biodiversity, but would also help produce impermeable surfaces and mitigate flood risk.

The Framework scopes the potential for what it calls 'play elements' to facilitate leisure activities for all ages, including for example, table tennis or pétanque and maybe a fountain or even a water feature for playing in for those that fancy it, I have got a few children that would. It envisages well-integrated public art and an opportunity to reflect our culture and heritage in a truly attractive setting, far more fitting of its twin backdrops, land and sea.

It envisages an improved range of transport options, the connected routes to and through the area for better active travel and better facilities for public transport. For example, moving the bus terminus to a dedicated transport hub with a proper bus station, integrated parking for shoppers and commuters, EV charging, secure bike or e-bike storage, and maybe even a car club for Town residents so that they can have vehicles on demand without the hassle of having to play parking roulette. And it goes without saying that access to the area for people, services and deliveries is a key consideration that would be at the heart of any good design.

Now, all these ideas are not mine. Thanks to the DPA's consultation process in the regeneration areas, they come from members of the public and from different States' Committees; exactly the kind of consultation that the debate on Amendment 8 yesterday underscored was so important. And neither is it pie in the sky. The Development Framework draws on a few different examples of where this kind of project has worked really well. And there are many such examples to choose from.

Paris, for example closed roads along a seven kilometre stretch on the River Seine and introduced sports facilities, play areas, seating areas, beaches yes, and plenty of green space and planting to attract and support nature, turning it into an attractive place to spend time on what was previously a traffic-dominated stretch.

And examples like this do not just happen because it makes them a nicer place to spend time in. Politicians do not decide to do them out of the goodness of their hearts. Waterfront redevelopments exist because they make economic sense as well as social and environmental sense. The highest level of evidence of this fact is that they exist and they persist. They would not do so if they did not work at that fundamental economic level.

Now evidence abounds that repurposing previously traffic-dominated areas has a positive economic effect. For example, retail turnover in pedestrianised areas generally outperforms non-pedestrianised areas, and shop vacancy rates tend to be significantly lower than in high traffic areas. When Exeter, for example, removed vehicular traffic from a series of roads and invested in its public realm, there was an increase in footfall of 30% and retail take in the area also went up and stayed up at a time when it was dropping in other towns in the region.

So I am sure Members of the Assembly understand the sheer range of potential associated with the objective of opening up the stretch of land. So the question is, how might this potential objective be achieved? Well, frustrating though the inevitable framing of this amendment around the concept of a tunnel has been, the reality is that there are quite a number of different ways to achieve that aim of taking traffic off the surface level of the road.

One of the options could indeed be a tunnel or an underpass, call it what you will, which would facilitate through access but take it off that surface level to release that use for other purposes. But even this, there are different variations on the theme of diverting traffic under the area. The most obvious option is perhaps to go under the road, but equally it could go under or perhaps just inside the harbour, possibly incorporating some of that all-too necessary coastal defence that Deputy Soulsby quite rightly referred to.

I will not be giving way. Deputy Vermeulen will have his chance to speak later.

Deputy Vermeulen: Point of correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: What is your point of correction, Deputy Vermeulen?

Deputy Vermeulen: Deputy de Sausmarez alludes to deliveries, but how would seafront properties like Marks and Sparks – (*Interjections*)

The Deputy Bailiff: I am very grateful to the Members for the opinions, but it is my opinion that matters on whether something is a point of correction. That is not a point of correction, Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, madam.

So going under the road or under the harbour is one of the options, or rather one set of options with potential variations on the theme, and I do not think any of us need a degree in civil engineering to appreciate that that set of options would come with a substantial price tag. So that cost would need to be assessed as part of a cost-benefit analysis but, given equivalent projects elsewhere and the potential for considerable commercial opportunities, I think it stands a reasonable chance of being a viable option.

However, going under is not the only option. I am not going to spend more than five seconds on the idea of going over the area, which personally I think has got not nearly as many of the same advantages, although I accept there might be someone out there who thinks they can make a case for it. But going around the area is certainly an option.

Given appropriate supporting and mitigating measures, we could potentially use our existing infrastructure to divert through traffic around the area and this is in fact the most common approach that is used elsewhere, not least because it is typically a lot cheaper than building completely new infrastructure. And it does prove very effective, as illustrated by the examples I gave earlier, notably the commercial examples from Exeter.

And indeed we already do this from time to time, not just with one-off events like Seafront Sundays or Art Sundays, but also we do have to close the quay for utilities to go in or road resurfacing to be done. So this is something that we have managed to do, and I am not suggesting that it would not be unmitigated. I think that it would have to be looked at with the support of a significant package of mitigating measures.

So really that is to give Members a flavour of some of the different ways it might be achieved, but I would really like Members and the debate to focus on the objective, not the how because the how is what we would be tasking people who would be much better positioned to carry out that analysis to do. So I am not going to stand here and pretend that I have got the answers or anything even approaching the answers, but I do think it is worthy of investigation, serious consideration and the thing to keep in mind is that objective.

It comes back to what I said earlier on, it comes back to the simple question of do we want to restrict our seafront to its current primary function as a vehicular thoroughfare or do we want to broaden our horizons and expand that range of potential use, exploring other opportunities through our economy, our people and the environment.

And there have been a few speeches in this debate so far, I am probably going to struggle to find the right page in my notes. Deputy Ferbrache, when he was opening debate on this policy letter, complained – I do not know if ‘complained’ is the right word – but he challenged us, over the last few decades, of there having been no inspiration, no foresight. Various people have talked about the big, bold decisions made by our forebears, the best part of 200 years ago in terms of the harbour and seizing the future potential. And Deputy Ferbrache challenged us and said, ‘Do we want to continue to be mediocre and second-rate or do we want to aspire to be better?’

Deputy Inder, I cannot remember which bit he was speaking on, but he talked about Guernsey as a destination port and I think this is something that would absolutely fit with that vision. Deputy Brouard as well, always with a very keen eye on the aesthetics and attractiveness of our Town and again, Deputy Brouard talked about making sure that people would want to come here in the first place and I think this kind of opportunity does exactly that.

And Deputy Helyar more recently talked about the need not to restrict the Development Agency with their work. Now really, this is the kind of thing that the Development Agency could, and in my view should, be investigating anyway but I think it would be really helpful if we could give a statement of intent in the Assembly and say that actually, we are thinking big. We are prepared to be bold. We do want to be ambitious. We do want to not just muddle through and make do, but we want to improve, we want to enhance, we want to maximise all those opportunities.

So I think it would be a really helpful direction to give the agency. It would give them more confidence to go and investigate the various options that could achieve that objective, and for that reason I hope Members will support this amendment.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby, do you formally second the amendment?

Deputy Soulsby: I do, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Right, well we will adjourn for lunch now and reconvene at 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.39 p.m.
and resumed at 2.30 p.m.*

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

**Establishment of a Development Agency –
Debate Continued –
Propositions carried as amended**

The Deputy Bailiff: We are resuming debate on Amendment 12, Deputy de Lisle.

1995 **Deputy de Lisle:** Thank you, madam.

2000 This Proposition to take through traffic off the service level of the road between the South Esplanade and the North Beach roundabout is something that I feel that some might not remember: the havoc caused a few years ago when Environment, under Deputy Burford, as Minister, merged two lanes into one which had the effect in front of the quay to have to be changed back due to the traffic tailbacks as far as the Salerie Corner. It was quite horrendous, resulting in a total calamity in an attempt to modify the traffic flow through the quay. That experiment cost retail businesses a fortune over a six-month period. It was not just the three months of playing around with the lines and the redirection of traffic but it was also the problem of getting people back to shop in Town and to use the Town again. So the experiment not only cost the Government a lot, but it cost retail trade and of course restaurants and so on, businesses in Town, a small fortune.

2005 And that was before the pandemic all that was going on, when trade was tolerable, to some. But given the current situation with shop closures and difficulties with restaurants and so on and businesses in Town, any development of that type would be a total disaster. It would shut the front for a lengthy period and we would lose the Town as we know it.

2010 The road provides access into Town and that is extremely important to our main centre. We do not want traffic to bypass the Town through tunnel vision. (*Laughter*) Rather it is a matter of attracting more business to the Town, providing more parking in Town, having traffic stop in Town and having additional parking close to the retail core. Not traffic *bypassing* Town. We have to concentrate right now on revival, dealing with closures in Town and getting the Town moving again.

2015 And going under the road, environmentally a tunnel would trap nitrous gases and fumes with lorries and buses all going through suffocating everyone as they pass through. What an environmental suggestion, what sort of proposition is that? This proposal is foolhardy. Environmentally it would present also a major hazard, given climate change and rising sea levels, digging a tunnel along the front would be a disaster. In an area already subject to flooding or rising tidal flows. But a tunnel through the front would destroy the historical integrity of the Town that has been laid out for hundreds of years.

2020 Any attempt to go around the area is something that some people might have experienced in the past when the front was closed or the quay was closed. It means quite a diversion. Up through St Julian's Avenue and around to try and get down the other side, it is quite a task. It is not easy to circumvent the quay and the front.

2025 So all this you have to think about. You have to realise what has gone wrong before. Before bringing this type of Proposition in front of the States. And you have got to realise that people are objecting now to the clutter along the pavement, along the quay, particularly people with wheelchairs and so on, they are complaining to me. 'What is all this paraphernalia on the pavement?' They say. 'If we put a board in front of our shop we can get prosecuted, so what are all these chairs and paraphernalia blocking the footpath along the front?' Surely there should be rules that apply to all and not exceptions of this type.

2030 And then we wanted to open up the market. We did that. We got the traffic out. What sort of situation do we find today? It is not really a boisterous area. In fact, if you look at the cameras very often that will show you through the website, you will see that there is nobody strolling in there at all. It is desolate! So do we want a desolate town altogether? Is that what they are trying to do?

Let me tell you that this does not sit well with the public. In fact the comments on Twitter, you might have seen yesterday and the day before, were rife. There was no support for it at all. No

support. This does not sit well with the public and we are representing the public in here and we should be very careful in this Assembly with proposals like this that aggravate the public because of the backlash that it causes to the States as a whole.

So please, make the Town into something but do not destroy what we have got. A tunnel through the front would destroy the historical integrity of the Town that has been laid out for hundreds of years. Also, of course, circumventing the front is a very difficult thing and would cost an enormous amount in terms of environmental costs, traffic congestion and also distances of travelling to connect one side of the front to the other.

I ask that people think very carefully before supporting taking through traffic off the surface level of the road between the South Esplanade and the North Beach roundabout.

Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you. Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you, madam.

I think, as Deputy Queripel mentioned, he has seen a number of vision documents that he has had presented to him over the years. There were things like ports masterplans, there was the vision document and there has been a retail strategy. I have actually mentioned the PwC Product Review and I am just going to read something from it. I have made mention of it on a few occasions because I still think it is one of the better documents that Guernsey has written about Guernsey as at St Peter Port as a destination. It was also two Committees ago and never actually dusted off. I am just going to read something as I think a lot of it is still relevant. I will not go through it bit by bit but the headlines are, and it is talking about the Guernsey destination port: greater activation of Castle Cornet; redevelopment of the harbour area around attractions – I will get back to that in a minute; military heritage, defence and occupation; other heritage and culture; events; products; and visitor experiences.

Now, when Deputy de Sausmarez opened she gave quite a visionary idea of what Town could become and I am just going to link this in to something that was said back in 2017 under, ‘Redevelop the harbour area around attractions’:

A huge under-exploited space that currently detracts from the town behind.

And this is talking about the front of the harbour area:

There are many examples globally of ports being successfully regenerated as vibrant leisure and commercial areas. For tourism purposes the focus would be on the area around Castle Cornet. However we recognise this would be part of a much more substantial masterplan for the harbour estate upon which the viability will be primarily dependent on the economic case for the financial services and other ... real estate components

So what Deputy de Sausmarez opened with is not too far away from something that has been said before.

Now, Deputy de Lisle has got concerns about, I suppose, locking out effectively the traffic from that area. I do not think, and I think as Deputy de Sausmarez opened up, there would be a financial and economic case to do something that would remove traffic from the front so I sort of get that. We have made the arguments before, or heard the arguments before, that some of the most valuable pieces of real estate in the Island are dominated by cars and I cannot actually believe I am saying that. But if it helps at all – I am not too sure it does – there is some connection with the pool marina project. Now, in the meeting I was in, of which Deputy Roffey was present, what I was quite encouraged to hear is that the pool marina project – and I know it is going to come back to the States, I know there is a price for it and I know that it is a decision we will have to make – what I was very encouraged by is that they had employed a consultant who had linked the land side with the sea side. Now, what we will not be able to do, and I am trying to connect the two dots here, and I will get to the removing cars from the surface area in a bit, what was quite clear is that STSB in considering the pool marina they thankfully, and I was worried that they would not, have employed

2085 people who have considered what is happening on the land side and that land side is obviously going to mean you are just not going to put a load of gantries up to the top of the pier somewhere, there is going to have to be consideration for facilities, attractions, washing facilities and all those kind of things, and that is me guessing my way through it because I did not get that far into the meeting, but those considerations are being given.

2090 So we have got two documents that recognise that there is underutilised estate on the front, which is the PwC report, which I think our Committee agrees with, I think it is by a majority and we have got the STSB pool marina that is going to recognise that the land side has got a role in the pool marina bit. So in that regard I think we are heading in the right direction.

2095 The difficulty I have got with this is the expense of building something ... well, I cannot go into the cost because I think, as Deputy de Sausmarez said, let's not play 'guess the engineers' at the moment because this will not end very well. The bit I am unsure of, and it is something for me to support this anyway, as the President of Environment & Infrastructure, the Propositions here, if it ever got past go would effectively mean that most of the cars that are transiting north and south ... Deputy de Lisle is kind of saying that if you block off the front therefore no one will ever go shopping. I doubt that would be the case because what it does not say is get rid of all the car parking at the same time, it does not say that. With whatever vision comes out of this, I am almost certain that cars and access to Town is not going to be entirely precluded.

2100 But what I am interested in knowing is:

... should identify and include in its development of the strategic direction the most viable option for taking through-traffic off the surface level of the road between the South Esplanade and the North Beach ...

2105 That would mean, I am assuming with the exception of service vehicles to get to shops and deliver stuff and I am assuming there would be emergency services and it might be the case that one or two of the piers could be used just for shopping or something like that ... What I am keen to understand is in Deputy de Sausmarez's role as Environment & Infrastructure, I just do not know if the work has been done, would a cheaper way of basically doing this just be to close off the front? And that is not a suggestion, I am just wondering if any work has been done by conducting some kind of, I am afraid, around the Island diversion, whether that has been considered at all? Or rather, 2110 like Deputy de Lisle said, up St Julian's Street, down Prince Albert's Road, kind of diversion. Has any work been done on that at all? That is what I am keen to know.

I am not sure. I like what Deputy de Sausmarez said. I only in part agree with Deputy de Lisle because I think there are always solutions. I do not think a development agency would just block off the Town completely but I would like to know what other work has been done in this regard 2115 because for many years there have been certain sections of our political body that just want to close Town. But I do wonder if there was not another way of doing it and what work has been done on that.

2120 But at the moment I like some of what Deputy de Sausmarez said but I am not sure I am going to be able to support this.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you.

2125 I should be able to actually shorten this debate because the concept was in the Development Framework and because it was in the Development Framework it will continue into the LPB as the art of the possible and it will be up to the Development Agency to actually figure out *how* that might be achieved. So I think already through the actual process we will be instructed to do this amendment whether this amendment is actually passed or not. That is all I am going to say on it.

2130 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Falla.

Deputy Falla: Thank you, madam.

I really like this notion, and that is all it is at the moment, really.

2135 Last weekend I had the opportunity, at the end of the CPA Conference, to go for a run along the
Isle of Man seafront. I have been to the Isle of Man about 15 times, it is the only time I have ever
been when it was not blowing a hooley and pouring with rain – as I believe the weather was here
last weekend – it was absolutely glorious, and the number of activities that were happening along
that seafront last Saturday afternoon were numerous. There were people skateboarding, there were
2140 people stopping and looking at the view, there were people strolling along walking their dogs,
people like me running. It was a very pleasant environment to be in and I think, actually, we have
got an even nicer outlook than the Isle of Man. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It happened to be a nice
day.

2145 So I can capture the vision that is being suggested here. And when it comes to the bus terminus,
it is a really bad place to put ... I think it has just happened and it has evolved that the bus terminus
was there and it has stayed there but it is not a great place for a bus terminus. There is lots of
potential here.

I think it is not just the retailers that potentially will have tunnel vision, the media have got tunnel
vision because it makes a nice headline. It is not necessarily a tunnel. I made the mistake of looking
at social media at lunch time and there are people on Facebook saying that we are mad talking
2150 about this because we have got no money.

The idea of a development agency is that they would find the money. We are not going to decide
today to spend millions or tens of millions diverting traffic away from the seafront. We are looking –
while we are thinking about these things – at an opportunity that is too good to be missed to free
up a very nice part of our seafront, which at the moment you take your life in your hands trying to
2155 cross the road.

I actually also think, I have heard Deputy Inder speak many times about his vision for the Castle
Emplacement and I think this would complement that hugely. Good for tourism, good for local
people. It just sounds as if we are doing something positive which will actually maximise the
potential of what we have already got.

2160 We are not voting for it today. We are voting to ask a development agency to include it in their
considerations but we are not actually voting for a tunnel or for anything specific today. We are
voting for the opportunity to reimagine what our seafront could look like and we are also voting to
ask the DPA to include that consideration in their planning brief and I think that is a very worthwhile
thing to do so I will be supporting it.

2165

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you.

2170 I also intend to support this amendment. For as long as I can remember people have been trying
to work out how we can actually maximise the use of our prime bit of prime real estate along the
front. And it is not just the quay but it is also: is Crown Pier best used as a car park? And I hasten to
add, in case Deputy de Lisle has a heart attack, I am not actually talking about reducing the amount
of parking around Town, but whether surplus parking on the Crown Pier in the middle of that stretch
along the prom is the best place for it. I do not think it is and I think all of these things need to be
2175 looked at.

I do take the sort of instruction, 'Do not go down the rabbit hole of deciding how it is going to
be done, that is for the Development Agency', but it is human nature, isn't it? It is very difficult not
to. Because I do tend to agree with Deputy de Sausmarez that a flyover would be so hideously ugly
that that is the last thing you would want along the seafront. I also tend to agree with Deputy de
2180 Lisle that doing it by having a ring road, a circular road ... Deputy Soulsby and I, even without the
front being stuck, were stuck in Queens Road this morning trying to get through, and it was not
when the kids were going to Beechwood it was after the rush hour. I think, yes, it could be mitigated
and you could pick enhancements or you could do other things but I think that would be a bit of a
nightmare.

2185 So I say now that I think the most logical thing to do *is* to go down. I do not think it is to go under the quay because I think that would be hideously expensive, there are all the services in there, the sewers and everything else. I need to stress here I am not speaking on behalf of the STSB, we have not discussed this, although Deputy Inder is right that we have talked about the relationship with our marinas, not just the pool marina but also the Victorian Marina that is there, the *[inaudible]* Marina at the moment and the shore. But *if* we are going to do this the most logical thing to me would be to take the absolute western slither of the harbours where you do not have to dig down, you can actually put almost a precast underpass, import it and put it in there. That has several advantages, it is a heck of a lot cheaper than going under the quay. Secondly, as other people have pointed out I think, the final level there could be somewhat higher than it is at the moment on the quay providing some kind of flood defences, although of course that does divert you. You need flood defences all around St Peter Port eventually! But it also makes that road slightly wider. It means the shadows do not go on it quite so quickly, it really does enhance what is actually there and we would lose a few moorings. If you actually look at Perry's guide map and you see the width of the road and you put it on it is very few.

2200 And what we are told by visiting yachtsmen – sorry, and yachtswomen, I am being very sexist there – using Victoria Marina is that it is a beautiful setting, sailing into St Peter Port. They love the fact that, unlike some marinas, they do not have to walk for a mile to get into Town, it is right next to Town but boy is it noisy and boy is it sort of inflicted by traffic going along and for some of them that is a real downer. So if we could address that, I do not know how practical it is but I have been surprised by some of the quotes that people with knowledge in engineering have given me about how little it would actually cost to do an underpass through the western fringe of the harbour.

2205 Certainly if those figures are anything near right then the financial gain that we would have through tourism and just through having that prime land for use, because we would charge people for alfresco, we would charge people for a new kiosk over there and a new restaurant over there. I think it would be justifiable. I do not know that, I cannot prove that to Members, but it is surely worth, if we are setting up a development agency, or even if we are not, examining that in some way.

2210 Deputy de Lisle did remind me a little bit of Private Frazer this morning! I am not old enough to remember this but I have read what was said when the centre of St Peter Port was pedestrianised because cars used to be able to go up the High Street, up the Upper Pollet, up to Smith Street, Rue De La Forge as it probably would have been called then, and the shopkeepers right in the centre of Town said this is going to be a disaster, it will completely destroy their business if it was pedestrianised. Well, I do not think Boots has the worst pitch anywhere in St Peter Port, if you look at the footfall it is probably heavier there than it is just about anywhere else ... I am not sure what that note means but no doubt I will find out when Deputy Vermeulen speaks later.

2220 So pedestrianisation, I think, the experience from other places is it actually improves footfall. I take his point about parking. I do not want to encourage excessive cars on the arterial road but if you think back to that superb policy letter last year from STSB on the ports, one of the aspects that was considered was taking parking underground at the North Beach and I think if that was taken account of this idea would actually work incredibly well together. Sadly, that element of the North Beach probably will not be able to be progressed until we have the harbour action areas having their local development briefs etc. but I will not go back to there.

2225 To look at the east coast and not look at how we absolutely use that golden kilometre, if you like, or that golden half mile along the front and see whether we can do something better. If it is not practical it is not practical, we are going to apparently get the best business minds, entrepreneurial minds and commercial minds looking at this. If they look at it and say it does not stack up, fine. I will understand that. I might challenge it but I will understand it, but it must be worth having a go. I think it would be squandering the opportunity not to do so.

2230 I have got no hesitation in supporting this.

2235

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, madam.

Yes, I was a bit like Deputy Roffey, I was starting to wonder when Deputy de Lisle was going to come forward with a requête to reintroduce traffic into the High Street, Smith Street and Le Pollet. In fact I think it could do with going the other way. I think the Town Church Square is the biggest unused opportunity in Town.

But the point I wanted to make – and I am going to support this amendment – is going back to about 2015, a very small consultant report was undertaken to look largely at cycle paths and when the report was submitted to the then Environment Department there was a photograph in it of St Peter Port and the caption that the consultant had put under St Peter Port, and they were UK consultants, and so this is something that always makes me think how others see us, was, ‘St Peter Port, largely a car park.’ And it is hard to get away from that when you look at it. I do not think we see it, we just do not see it because it is there every day: the piers all along by Havelet, every square inch of that part of Town that could have a car put on it, has a car on it.

So I think that this idea, in conjunction with all the wider ideas, is actually well-worth considering because I think that we do have a beautiful Town but we are hiding it in some ways and I think this is a real opportunity and I will be voting for this.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Murray.

Deputy Murray: Thank you, Madam.

It is *Groundhog Day*, we are going through the same discussion again. Individuals putting forward ideas, prematurely I have to say.

We can only see what we can see today. The whole point of the agency is they will have a global vision for the whole of the east coast. We are talking at the moment, in as far as we can see, which is tomorrow and five yards ahead and what we would do to improve things in that regard. Isn't the whole point of having a much bigger vision that we wait to see what the whole scenario could look like, or scenarios, so that we could actually decide whether those were the kind of solution we would like for our east coast and how all the component parts would fit.

When we start to debate endlessly people's ideas about what they would like – and this is not a bad idea, I do not disagree with it, I think it is impractical but it is not a bad idea – but there are dozens of ideas that we could be putting forward. I would suggest this is not the time to be discussing this. Nor is it the time to be giving instructions to the agency; it is premature at this point. We will have that opportunity but it is not now. I would rather that we actually recognise that and just move on and dismiss this, it is pointless discussing this any further in my opinion.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: Thank you, madam.

I had some really horrible images in my mind when I first heard of the idea of an underpass. One of the worst ones being of our beloved Town becoming a ghost town. No longer will it be the jewel in the crown of St Peter Port and that would be absolutely catastrophic, as Deputy de Lisle has already said in his speech.

And when Deputy Falla spoke he said, ‘We are not voting for a tunnel today’, but I know how these things work. If you really do not want something to happen you have to do your utmost to nip it in the bud, which is what I am about to do.

Madam, I cannot support this amendment, even though I am sure it has been laid with the best of intentions by Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Soulsby. The result of this piece of work being given the go ahead will be that vehicles will no longer be permitted to park on the Albert Pier or the Crown Pier. And whilst that will no doubt be very appealing to some people it will be absolutely devastating to our beloved Town, which as we all know is already struggling to survive. And where will the people who want to go to Town park if they cannot park on those piers? Plus, of course, we

all need to bear in mind the sun sets in the west so it is the west coast where people go on a lovely summer's evening to spend their money. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Not the east coast or the coast on the Town sea front. So with that fact uppermost in my mind, I cannot see restaurants on the South Esplanade or the Quay picking up any more trade or making any more money than they currently do if this amendment succeeds.

Then, of course, when we talk about an underpass being built we are talking about millions of pounds and it seems rather ironic to me, Deputy de Lisle touched on this when he spoke, that the fumes from the vehicles will be enveloped in that tunnel with nowhere to go instead of being outside on a road where the fumes dissipate. And we need to be mindful of the fact that if it costs millions of pounds to put in place, as I am sure it will, then someone will have to pay for it, and that someone will probably be the motorists who use it.

Deputy Sausmarez told us, in her opening speech, there are currently something like between 16,000 and 18,000 journeys a day undertaken by motorists on the stretch of road from South Esplanade via the quay, ending up at the Weighbridge roundabout, so potentially an underpass could be a huge money spinner. My view is rooted more in reality. I think what would happen is the majority of motorists would avoid the underpass and go off and down the Vals de Terre and St Julian's Avenue instead. The result of that, of course, would be massive traffic jams with hundreds of irate motorists all revving their engines out of frustration. If we are concerned about the environment, that will then result in clouds of pollution hanging over the Vals de Terre and St Julian's Avenue. Along with the underpass, it will become the most polluted area in the whole of the Island.

And how will putting an underpass under the quay on the South Esplanade resolve the flooding in those areas during the spring tides, especially on the quay, where the restaurants get flooded on a regular basis year after year? Al fresco diners will not be able to sit outside dining when that happens. So when will they be sitting outside these restaurants? Well, possibly lunchtimes during June, July, August and September. So is an underpass going to be put in place to accommodate al fresco diners eating their lunch for just four months a year? Or are there other reasons that are not occurring to me right now?

Personally, I would rather see money spent on addressing the flooding issue and leave everything else as it is. What exactly is the problem that needs to be fixed here? I cannot see it. The sun sets in the west. That is where thousands of Islanders choose to be on a lovely summer's evening – I know that because I live on the west coast, (*Laughter*) and I am one of many who spend a lot of time on the west coast. I do not come to the east coast; I particularly do not come to the Town seafront. Why would I?

If parking is removed from the piers, our beloved Town will die. Putting an underpass in place will result in pollution and traffic jams at the Val de Terre and St Julian's Avenue, and the underpass itself would not only cost millions of pounds to build but would become a tunnel full of pollution with motorists who use it paying for the privilege of being surrounded by that pollution. As we all know, even if you have your windows closed when you are in your car, fumes still find their way in.

I very much appreciate I may be missing a fundamental point or two here somewhere along the line – I am sure Deputy de Sausmarez will point that out to me when she responds – but as I often say in my speeches, I am an optimistic realist, ever hopeful that things are going to get better, but I am rooted in reality, that reality being that we should be pursuing the possible, that which in reality can be achieved. I often think idealistically myself. I find myself thinking that these wonderful aspirations, in my opinion, would be hugely beneficial to the whole of our community. Some of those aspirations I have even put forward – ideas that I have even put forward to the States over the years, all of which have been rejected, unfortunately. There are several reasons for that, of course: on the grounds of cost, on the grounds that properties were not available, on the grounds they were not considered to be attainable, etc. So, over the years, I have come to realise I have to be realistic and not only come up with ideas that are attainable but do not waste time or money pursuing aspirations that are not attainable. But sometimes the States do that – full of good intentions and wonderful aspirations, but they are just not going to be attainable.

And how big will this underpass need to actually be? I suggest it will need to be at least three lanes wide – two lanes with the traffic going in opposite directions and one lane left free for ambulances in case of accidents. I realise there are three lanes along the Town seafront currently and they are all fully operational, but cars can move out of the way, whereas when cars are in tunnels they cannot move out of the way. And how far under the ground will the tunnel need to be? I say that because the deeper it is the longer the access and exit points need to be. So where will these gradual, sloping access and exit points be sited exactly? I realise that Deputy de Sausmarez cannot answer these questions because they are going into detail, but I am a person who needs detail; I am a practical person.

Of course, there are miles and miles of cables under the ground along the Town seafront. There are even tunnels there already that go up underneath the Town. I believe I am right in saying that they go up to Market Square, but I stand to be corrected on that. What I do know – and I am not an expert but I am just using my common sense – is the whole thing will be a logistical nightmare if it goes ahead, so I cannot see the benefit of putting a tunnel in place and I do not want any time or resource spent even looking at the idea. Of course, instead of a tunnel there could be a bridge, a flyover, put in place, which would completely ruin the view of the other islands.

Or the agency could say, 'Do you know what? The best way to get motorists off the seafront is to simply put a no-entry sign at each end. That is the best way. The result of that will mean that the traffic will have to use the roads around the Town. There will not be any new roads put in. Where are these new roads going to go? The ring road that gets used would be the current roads around the Town now. Imagine the congestion that is going to cause.

I do not think I am a Private Frazer in response to what Deputy Roffey said about Deputy de Lisle when he spoke, and I do not think I am a Luddite, as Deputy Ferbrache mentioned a couple of times in his speeches yesterday.

Moving back, for a moment, to aspirations, I am not for a second saying I do not pursue personal aspirations and dreams, because I do; I have done that all my life and I continue to do it. This is not about us pursuing our personal dreams and aspirations. This is about what we think is attainable and what we think is going to be beneficial to our community. We have to balance – and that is always what I try to bear in mind: balance is absolutely crucial in all things at all times – that which we think is attainable and going to be beneficial for our community, with our focus on how much these things are going to cost.

I think I have made some extremely salient points in my speech, madam. (*Interjections*)

As I said earlier, I very much appreciate I may be missing a fundamental point or two along the way somewhere. I look forward to hearing what Deputy de Sausmarez says in response and I repeat I appreciate that she and Deputy Salisbury have laid this amendment with the best of intentions, but I am not getting it so I need a lot more information, detail – if there is any detail – whatever I can be provided with to get that on record. I am not saying I am going to vote for the amendment; I just want to hear all that on *Hansard*. It all needs to be put on record so the public can know what the answers to the questions were.

Oh, guess what, madam, in closing I ask for a recorded vote, please, when we go to the vote. Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Queripel.
Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, madam.

Listening to Deputy Queripel, it is as if we are thinking about building Crossrail. We are talking about, probably, less than a quarter of a mile, if that, for a bit of tunnel. We do not know; it might not be even that long.

Deputy Queripel asks if he can get answers to his questions as he might be missing something fundamental. He is missing something fundamental: we are not proposing anything in terms of

what this will look like or where it will be and what traffic goes where; we are just asking the DPA to investigate it.

2395 And just to be clear, this is not Deputy Murray talking about just some other Deputies with an idea that we should investigate. This is not. As Deputy Oliver made very clear, it was in the development framework that was put forward by DPA and I remember it coming ... I think it was presented to P&R and I thought what a really good idea that absolutely made sense. It made sense for me because, contrary to Deputy de Lisle's comment, this will actually help people get into Town who want to go into Town. Quite a few people have to go through Town to get somewhere else, so
2400 it separates the traffic. He talked about 'It is so bad now?' and 'People are not going into Town,' and 'Woe is me,' and 'Where are people?' Well, it is precisely because of the situation we have in Town now that people are not going.

Fumes in the tunnel – there are means to deal with that. You have electrostatic filtration systems, if you want to put them in for such a short area. We have fumes now. If you look at the bottom of
2405 Fountain Street, it is one of the worst places on the Island for pollution. It is awful. Cars are stopping to allow pedestrians to go through, which is fine, but it is blocking everything up. If anybody thinks that makes for a perfect situation now, I do not know why they want to preserve it in aspic.

And on that, we all think we must not change what we have got, it has been there since time immemorial, as Deputy de Lisle was explaining, for hundreds and hundreds of years. Well, it has
2410 not. A lot of this is quite new. We know traffic could not go down Val de Terres before the beginning of the last century. This is not ancient stuff that we must preserve. As Deputy Roffey made clear, traffic used to go in different directions in Town anyway. You need to think, as we talk about our forefathers. Deputy Le Tocq said that yesterday. If they were alive now they would not be saying, 'Oh, yes, it was brilliant what we did, fantastic, we'll never change it.' I am sure those same people
2415 would be saying, 'How can we make things better now that the car is king and we have these things called motor vehicles? What do they do? Oh, yes, we need to do things in a different way.' The Victorians did a great thing in Victorian times. We need to think, what is a great thing to do for our times now?

I always worry when people say we have got to preserve everything. Yes, we want to preserve
2420 what is good about Town and the quaintness and the High Street and make it a bustling high street, but outside of there, it is not a great place to have to walk around. Certainly not if you are a pedestrian. Certainly not if you have got a disability and it is not a place to be able to loiter and look around, enjoy anyway. It is about going from A to B. We want people to want to stay around and enjoy the place.

2425 But those people who want to actually go into Town, encourage them to go into Town, not people who actually want to go through Town for another reason. Deputy de Lisle was talking like, 'we do not want cars to go through Town, we need to capture them', as if we need to put them in a pen so we cannot let them go and escape from Town, so they can shop in Town. Well I do not think that is really going to help.

2430 Deputy de Sausmarez talked about Exeter and that is a city I know quite well. I grew up not far away. I remember, as a kid, I always remember the amount of traffic going through and up and down and around and I went back a few years ago, not a few years ago, recently, my eldest has been at university and it has absolutely transformed. It is a place where shopping has developed, it is a place you can look around and it is really a fantastic city now and I think, if anybody thinks that
2435 just keeping cars in the city makes a lot of sense, then I would thoroughly recommend a trip to Exeter.

I think I have probably covered everything off on that. I think it was Deputy Queripel talking about flooding issues. I think this would be one means of being able to deal with flooding at the same time as a tunnel. We could do both at the same time and I think they would actually
2440 complement each other. That was one thing that came out of the discussions we had when the DPA came around and showed their development framework.

This amendment goes back to those principles, basically. It is using the phrase, although it is not one I particularly like, thinking out of the box, and we really do. We tend to look at what we have

and see how we can fiddle with it but we should be thinking fundamentally different. If we think that the Development Agency is not going to cost millions and millions of pounds then we might as well not vote for a development agency now. All the work we do on the seafront enhancement will require millions and millions of pounds.

And if we are going to do such a major project, we need to think laterally. Think about what is the potential here? How can we really make something, which our forefathers would be proud of in this day and age? So I would really ask Members to think about that and really hope that they approve this amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, madam.

This is the sort of amendment that has my sympathy because really it is not asking to do very much and, whether we vote for it or against it, it does not stop the Development Agency from coming back and suggesting the sorts of things that are included in it.

The negative part of it, perhaps, is that I could have thought, probably, and the rest of us probably, of dozens more that we would like them to consider. So I am not terribly certain whether it is worth voting for or not, except that I will say this, bearing in mind particularly what some previous speakers have said.

I was privileged, madam, a couple of weeks ago, to represent Guernsey at an event at St Katherine Docks in London that celebrated the life of William Le Lacheur, a famous Guernseyman who sadly is not today very celebrated here in Guernsey. But it was an event held by the Costa Rican –

Deputy Roffey: I thank Deputy Le Tocq, for giving way.

As he is lamenting the fact that Guillaume Le Lacheur is not properly celebrated in Guernsey, would he be pleased to know that the next large GHA development is going to be called Parc Le Lacheur?

Deputy Le Tocq: I am not only pleased to know, I knew it before, because I suggested that name to the Guernsey Housing Association and I am very pleased and hopeful that somebody might represent Costa Rica when we do name that park. I understand there is a number of other things, a blue plaque going up to celebrate him.

He was of course, and as I said, this event in St Katherine Docks in London was hosted by the Costa Rican Embassy. In Costa Rica, William La Lacheur is a national hero. On their crest, it has a picture of his ship that was built here in Guernsey. Now there were some other pictures there at the presentation and some of them depicted St Peter Port, the old harbour, in the 1830's, before the development went on.

Because the old harbour, there was not a road, there was not a quayside there. There was not a south quay, there was not the north emplacement and the south esplanade. They did not exist. Those and other quays did not exist. There was just the simple piers that went out. Cow Lane accessed into the harbour through – what do you expect – a tunnel! There was in fact a tunnel the other end of the harbour and you could hardly get out.

A lot of the problems that existed at that time were because Guernsey was growing in terms of its international trade. William La Lacheur sailed his boats around Cape Horn to get to the ports of Costa Rica, that were only on the Pacific side in those days, and came back and started the coffee trade, first here and then to London, from Costa Rica, to which they are very grateful today. An incredible, sustainable economy that I think we would do a lot to learn from.

But the point is this, when you look at those pictures, you think how did it get from that, a very small port that did not seem or was not appropriate, even for its own day, in terms of the shipping and the sort of commerce that was needed at the time, to the next stage and to where it is today? Reading up about this, you discover that our forefathers saw the need to reclaim some land, so they

did exactly that and most of our seafront here in the harbour is reclaimed land. It did not exist before then.

2500 There is no reason whatsoever that we could not if we wanted to – I am not saying I particularly do – take a slither through the existing harbour and divert traffic that way. It can be done. It probably would pay for itself eventually, I guess. I am not here to discuss that today because if we are going to do that, you know, we could get into discussing what colour the tarmac is going to be or something. That is ridiculous. All I am saying is it is possible and I believe that we should do that.

2505 Now, I know that in his day, because I did some research on this, in Le Lacheur's day, to get to the 1850's, by which time the boats were bigger and there was a desperate need to see the harbour developed, the Bailiff at that time was a really innovative person. He had introduced the ideas around the first banknotes to Guernsey. He had developed the market buildings, etc. He formed a States' Committee in the 1830's but it took over 20 years for them to agree to the developments that we see today.

2510 Fortunately, he pioneered. His name was Daniel – wait for it – de Lisle Brock. I am sure he is actually an ancestor of Deputy de Lisle and I really do wish that Deputy de Lisle, madam, had that sort of vision. He was willing to pioneer and continue to do so and, as a result of which, in the 1850's, the development started, the Castle Emplacement was built. They reclaimed the land so that there could be proper traffic up and down the front, which you know would have been horses and carts, probably, mostly, in those days. It could happen. And after that, trams and all those sorts of things. It created an infrastructure that made Guernsey make money.

2515 Now that should, for those capitalists amongst us, be an interesting thing to do and it did enhance the Town and the Town, as at that time, grew threefold. So much so that St Peter Port, as I am sure many St Peter Port people here know, grew so large it needed four Douzaines to sort of manage it.

2520 All I am saying is that we should not write these sorts of things off and I hope that even if this fails we will send a signal to the new Development Agency that it should think that big.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

2525 **Deputy Gabriel:** Thank you, madam Deputy Bailiff.

Trying to get back to the thrust of the amendment to take through traffic off the surface level on the seafront. To some, who have perhaps put two and two together and jumped to a conclusion, this could be a tunnel. Some will think because of a loose association with a local promoter of an inter-Island or French tunnel that I would support this immediately and get my shovel out.

2530 Well that is perhaps not the case and I would like to perhaps try and myth-bust a lot of comments that have perhaps gone before us. Tunnel depths in New York City, they are on average about 28 metres. In Norway, one of the deepest in the world, 287 metres depth. Seventy-two years ago in Houston, Texas, the Washburn Tunnel, that was 1950, for those who have not quite got the mental arithmetic, sorted, a 3.8 kilometre tunnel was built at a depth of 20 metres; relatively shallow.

2535 So we are not going to be talking about interfering with infrastructure, underground infrastructure. We are not going to be talking about potential flooding issues or anything like that.

Going back to the amendment, Deputy Ferbrache has intimated previously that we should have action. Giving direction to Development Agency that we have a vision for our seafront is surely action? Should our aspiration for this Island be one of mediocrity or something like Deputy de Sausmarez has briefly described, with plazas, al fresco areas that can hold all sorts of public, sporting events, anything really where the public is involved?

2540 We regularly hear from various locals and other commentators and visiting journalists that St Peter Port seafront is a jewel in our crown. So why shouldn't we have the vision to polish it and make it shine and make that shininess radiate further?

2545 We have heard already from Deputy de Lisle, as one, that we should not be diverting cars or traffic away from our seafront, that we should be getting them there. But we are not diverting traffic

away from the seafront that is already destined there. We are diverting people away through traffic. If you want to travel from St Martin's to St Sampson's in a vehicle.

2550 You do not want to be fighting with everyone that is trying to get a parking space, or anyone else that is carrying shopping, crossing the road, pedestrian activity that is in our Town. Surely you take the excuse of going either around Town, which some do, or if there was an alternative route, be that overpass, underpass, anything like that, wouldn't you take that?

2555 Our bus service has to go along the seafront if it is travelling north. Wouldn't it be great if our buses were routed another way? Wouldn't this increase our tourism product that we have heard Deputy Inder try and progress and run in tandem, destination within destinations that we have, such as Castle Cornet?

2560 Shouldn't we aspire for greatness rather than just carry on what we are doing and be mediocre about our approach? Anyone that is wanting to travel from St Martin's to the north of the Island, prior to 1935, was not using the Val des Terres. Val des Terres started cutting in 1931 and was opened by the then Prince of Wales on 24th July 1935. That provided a lot of work for out of work Islanders in the 1930s and now we do not think of anything, of whipping down the Val des Terres or even whipping up it, to get home through to St Martin's or even further afield.

2565 I am going to support this amendment because I like the idea of giving vision to the Development Agency and including something rather than letting them come up with a *carte blanche* or, if it is not included, for it to be excluded. And we should not be excluding by policy.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

2570 **Deputy Prow:** Please could I ask for 26(1), please, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes.

Those who still wish to speak on this amendment, stand in your place. Do you still wish to pursue the motion, Deputy Prow?

2575

Deputy Prow: I am afraid I do, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: So the motion is that the debate is guillotined. Those who support the motion say *Pour*; those against?

2580

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.

The Deputy Bailiff: Too close to call. It is going to be a recorded vote.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 20, Contre 13, Ne Vote Pas 2 Absent 4.

POUR

Deputy St Pier
Deputy Trott
Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Blin
Deputy Burford
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Inder

CONTRE

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Taylor
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Bury
Deputy Cameron
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Falla
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Matthews

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Queripel

ABSENT

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

Deputy Mahoney
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Prow

Deputy Roffey

2585 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

So the motion to guillotine the debate on Amendment 12, there voted Pour, 20, Contre 13, there were 2 abstentions and 4 absences. Therefore the motion is passed and I turn to Deputy Ferbrache to reply on behalf of the P&R Committee.

2590 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Thank you very much, madam.

Well where have we been in this debate? We have had lots of, I have got to say, a bit of self-indulgence, really, because the actual point of the debate is very simple. P&R will be voting in accordance with their own consciences in relation to this matter, I will be voting in favour of the amendment.

2595 But I do not think we need to go to Costa Rica. I do not think we need to go to Norway. I do not think we have to go to New York. I am glad Daniel de Lisle Brock was mentioned, but we have also got David de Lise, Deputy, here. So I am not really sure why we mentioned all of that.

2600 Of course, the Town seafront could be greatly improved if the kind of ideas put forward by Deputy de Sausmarez in outline have any degree of realism at all and I do not know whether they do or not. Because it was a bit, I have got to look at it as a lawyer, it was certainly much better and more acceptable to me, better framed than the amendments put forward by Deputy Roffey because of the terms of the amendment.

2605 It was not in imperative terms, it was to agree that the Development Agency 'in consultation with' the relevant stakeholder should identify and include, etc. Now, if it comes back, if the Development Agency comes back and says, 'This is completely impractical.' I think it can do that. I am not saying it will come to that conclusion but it can do that.

2610 But I would hope, perhaps, something could happen. I do not quite share, much as I would like to, because one thing we are not going to change dramatically, I appreciate about climate change but we are not going to change it dramatically, is the weather in Guernsey. I do not see too many people sitting along that part of the Island having ice creams and eating cake in November.

But nevertheless there are the opportunities to do something. It could be considered. It is quite harmless and Deputy Gabriel was talking about being visionary and there was a song I remember when I used to watch a programme on Saturday morning. *Reach for the Stars*. And that, perhaps sometimes, reach for the stars, even if we fail.

2615 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, madam Deputy Bailiff.

2620 Ah, well. This debate has taken us in all sorts of directions, over, under, around the issues, but really, as I said in my opening speech, it is fundamentally quite a straight forward question. Do we want to restrict the use of the seafront primarily to that of a vehicular thoroughfare, or do we want to explore potential other uses? That is what it boils down to.

2625 I will go through in chronological order. I hope it is not too painful. Deputy de Lisle, I think, was a little bit, I think missed the point about through-traffic. As Deputy Soulsby said, that is to enable people who would be passing through anyway, not to try and divert people away from it.

2630 In fact, people will know that I am very interested in transport and improving access and, fundamentally, one of the main strengths of this, or exploring the options around this would be improving access to the retail areas. I referenced some examples in my opening speech of how that has worked quite spectacularly and I will come back to that as I respond to various speeches and questions in the debate.

He talked about the environmental impacts. Again, something I feel very strongly about and, as Deputy Soulsby touched on, this is again incorporated with the other considerations, a great opportunity to look at how we can improve our environmental impact and mitigate environmental concerns.

2635 There are so many opportunities related to that, in terms of reducing our energy use, making more liveable communities, mitigating flood risk, you know, boosting nature and biodiversity, improving air quality and water filtration and all the rest of it. So, so many environmental opportunities, this is not the time or the place to go into the detail. This is a high-level agreement only.

2640 I was a little bit confused by his references to comments on social media. I mean, I just picked at random one of the comments on social media, which said something along the lines of, 'Love the vision here. As part of a suite of measures this could be a great investment. Investments have a short-term cost for a long-term gain and this is that.' Various other comments along that line.

2645 I did however notice one comment on Twitter from a shop in the arcade, which was not quite so positive! (*Laughter*) It had been retweeted by the same shop and liked by the same shop, or quote-tweeted or something. So I agree there are some negative comments out there but also some very positive ones.

2650 Deputy Inder referenced two reports which point to, I think this actually answers many of the questions that Deputy Queripel was raising. Deputy Queripel posed the question: what problem were we trying to fix? Report after report, Deputy Burford referenced another one, have pointed to the under-utilisation of this prime bit of our public realm. Now, I do not need to stand here and wax lyrical about what a great piece of the public realm that is. I and others have already done that. We all know that. This is our Island, our Town. We all know, with our own eyes, what a great space that is.

2655 The problem is that we are not using that to its fullest potential, by any stretch of the imagination, and we are told so time and time again. But, as Deputy Burford pointed out, we do not always recognise it. I think we do get the best insights from those that are visiting our Island because they see it with fresh eyes, not through the Guernsey goggles that we might wear and they do point this out to us.

2660 I used to work in a food hall along that stretch when I was younger, and it is amazing the number of visitors who would comment on it, say, 'You have got the most beautiful town, the most beautiful harbour, but my goodness, running the gauntlet across this road – the traffic, the noise, the smell.' I think we have become a little bit blind to it ourselves but visitors will not fail to point out how striking it is for other people and what a missed opportunity it is.

2665 Deputy Inder raised some questions over expense and parking and these are all exactly the considerations that would need looking into and also opportunities, real opportunities. Deputy Roffey touched on some of those and other people did too. And Deputy Inder asked whether any work has been done. This is a big project. I would want a desktop study to look at that cost benefit analysis. The whole point of this amendment is to do the high-level cost benefit analysis to establish which, if any, of the options are the most viable. I think that work is really important. I think it is an opportunity that we should be missing. In fact I think it is an opportunity we should be grasping with both hands.

2670 Deputy Oliver was right to point out that the DPA could indeed – this is, as I have expanded on at great length already in the development framework for the St Peter Port Regeneration Areas – be included in the local planning brief. But if this amendment ... is it worth the resource, is it worth the effort? The whole reason I brought this was to, hopefully, get a positive endorsement that we are prepared to think this big and give a clearer steer and a firmer mandate for exactly that work.

2680 Deputy Falla gave us some great examples of his experience, his recent experience in the Isle of Man, which although it has a less beautiful seafront than ours, makes more of it. It is a very pleasant, vibrant place, it is good for tourism, it is good for local people, he said. I think these are the kinds of opportunities that we have here.

Deputy Roffey gave us some, you know, expanded engineering views, I suppose. I think it was a useful reminder about how calls to pedestrianise the High Street, Smith Street and Le Pollet, were first viewed. This has come in, when you look into projects like this, there is always resistance, there is always a little bit of nervousness, scepticism and I do not know how many people would go back. We see this time and time again here and elsewhere.

Deputy Burford told us about a note in a report, which describes St Peter Port as, quote, 'largely a car park' and actually I had a very similar comment told to me by a visitor, someone who came over to present to the business community last week and said that they took the opportunity to look in at our real estate shop windows and said, 'You do not seem to sell homes in Guernsey. You seem to sell parking with accommodation attached.' Again, that was their striking impression of Town: just that it was beautiful but very dominated by traffic.

Deputy Murray, I did not really understand Deputy Murray's point. He says he wants a big vision. Well this is his chance to put that on record, to do that, to give that steer. I cannot stress this enough, if we do not support this amendment, what message does that send out? The Development Agency has got a pretty broad scope, you know, within which to focus. They have got a lot of work to do. I think we can all agree on that. They are going to have a lot of work to do. They do not have infinite time. They will not have infinite resources. They are going to have to make some choices about what they focus those resources on and where they focus that time on.

Now, if this amendment is not supported, they could well interpret that as a signal that we are not ambitious enough. I am not going to give way. So it is perfectly within their remit, it is perfectly something that they could do. Absolutely. But they need to make some choices about how they focus their resources, where they focus their efforts, and I think we should be careful about what message we give them. The whole reason I brought this amendment was to try to provide some better guidance for them. To say, yes, this is something we want to do. We are ambitious.

So Deputy Queripel covered a vast array or provided a vast list of questions that I am not in a position to answer, many of them, because they are at the level, these are the kinds of question that we need further work to be able to answer. But what I would say is that the evidence, as I have already explained, and this is not isolated evidence, this is macro-level evidence, that where you repurpose space and make it people-centric, where you improve access, where you improve accessibility, your retail take and your hospitality take and your general economic benefits go up, not down.

Time and time again we see this. I gave the specific example of Exeter in my opening speech, when they removed through traffic, as Deputy Soulsby has described, from a series of roads and they saw, and this was 10 or 15 years ago, I think it started, maybe slightly longer, it certainly coincided with the economic downturn and they saw, against an overall trend of declining retail trade, declining footfall, they saw an increase of footfall of 30%. A 30% increase in footfall and a commensurate increase in retail take.

So it boosted the economic vibrancy of that area. It increased footfall – I am not going to give way, I am sorry, it is a long debate – and we see this time and time again. Deputy Queripel also questioned whether anyone would want to sit on our east coast after, I do not know, noon or something. Well, I would say he should go and have a chat with the people who run hospitality venues along that stretch. They will tell you, again as I mentioned in my opening speech, that it is unbelievably popular and I think it is unbelievably popular, in spite of the fact that there is a main road running along it.

But they have told me that the limiting factor is the available space and if they had more space they would fill that too. It is incredibly popular and it does them very well. So, I think we should look at the first-hand evidence that we already have in that very area for some confidence about the economic benefits that this could bring.

So, as I say, it is all about, I did again in my opening speech, talk about improving the transport connections, and a couple of people did pick up on this. It is about not just muddling on. Deputy Soulsby, when she spoke, said actually, you know, there are people who avoid Town because it is not easy to get into and move round. I am one of those with children. I will only come into Town if

2735 I do not have to park on a pier. I will come in on a bus, I will come in on a bike, but having to shepherd children across from the piers and back again is actually really stressful and I would just rather avoid it.

2740 Actually, I was having a chat outside. Some people were talking to me about it yesterday, they were both parents of young children. They said exactly the same thing. It is just such a relief, you know, on those occasions when it is Seafront Sunday or whatever, it is such a relief not to have to worry about that constraint at the moment. So it would be about improving transport connections, improving public transport, improving the parking provision and putting it in better places, making it better. As I said before, improving provision for shared mobility, through connections. It is all about improving. This is one of the single most important things that you could do to improve transport to and within St Peter Port.

2745 So, yes, I think I have touched briefly on the flooding issue as well. These kinds of measures would very much provide opportunities to mitigate the flood risk that we are already experiencing and one of the reasons we are experiencing increased likelihood of flooding is because we are already experiencing increased intensity of rainfall and, of course, the more hard surfaces there are, that area is at the bottom of a big hill, there are things you can do, with greater planting, for
2750 example, and permeable/semi-permeable surfaces. We would have so many more options to mitigate flood risk from the land side but also from the sea side, potentially, as well. So it is exactly the kind of consideration that could be bound up in this work, looking at options.

2755 Deputy Soulsby, yes, made the point that this will actually help people to get to Town and I cannot stress that enough. It will be a draw in its own right. There will be more to do. Retailers will tell you of the importance of dwell time. They will tell you about the importance of a public realm that is attractive, that it is a nice place to spend time. Because when people are spending time they are likely to spend their money there as well. So this will be a draw in its own right as well as the potential to improve transport connectivity.

2760 And Deputy Soulsby also made the important point, we should be thinking, this is our opportunity to think how can we make what we have got better? What can we do for future generations? What might future generations thank us for? And this is that opportunity.

2765 Deputy Le Tocq made the point that a vote against this amendment does not stop the Development Agency from doing this but, I repeat, really? What message does it send them? So I say if you like the idea of exploring the potential around this, vote for this amendment, because that will send a much clearer signal. I worry about the message that a vote against it would give to the Development Agency.

2770 And a reminder, of course, Deputy Ferbrache also picked up on this, that this will all come back. This was just exploring options. If none of these options prove to be viable, that is what will come back to us. But this is really about what to include. What we hope to see in that strategic direction, which let's not forget will come back to us in much more detail. That will be our opportunity to support certain ideas, once we have got a much clearer understanding of what is involved.

2775 And Deputy Gabriel, apart from some engineering insights, he really ended his speech on talking about making positive decisions for positive action, clarifying our vision and aspiring for greatness and I think that is what this is about. Deputy Ferbrache, again I mentioned this earlier, but in his opening speech he said, 'Are we happy to become mediocre and second-rate?' Well, I am not. I want to aspire for a lot more than that.

2780 I hope the Assembly will back my view and this is really greater clarity about what the Development Agency should look at and, again, I would ask that anyone who thinks there is potential in this should vote for it. It is not a binding decision at all, it is just a clearer steer. It gives a bit more clarity to the DPA as well, and I think it would be a lovely thing to vote for, so please do.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy de Sausmarez.

States' Greffier, a recorded vote has been asked for, so could you kindly call the roll?

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 22, Contre 11, Ne Vote Pas 2, Absent 4.

POUR

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Taylor
Deputy Trott
Deputy Blin
Deputy Burford
Deputy Bury
Deputy Cameron
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Falla
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Matthews
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Prow
Deputy Roffey

CONTRE

Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy Aldwell
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Queripel

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Brouard
Deputy Meerveld

ABSENT

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

2785 **The Deputy Bailiff:** In relation to Amendment 12, there voted Pour 22, Contre 11, there were 2 abstentions and 4 absences. Therefore the amendment was passed.

[Amendment 1](#)

1. To delete Proposition 5 and replace it with the following:

"5. To direct the Development & Planning Authority to complete the Local Planning Briefs for the St Peter Port and St Sampson Harbour Action Areas within 18 months following a decision of the States which provides direction as to the future development of commercial port infrastructure for Guernsey".

The Deputy Bailiff: We will now deal with Amendment 1.

Deputy Oliver, would you like the States' Greffier to read your amendment?

2790 **Deputy Oliver:** I do not think so, I think it has been out long enough.

Madam, this amendment seeks to clarify a problem, which we, the DPA, have identified, with the Development Agency policy letter as a whole. This problem is that, if prepared in the absence of a direction from the States as to the future development of the commercial port infrastructure for Guernsey, or at least the nature of the required facilities and their general location, we will not be able to properly plan for these areas.

2795 Essentially, we need to know what the absolute need to achieve is before you can plan. When the States approved the IDP, it clearly recognised that the harbours were a complex area, needing further research and comprehensive master planning to maximise our opportunities and harness investment.

2800 Under the previous States' Resolutions, further work and research on future harbour requirements to inform and guide planning-making, has been undertaken, but no direction on what is needed has come forward from the States.

2805 It will be very difficult for a local planning brief to perform the functions set out in the IDP if direction from the States as to the future development of the commercial ports for Guernsey is absent. Any local planning brief prepared in such a context will have reduced effectiveness and thus will not be able to maximise the potential or the harbour action areas or fully promote the wider

economic, social and environmental objectives foreseen by the States through the IDP. It is primarily for these reasons that the DPA is bringing this amendment to ensure that, by the time we commence preparation of the local planning brief, direction will have been provided.

2810 The second element of this amendment relates to the timescale of preparation of the local planning brief once the States' direction has been given. Proposition 5 currently refers to directing the DPA to complete the local planning brief by December 2022. Now, we are at the end of March 2022 and although some work has commenced by officers in scoping the LPB and in preparation of formal tender process, this timescale is frankly impossible to achieve.

2815 The DPA believes that an 18-month period is achievable to ensure that the LPBs are properly considered and consulted upon with the public, stakeholders and to allow all the other necessary statutory processes to be properly concluded. Doing things properly will not delay things, quite the reverse. It will mean that action will happen. It will mean that the right action will happen in the right location.

2820 The authority will make sure that the LPBs will progress as quickly as possible, working alongside other projects to front-load the process as much as possible. I will add that this timescale will not hold up work continuing for certain States' projects, such as the pool marina. I understand there is still a lot of technical work and further research needed for such work but, if necessary, the DPA can consider the development proposals, for which would not prejudice the outcomes of the local planning brief or inhibit its future implementation and ask the States to support this amendment.

2825

The Deputy Bailiff: Do you formally second this amendment, Deputy Taylor?

Deputy Taylor: I do.

2830

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Falla.

Deputy Falla: Thank you, madam.

I will not be long but it just seems to me that there are a lot of chicken and eggs involved in this and we are still nowhere near providing directions to the future development of commercial port infrastructure. We need to do that before the local planning briefs can even start. So we are gazing a long way into the future, which does not feel very good.

2835

But I just would like to ask why nobody spoke to the DPA to get an idea of how long it is going to take when the policy letter was drafted?

2840 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: I am going for a guillotine motion, 26(1), please.

2845

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Inder has put forward a motion under 26(1) to guillotine this amendment debate. Would those who still wish to speak in relation to this amendment stand in their place? Do you still wish to go ahead with the motion?

2850 **Deputy Dyke:** Madam, could I say something?

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, I will find out what it is, Deputy Dyke, and I will tell you whether or not.

2855 **Deputy Dyke:** It is a matter I discussed with Deputy St Pier and with the Comptroller. There is a kind of mismatch owing to a wording error in Amendment 3 from yesterday and the suggestion that the Comptroller made to me was that, if the Assembly agreed for the purposes of *Hansard* which prevailed, that might cure the problem. So it is a technical point.

2860 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Is it to do with this particular amendment?

Deputy Dyke: Well, it concerns the two. Do you want me to explain?

Deputy Inder: Madam, I will withdraw my 26(1).

2865

The Deputy Bailiff: Comptroller, perhaps you could explain the issue?
Are you able to?

2870

The Comptroller: As I understand it, madam, it relates again to sequencing and the preparation of the local planning briefs. But I think it has been covered already in debate at some stage because the point was made that of course the statutory requirements for local planning briefs will trump any direction from the States. I think that is the issue Deputy Dyke wishes to address and simply put on the record that that is the case. But I think it has already been put on the record by somebody during the course of debate, anyway.

2875

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Dyke, is that the point you wish to make?

Deputy Dyke: Yes, thank you.

2880

The point is a fairly simple one. If you cast your mind back to Amendment 3 all those days ago, in paragraph 1(A)(b), and this is an amendment we have passed, it provides that the long-term development plan should be consistent with the requirements set out in the local planning briefs, which indicates that the local planning briefs should come first.

2885

I did speak to Deputy St Pier, and he can confirm this, that that was a wording mistake and should not have been there. The idea being that we would follow Amendment 1, as just proposed by the President of Development & Planning, that the local planning brief would come after the presentation of the long-term development plan, within 18 months.

2890

So, at the moment, we have got a circle. If they are both adopted exactly as they are, we have a circle of things, you do not know where you start, which comes first, the whole chicken and egg situation. So the suggestion that I am picking up from the Comptroller is that we simply reassert, for the purposes of *Hansard*, that the intention is that Amendment 1 would prevail and that it, the local development plans, would follow the long-term development plan produced by the Development Agency. That was all, just to clarify which comes first. So, if we are to assert that for *Hansard*, that sounds fine, assuming we all pass this amendment.

Is that fair?

2895

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Thank you.

2900

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: I am going to try 26(1) again, then.

2905

The Deputy Bailiff: Can I ask those who wish to speak on this amendment to stand in their place?

Do you still wish me to proceed with the motion, Deputy Inder? The motion is to guillotine the debate on Amendment 1. Those who support the motion, those against.

Members voted Pour.

2910

The Deputy Bailiff: The Pours win. Debate is guillotined.

I turn to Deputy Ferbrache, in this context, to reply on behalf of P&R.

Deputy Ferbrache: Thank you very much, madam.

2915 I did not understand a word of that exchange between Deputy Dyke and the Comptroller, frankly because –

Deputy Dyke: It was a legal point. *(Laughter)*

2920 **Deputy Ferbrache:** I always say this about corporate lawyers: as a corporate lawyer, I do not think they know any Law. They only know how to do photocopying *(Laughter)* and copying other people's agreements and charging extortionate charges, where us poor humble litigators had to work by the hour, sweat our brow and do something innovative for modest emoluments.

2925 But let me just say what I understand. This amendment, if successful, directs the Development & Planning Authority to complete the local briefs for the action areas within 18 months. These are the words:

... following a decision of the States which provides direction as to the future development of commercial port infrastructure for Guernsey.

2930 So let us look at Amendment 3 and let us look at number one, because that directs Policy & Resources, in consultation with STSB, to set out the options for Guernsey's future operational harbour and commercial port infrastructure requirements. So P&R and STSB, they probably on Monday only agreed by 11.30 what the proposals are. *(Interjection)* Well, Deputy Roffey always knows everything so that is not really a problem!

2935 But in connection with that, they meet, come to an agreement, but if they cannot they would have to seek further direction. Let us assume they come to an agreement and then the 18 months would start from that policy then. I do not think it is any more complicated than that.

What I can say is that Policy & Resources supports this amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

2940 **Deputy Oliver:** I have got so much to answer here.

But the one question I did have is, yes they did come and speak to us and when they did first come and speak to us it was so far back that the officers did say that it could be completed by December 2022. However, by the time that it was actually lodged, it was a very different time to when it was first considered and the first date was agreed.

2945 I just ask you to support the amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Oliver. So, we now go to the vote on Amendment 1. Those who support Amendment 1 indicate Pour; those against?

Members voted Pour.

The Deputy Bailiff: I declare the amendment passed.

2950

[Amendment 7.](#)

Immediately after Proposition 5, insert the following Proposition:-

"6. To direct the Development & Planning Authority to fast track a review of the current Island Development Plan especially pertaining to waterfront issues and land use, and to direct the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure in co-operation with the Policy & Resources Committee to prioritise resources for a review of the Strategic Land Use Plan."

The Deputy Bailiff: We now go to Amendment 7.

It is you, Deputy Gollop. Would you like the States' Greffier to read out the amendment?

2955 **Deputy Gollop:** Yes, please.

The States' Greffier read out the amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop gets to do his speech.

Deputy Gollop: Yes, thank you.

2960 Yes, I will not say it was a last-minute amendment because I had thought about it for some time but other issues came up prior to putting it and we have seen quite a few. Part of me was tempted to withdraw it because it is never a good idea to get into amendments at a quarter past four on a Friday afternoon, when people are in a fed-up kind of mood.

2965 Because, like Deputy Ferbrache, I did not understand a word of the exchange on the last amendment. My reason for voting against is, regardless of the common sense that it has for Planning in being able to formulate their plan within 18 months of the decision on commercial ports not being made, that only delays the process further.

2970 This is precisely the point of my amendment. Although it says no consultation was done, in practice, myself and Deputy de Lisle did meet a couple of pretty senior officers, who served at the DPA and E&I and one could sort of ... I am perhaps not a particularly process-diligent person and I ignored my own SACC rule, much to the probable dislike of the other SACC committee Members, because there is a lot of bureaucracy now under the new 4(1) and when I looked back at the amendment, for example, Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Soulsby successfully won, they said, 'Oh, it contributes to a wide variety of States' objectives and policy plans; Government Work Plan, St Peter Port regeneration, Guernsey tourism, energy, climate change mitigation, Integrated Transport Strategy and a Strategy for Nature.'

2975 I did not put all of that. But a comprehensive speeding up of looking at Planning will obviously touch all those areas and many more because, when one looks at the bigger picture here, at the literature, what have we got, the waterfront is just part of the Island's situation but it has an impact on many other things.

2980 When one was going through work for today, I came across the Strategic Land Plan. Now the Strategic Land Plan was a product of Guernsey Tomorrow. I will be the first to say that Guernsey Tomorrow was a relatively successful consultation exercise, diligently done over a long period of time.

2985 Do you know what year it was done? 2010 or so. This was approved by the States on 30th November 2011. Now that was not the last States or the States before that. It was even the States before the Sarnian Spring, so-called. In other words, we are still working from a document that has not been approved for over 11 years. What business would be in that sort of situation?

2990 When you look at it, it was written in quite generic terms but parts of it are definitely relatively old. It does not have as much on climate change as it would do now. It does not have a particular emphasis on housing, wellness and the Partnership of Purpose was not even in the picture.

Listen to this from this particular bit, the spatial strategy that is core to us:

... development is concentrated within and around the edges of the urban centres of St Peter Port and St Sampson's Vale with some limited development within and around the edges of the other main parish or local centres to enable community growth and the reinforcement of sustainable centres.

Since all that was written, we have seen a considerable increase in housing prices, we have seen definite resistance to green fields being developed ahead of brown fields. St Sampson's and the Vale have been perhaps redefined and the Leale's Yard will continue that.

It just needs upgrading and looking at it again. Again:

... sustainable developments reducing where practical the Island's contribution to greenhouse gases ...

That isn't strong enough. Nor is the policy LV2 for climate change mitigation or its adaption. And sustainable design has changed.

But this is going back a long time. Then I come to another debate that I was involved with, because I was President at the time of the Development & Planning Authority. Earlier in this week, Deputy Inder wanted people to know one reason he supported electronic voting was he said he wanted people to know what he was doing in 2016. Well, I can tell you, Deputy Inder arrived in the Chamber just as we were finishing the Island Development Plan debate – he had actually missed the first half, but he won a by-election, so he could not help that.

We voted all that through to take effect and we made it very clear that a review would take place within five years, by October 2021. But for logistical reasons that has not happened. Obviously we have had COVID, we have had other problems. But that is a little bit of an issue because we are embarking on a new voyage of this waterfront development – at the time I thought we might be rehearsing the new Abba album because we had *Don't Shut Me Down* with the seafront, we had *Just a Notion* from Deputy Falla and I would talk about my *Little Things* but I will come onto that later, maybe in general debate.

But we go into ... here is a debate from the closing part of the last States. We considered after consideration of a policy letter of the Development & Planning Authority – this was not during my time, it was during the solicitor Deputy Dawn Tindall era, or Deputy Oliver was still involved, Vice-President. We were to note the annual and we noted that the DPA had an obligation under the statutory Island Development Plan to review housing land supply and employment land supply in the five-year review. Now the five-year review has been postponed.

Then we directed the Development & Planning Authority to extend the current scope for the five-year review of the IDP to include specific reviews of development frameworks, green field land, important open land, Agricultural Priority Areas and visitor accommodation. Now we will actually see, we have seen because the report tells us, that there has been a 10% decline in the last three years of visitor accommodation. We have seen encroachment on some areas used by agriculture, formerly, into horticulture –

I give way to Deputy –

Deputy Oliver: Point of correction, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Did you say it was a point of correction, Deputy Oliver?

Deputy Oliver: Yes. The visitor accommodation is not for the Development & Planning to look at. It is actually Economic Development. They will be coming up with a strategy for us to facilitate.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Gollop: That is a fair enough point, except that I am actually reading from the Resolutions of the States that the then Development & Planning Authority put to the Chamber. So it clearly is a joint enterprise rather than just specifically.

The point I am making is that there is a lot of work to be done. Now, Deputy Oliver and her new committee, new-ish committee, have received a lot of praise and are seen perhaps to be doing as good a job if not a better job than its predecessors. I am aware of a number of workstreams that they have put into play, from visitor accommodation to further work on reducing unnecessary proposals whereby you have to develop. There are more exemptions and all kinds of things.

But here we are. We are actually working on the waterfront strategy, with enormous consequences, for everything from marine life to tourism, to economic development to our very ecological existence. We are also, in a way, going to have areas like Leale's Yard associated with this.

There is clearly an enormous implication for housing and for spatial planning and for transportation and maybe one benefit of this vision will be to reduce the suburbanisation of much of the country parishes and the development area of losses and open land. I feel that if we are wishing to be serious on this strategy and effective with time, and also with other strategies like, for example, housing, energy, transportation, we need to be working with modern, third decade tools.

I do not understand why and how, in the Government Work Plan, we have actually side-lined the importance of putting financial and human resources into a forward development. Because there has, I understand, been a net reduction in people working on that whole area of planning or secondment of officers to other areas.

So I did not wish this to be seen as a hostile amendment, in any way, to the Committees, including Development & Planning. What it is, it is a raising-awareness call, a wake-up call, perhaps also a premonition to the Government Work Plan update, that if we are going to succeed with further economic development linked to environmental preservation, and also getting things done, not necessarily action this day but action this decade, we need a modern planning framework. We need a reconsideration.

Other speakers have already made my speech for me, in some ways. We heard Deputy Parkinson, for example, say that he did not realise when he voted for the Island Development Plan, some of the inflexibility that has come with it. Deputy Dyke, as a Member of the Development & Planning Authority, has informed us there were things in the pipeline, coming down. We have had other considerations about housing and the difficulties, maybe, that we have got with the use of land in St Peter Port to free it up and to make it work.

So this galvanising and putting dynamics before this work is inevitable. Even if this amendment is not supported today, surely it should come back by the summer, hopefully with support from everybody including the Development & Planning Authority.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle, do you formally second this?

Deputy de Lisle: I do and I reserve my right now –

A Member: Point of order.

Deputy de Lisle: I do, madam, and I would like to speak right now, if I may.

The Deputy Bailiff: I think there are going to be some motions in relation to this debate, so that, I am afraid, I need to establish first, before you are given opportunity to speak as seconder.

Deputy de Lisle: You are saying I will have the opportunity to speak?

The Deputy Bailiff: No, Deputy de Lisle, what I am saying is that I believe that I am going to be asked to have a motion, possibly under 24(6) that this goes beyond the original Proposition and that takes priority to your speech as seconder.

Deputy Soulsby: That is what I would like to propose, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: So Deputy Soulsby is proposing a motion under 24(6) that this amendment goes beyond the original Proposition.

I do consider that it does go beyond the Proposition so I will put this to the Chamber, a motion that the amendment be not debated a no vote be taken upon it. That is the motion being sought by Deputy Soulsby. Those who support the motion indicate Pour; those against?

Members voted Pour.

The Deputy Bailiff: The motion is passed. Therefore, there will be no debate on Amendment 7.

[Amendment 2.](#)

Insert the following proposition immediately after Proposition 3:

"3A. To agree that the Development Agency is added to the existing list of entities whose activities fall within the scope of the States of Guernsey Freedom of Information Code."

The Deputy Bailiff: We now go to Amendment 2, which is the last amendment.

I turn to Deputy Burford, as proposer. Do you wish the amendment to be formally read out, Deputy Burford?

Deputy Burford: No, thank you, I think it is fairly straight forward.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Burford: Madam, I do not have very much to say on this amendment as, as I have mentioned, it is straight forward.

As I have previously outlined, however, I do have significant concerns about the limited nature of public consultation and input that is going to be involved in this wider Development Agency project. Extending the Freedom of Information code to the Development Agency is not going to solve all of those public engagement issues but it will give the public and the media and indeed States' Members one more lever with which to gain transparency around this major undertaking.

I have been asked, if I want the Development Agency to fall under the FOI code, then why not the Sports Commission or the GHA or any other arm's length body. My answer is that I would have no problem in adding these other entities but they are not the matter in hand and, of course, no comparison can realistically be made between something like the Sports Commission and the multi-million pound wide-ranging venture that is the Development Agency.

Both the UK and Ireland apply their FOI Law to an extremely wide range of public bodies, incorporated and otherwise, including development agencies, so we would not be doing anything new. I am grateful to the President of Policy & Resources for indicating in the Teams meeting that we had on amendments that his Committee will support this amendment and, in the interest of openness and transparency, which I am sure many Members will have championed on the election trail, I ask the rest of this Assembly to support it too.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby, do you formally second this?

Deputy Soulsby: I do.

Deputy Inder: Motion 26(1), please, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Inder has asked for a motion of 26(1). Those who wish to speak on this amendment stand in their places. I do not think it is therefore necessary for me to put ...
(Interjection)

3135 Therefore there is a motion to the Chamber that any debate on Amendment 2 be guillotined. Those who wish to support the motion indicate Pour; those against?

Members voted Pour.

The Deputy Bailiff: The motion is passed.
Deputy Ferbrache.

3140 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Nothing to add to the able comments of Deputy Burford.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Nothing to respond to!

3145 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Therefore I ... Oh, yes, Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: In the interests of transparency, madam, I ask for a recorded vote, please.

3150 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Queripel.
States' Greffier, a recorded vote on Amendment 2, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 22, Contre 8, Ne Vote Pas 2, Absent 7.

POUR

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Taylor
Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Blin
Deputy Burford
Deputy Bury
Deputy Cameron
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Falla
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Matthews
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Prow
Deputy Queripel

CONTRE

Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Roffey

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Brouard
Deputy Oliver

ABSENT

Deputy St Pier
Deputy Trott
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Deputy Leadbeater
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to Amendment 2, there voted Pour 22, Contre 8. There were two abstentions and seven absences. Therefore the amendment was passed.

3155 That was the last of the amendments. States' Greffier, can we just confirm whether or not members of the team are going to circulate an amalgamated version so that Members know exactly what has been passed in due course?

We now enter general debate.

Deputy Inder.

3160 **Deputy Inder:** I am going to attempt a guillotine motion of general debate.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Inder has requested that we have a motion under 26(1). Those who wish to be part of the general debate, please stand in their place. Do you wish the motion to be put to the vote?

3165 So the motion is to guillotine the debate on the general debate in relation to the Proposition put forward by the P&R Committee as amended. Those who support the guillotine motion say Pour; those against?

Members voted Contre.

The Deputy Bailiff: I think that was lost. I will call the motion lost. We will now continue into general debate. Who wishes to speak first?

3170 Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I will do my little piece now, then.

3175 Although I supported Deputy Meerveld's, I will not call it a *sursis*, amendment earlier, because I think there is within this structure a democratic deficit and, maybe to a degree, a lack of clarity of direction, nor is there a bailout strategy if things go wrong and conflict arises between one of the numerous committees, the political oversight team and the team of the powerful, dynamic people who surely will make the waterfront group be populated with non-politicians, I think that is potentially a disaster waiting to happen, unfortunately.

3180 I do think, though, we do need to do something to move the debate forward and I am probably not like some Members, who do not really want to see anything happen. I appreciated, as I always do, what Deputy Queripel said earlier this afternoon, because I think he speaks for thousands of people in Guernsey.

3185 I do not necessarily share his opinion but I do think his opinions are quite widely held. A lot of people think we have not got any money. I do not personally agree with that mentality but it is widely believed and certainly I accept Deputy Ferbrache's view there are no money trees. And a lot of people believe there is nothing worth changing and they are negative about ideas of traffic changing or cafes or whatever.

3190 I would remind the States, and this is always a struggle, that we do seem to get a big picture mentality from some of our more able politicians, especially those who come into the States more recently, and very much a view that we should be only focussed on big, strategic direction questions, and I would remind those Members that not only did some candidates not wish to do that, some Members, but many thousands of members of the public expect us to get involved with the smaller issues.

3195 Sometimes when you get people from a high-level background who take on significant roles in our public or private commercial life, they come from outside, they do not necessarily see what a goldfish bowl they enter in Guernsey. Because suddenly, what would be a regional issue in the UK, becomes a national issue, where you are on television every night.

3200 There has been a certain sense, Deputy Meerveld, Deputy Inder and others, basically said we do not want people talking about where, for example, the bus stops are or the kiosks. But it is precisely those issues that are bigger than finding millions of pounds, in the minds of many people.

One only has to look at the events in the last States before one, that poor Deputy Burford suffered unfairly for, amongst others, when the Environment Board wanted to go down the route, Deputy Queripel reminded us about this, or narrowing the coast-way.

3205 They had, amongst other goals, climate change, and another goal of improving access to cafes and things. Now, Deputy Queripel queries the effectiveness of those cafes late at night, in the evening, because of the sun setting. He is right, they probably are more popular in the day. But they are used at night, especially in the summer. I myself will be having a little cigarette with some of my colleagues outside, even though it is the east coast.

Ironically, Economic Development in this term have blazed a trail by opening up part of the pavement, in conjunction with Environment & Infrastructure, so now the pavement along the seafront has effectively been widened for the use of cafes and one has to walk out almost in what used to be the road, which is frustrating for me but it is good for the diners.

What happened five years ago. Enough is enough. Sometimes the news for the public is dominated by issues of buses not running or a beer garden that has too much noise. Or 1,500, 2,000 people complaining about the narrowing of a road. That is why ensuring that we politically deliver is finding an answer to the paradox of Government. Because Government in our kind of society is always trying to marry two different things. It is a bit like, if you eat too much, that can be harmful; if you eat too little, that can be harmful.

In our situation, we need the expertise, we need the people who can successfully deliver projects, whether commercial or environmental, who have that vision, but we also need to democratically represent the public and that is everybody, from the older generation to the younger generations and people who I think are the emerging generations are probably more like Deputy de Sausmarez's perspective of people who want to use the Town in a different way than from a few years ago.

Where I see this is that even quite micro-issues can have a significant impact. When the North Beach car parking was developed 40 years ago, it changed the centre of Town. The centre of Town moved from the southern part to the northern part. Policing achieved that a bit, as well. If we move the bus terminus to the North Beach there are certain advantages. There are disadvantages.

Deputy Falla and Deputy Gabriel clearly thought that was a good idea but I am not sure most people who travel by bus would, because the southern terminus, although windswept, is convenient for the Town Church, what is left of the markets and the south of Town. You terminate most routes at the north of Town, you will actually go against Guernsey's strategic policy, which is probably to encourage the use of public transport. So, I am just saying you cannot always look at the things in a vacuum.

Another issue is sometimes the bus station has suffered a little bit from anti-social behaviour and anti-social characters – or I should not go there so much, no! – and there are alcohol-free zones in the area now and also in the Town Church Square, which Deputy Burford alluded to. Another micro area, really, but it has been controversial for 20 years and will probably remain so.

That part of Town, many people would argue, is being spoilt by too much traffic, cars, buses etc. being there. But of course what is the goal of freeing it from traffic? If it is to use it commercially by building on it, many people would have misgivings about that. If the goal is instead to green it up and have it as a lovely park or an area where people could relax and do things, that is good.

But we have actually had a problem in St Peter Port of people who are sitting around being regarded as anti-social in some quarters. On the one hand people hear, people want more areas to sit around in and then there are complaints that maybe they are not quite necessarily the people some people have in mind. So I think there is a social dimension to this.

The States has just voted for Deputy Oliver's amendment, but a significant issue with that is, although it may be logical, I am not at all clear on the way ahead. Because now we hear the development framework will be perhaps 18 months after the States have made a decision about the commercial harbour. We have missed the opportunity to vote for Deputy Roffey's first amendment. The second amendment was not even allowed, which was more facilitating. The possible amendment, which was to look at other areas as well, has not come forward.

So we are effectively sailing out with a waterfront development agency framework with absolutely no destination that is certain and apparently no development framework or revised SLUP or Island Development Plan, either. And so I say good luck to the people who populate the waterfront board, because they will have a very difficult job because they will have not one but three tasks.

The primary task we think they would have, would be technical and commercial knowledge of project implementation and finding the money and resourcing it, so that it goes faster than a States' procurement project. But it has two other functions it has to do. The first is somehow win the public

3260 round, especially in the run-up to a general election or maybe more difficult and challenging economic times.

And the third task they would have is working effectively without the States giving them any direction, having the problem that if their deliberations are brought back to the Chamber, and surely in some instances given the scale of the project that is inevitable, we might all start amending it all over again or throwing it out, or saying. 'we do not like this', 'we do not like that'.

3265 So, I certainly have reservations about much of this and also about who owns it, because this structure is difficult in a non-executive structure and it is difficult in a situation where St Sampson's and St Peter Port, although they have active Constables and Douzaines, they do not have, really, local government that can take effective decisions on the ground. But they do have a role, occasionally, in blocking projects or inputting their dialogue on. And the Education Committee, 3270 from the last term, can look at what happened when the Douzaines, late in the day, were worried about a project that was moving forward.

So, actually, I am positive in the sense that we really do need to get a more focussed waterfront development agency structure. I support on balance the amendments that Deputy St Pier and 3275 others placed, and I think we need to realistically finance it. And we need to balance the commercial opportunities, which undoubtedly exist, with real environmental vision and respect for the communities. In fact the community comes up a lot.

But the main report from the waterfront agency does not, I think, put enough emphasis on some areas, such as housing around the area, or transport, or heritage, or arts. I think they are all areas 3280 that need to be input into the process.

So I do support it but I think that the political structure surrounding it and the financial structure are still not particularly robust and will need further work. And we desperately need this group of high-level people to come up with a vision quickly, to sell it to the public and then for it to be re-debated in the Chamber. Otherwise we will run the risk of significant political controversy and things 3285 never happening. As it is now, I cannot see anything material really happening before 2025. I hope I am proved wrong.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

3290 **Deputy Roffey:** Thank you, madam Deputy Bailiff.

I think there has been a philosophical schism, really, running through – well, we have only just started the actual debate – the debate that has sort of come out through the corners on the amendments. There has been a set of Deputies, largely first-termers but not entirely first-termers, who take the line that actually let us outsource all of this. Let us get wiser people than us, more 3295 experienced people than us. People with a better grasp of the commercial world than us, to do it on our behalf. From idea, conception stage, all the way through.

I do not buy that. I do understand why it is attractive because, frankly, we have had 15 years of various attempts to have a politically driven solution and it has not really got us very far. I am not saying that nothing has happened but I do not think it has got us very far. But I just do not think in 3300 a democracy you can outsource political decisions.

You know, I have seen pejorative things on social media from a Deputy saying, if you leave it up to Deputies, by the time they have finished with their coloured crayons it will be a complete mess. I am not going to hand over the east coast of Guernsey to a bunch of entrepreneurs and business types to pick up their coloured crayons and decide exactly how it wants to be divvied up. I am quite 3305 happy for them to use their fertile minds to come up with ideas and to come up with suggestions.

Where we are left now, I have not seen the consolidated proposals but I am looking at the successful Amendment 3 and looking at 1(A) and I think that 1(A)a is going to be absolutely crucial, which is when the strategic direction, as envisaged by this new body, is brought back to this States for approval.

3310 I pass notice now that I am not going to be a humble little Deputy, saying I am not going to challenge that because these are the great, the good, these are the billionaires, the entrepreneurs,

these are the people, the construction experts and the whatever else, because I am here on behalf of the people of Guernsey and if I do not think that that vision is correct, I will try to amend it.

3315 So I think in some ways, the important tasks and important things that these people will have to do, and I have no idea who they are going to be, is in Amendments 3 1(A)a and 1(A)c. Because once we have approved a vision and the elements of it, it is going to be delivery process. I do question whether the same membership should be on the Development Agency all the way through, because I think it is an entirely different set of skills, what is there under 1(A)a, which is a sort of master planning, a vision, of course you need to know what is practical and what is not practical. So there
3320 will be some crossover at skills, I accept that. But there is a different set of skills between the execution and the vision.

So it is not without some trepidation that I actually go with this proposal at all, for exactly the reasons that I have set out that I think it is to some extent outsourcing Government, but I think it is trying something different, we do have an under-utilised superb asset on the east coast. I wish we
3325 could have done it ourselves better up to now. We have not really managed it but I am not letting go. You know, I am still sitting on here, in here, or standing at the moment, as a representative of the people of Guernsey and then what comes back, if I think it is wrong, I would oppose it, amend it, do whatever, but I wish it the very best of luck and I hope that we get the right mix of people on it.

3330 I do not mean this wrongly, because some of them, I will be talking about friends of mine. But I hope it is not just the usual suspects that end up on this body. Because I think if we are really going to have fertile ideas, there are some brilliant people that we use again and again and I am really grateful to them for everything they have given to this Island. But I think we need to have ideas coming from leftfield as well, if you like, and have a real meld of ideas. So, I have got trepidation, I
3335 have got trepidation but I am going to park my cynicism and go with this but with one heck of a watching brief, I have to say.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle, just before you speak, and I will call you next, I am going to ask H.M. Sherriff to circulate the Proposition in paper form, so that everybody has it in front of
3340 them.

Propositions (as amended)

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled 'Establishment of a Development Agency' dated 31st January 2022, they are of the opinion:-

1. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee, in consultation with the States' Trading Supervisory Board, to set-out the options for Guernsey's future operational harbour and commercial port infrastructure requirements for approval by the States.

1A. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to establish a Development Agency as a company limited by guarantee, wholly owned by the States, that will be tasked with:

a) the preparation of a strategic direction for approval by the States setting out the options for the provision of infrastructure along Guernsey's east coast consistent with the objectives and priorities set out in paragraphs 9.3 to 9.5;

b) the preparation of a Long-Term Development Plan for the provision of future operational harbour and commercial port requirements and infrastructure along Guernsey's east coast consistent with the relevant extant strategies and policies of the States, and with the detailed requirements set out in the Local Planning Briefs. The Long-Term Development Plan shall require a Certificate of Consistency from the political oversight group to provide assurance that the proposals are consistent with the decisions of the States and its strategies and policies; and

c) delivery of the Long-Term Development Plan.

2. To agree to establish the political oversight group (as set out in paragraph 5.9.2.7) which shall:

- Have oversight of the appointment process of a board for the Development Agency (as set out in paragraph 5.9.2.8) and thereafter make recommendations of appointments to the board for approval by the States;

- Discharge the role as the guarantor on behalf of the States (as set out in paragraph 5.9.2.10);

- Have responsibility for certifying that the Long-Term Development Plan is consistent with the decisions and strategic directions of the States of Guernsey and its strategies and policies as may be amended from time to time;

- Undertake a comprehensive review of the strategic direction every five years in accordance with paragraph 9.14, or sooner should the political oversight group consider it necessary to do so, for approval by the States;

- Deliver the annual report of the Development Agency to the Policy & Resources Committee for submission to the States for debate (as set out in paragraph 6.7);

- Comprise three States' Members, one nominated by each (but need not be a Member) of the Policy & Resources Committee, the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure and the Committee for Economic Development. 2A. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to develop and set out for approval by the States the Terms of Reference, any delegated authorities and clear financial arrangements for the political oversight group (based on the principles set out in paragraph 7.5).

3. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to make available a maximum of £1million of funding over the first two years of the establishment of the Development Agency (as set out in section 7) by approving funding from the 2022 Budget Reserve and making specific allowance in recommended Cash Limits for 2023 and 2024.

3A. To agree that the Development Agency is added to the existing list of entities whose activities fall within the scope of the States of Guernsey Freedom of Information Code.

4. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to:

a) establish a clear land management transfer policy for approval by the States; and

b) consult with the States' Trading Supervisory Board on the areas of land to be transferred from the States to the Development Agency and on the revenue implications that would result; and

c) to effect that transfer once the Development Agency has been established.

5. To direct the Development & Planning Authority to complete the Local Planning Briefs for the St Peter Port and St Sampson Harbour Action Areas within 18 months following a decision of the States which provides direction as to the future development of commercial port infrastructure for Guernsey.

6a. To agree that the development agency, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, should identify and include in its development of the strategic direction the most viable option for taking through-traffic off the surface level of the road between the South Esplanade and the North Beach roundabout (or whichever points along 3 the stretch of seafront through St. Peter Port that the agency considers more appropriate) in order to realise greater potential economic, social, and environmental benefits in this area of the public realm.

6b. To direct the Development & Planning Authority to take this aspect of the strategic direction into account when developing the Local Planning Brief for the St. Peter Port Harbour Action Area

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Thank you, madam.

3345 I have reservations with respect to the establishment of a development agency. The first one would be the investment of £1 million for the first two years of our monies, when really the Chief Minister has made the point very recently in the *Press* and in this Assembly with regard to the fact that we are not doing enough for the people themselves, particularly when you look at the increase in inflation that we are being subjected to over the next little while and the impact this is having on many families across the board.

3350 Yet here, we are talking about putting £1 million into this planning process to establish a development agency that probably we could be doing ourselves, if we got with it, internally here, with the decision-making that this parliament could be making.

3355 The other point is that this money is being put forward to appoint the hiring of new staff when we should be rationalising the Civil Service, in my view, and certainly not appointing three members of staff, a chief executive, a commercial development officer and an administrator at £250,000 a year, and in addition to that setting up an office, at £250,000, as well as that, in terms of putting forward IT, office space and so on and so forth for that particular office development when, in fact, we have got officers internally here that could be used and we have personnel that we have got to utilise, perhaps, in different ways now as we see the circumstances changing very rapidly before us, not only as a result of COVID, not only as a result of Brexit, but also the result of the turmoil, the global turmoil at the current time, into the future that we do not really know how it is going to transpire.

3360 But our people are definitely going to suffer here, with respect to inflation and pricing across the board, and we have to consider that before investing so much money into a study through a development agency.

3365 But also there is this business of establishing a land management transfer policy. Land to be transferred from the States to a development agency. What is all that about? The land is part and parcel of the people here in Guernsey. It is not to be transferred, *ad lib*, to a development agency. So I cannot agree to that either.

3370 And this business of establishing a political oversight group of three people. It is the States as a whole to be involved in that. Not three people, Deputies Helyar, Inder and de Sausmarez. What is all that about? It is the States as a whole to be looking at that, not just three people as an oversight. Other politicians have been elected to represent the people as well as those three.

3375 So there is lots in here that I do not like. But the main thing is the Chief Minister's point, a very strong point, investing more in the people of this Island rather than these developments of this nature and a development agency taking up so much money over two years and further increasing the numbers of staff, when we should be looking at reducing those numbers.

3380 I also, through this process, have become more and more aware, and it has become very obvious to all, of the lack of a review of the IDP and local planning briefs of St Peter Port and St Sampson's, which has had a very delaying impact and a negative impact on regeneration across the Island, but particularly with respect to regeneration through the harbours and on the east coast and bringing planning policy, really, up to date with current public thinking. Because it is lagging and it has got to be brought up to date quickly.

3385 We are lacking a review of the current Island Development Plan. It is long overdue. DPA requested postponement in 2020 of the five-year review of the IDP, given the COVID pandemic emergency. Fair enough but the Strategic Land-Use Plan (SLUP) is also dated at 2011 and is in need of review. This has in the past frustrated development opportunity and regeneration, as I say.

3390 So, in all, I feel that, really, the hiring of new staff, the oversight group, why set up a new office transferring public land to a development agency and this whole business of delaying a review of the current plans, Island Development Plans, and the briefs, with respect to St Peter Port and St Sampson's, delaying those further is just not on, as far as I am concerned.

3395 While I am standing, though, I was also asked my relationship to Daniel de Lisle Brock and I have to just answer that, madam, if I may! The relationship is direct. Daniel's mother was Elizabeth de Lisle and the relationship is five generations back. Daniel, as you know, was Bailiff here while his brother Isaac on the left was fighting against the Americans in Upper Canada, in Ontario, now.

I thank you for your indulgence.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy de Lisle.
Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, madam.

I have voted in favour of all the amendments, which incrementally increase the governance and control over the Development Agency quango. But because the Assembly has rejected ultimate control through Amendment 8, I will vote against all of the proposals and will explain to Members why they should do the same. Much has been made of the abilities of commercial business people. Deputy Ferbrache accurately quoted me as having said that Government should not interfere in free markets and should get out of the way and allow businesses to get on with it.

I stand by those sentiments. But the reverse is also true. Deputy Inder kindly referenced my extensive international business experience yesterday day. *(Interjection and laughter)* What I did was serve as a managing director of the Asian and US operation of the world's three largest investment fund research companies, one of which is now a listed company in the USA and the two others are subsidiaries of Reuters and Standard & Poor's. What this international experience at the top of an industry gives me is a certain perspective. A perspective which is different from, say, someone who drove a taxi while renting a couple of self-catering units in Guernsey. **(Several Members: Ahh.) (A Member: Meow!)** *(Laughter)*

Yesterday I admitted that prior to being elected my extensive international corporate experience had led me to believe that governments should act more like business. However, since becoming a Deputy I have learned that the functions and drivers of Government are completely different to those of business and therefore it is equally inappropriate for companies to try and manage Government or even more so than it is for Government to try and manage businesses.

My biggest issue with this proposed Development Agency quango is a lack of direct accountability to our community. Members of the public who object to a States' proposal, can petition the Deputies they elected to intervene on their behalf. If they are not satisfied with the action of those Deputies, they can reject them at the next election. There is no such direct accountability with this quango and those voting for its introduction are voting away their power to intervene on behalf of the public. Something they are likely to be challenged on in the future.

Before our final votes on these proposals, I suggest Members carefully consider how realistic their expectations for this quango are. We are led to believe that this quango will deliver a comprehensive, holistic plan, for development of our east coast and then will proceed to development autonomously.

Let me predict what I believe will transpire. I expect that the independent directors will quickly find themselves fettered with all the planning requirements and public expectations, which this Assembly faces when making decisions. These realities will prevent them producing a comprehensive, long-term plan, with staged developments, as would be done in the private sector.

Instead, to justify their existence, they will propose disparate vanity projects, plus others, which address a few immediate issues, without any comprehensive long-term plan. Some of those projects will then provoke the public backlash mentioned by Deputy de Lisle yesterday. For example, take the proposals to move the model yacht pond to Salerie Corner. A Salerie hotel. Shops on the North Beach. Little Venice. Or to fill in Belle Grève entirely. Think about how the public reacted to those now dead and defunct proposals. Dead and defunct, assuming the quango does not try to resurrect them.

The public backlash will then escalate when they face frustration at their inability to change the proposals through the rules-based IDP Planning Law and pressure will mount on Deputies to prevent the proposals proceeding and potentially to wind-up the quango. Followed by the usual recriminations regarding money and time wasted.

It is worth referencing the comments of the Development & Planning Authority President, Deputy Oliver, during the debate on Amendment 9. She said that the Island Development Plan Law

comes higher and trumps anything we say in this Assembly. Illustrating perfectly how the previous Assembly locked themselves and future Assemblies out of the planning process, preventing Deputies representing public interest in the process.

Deputy Dyke observed that the Assembly can potentially amend the Island Development Plan Law and will back some of those restrictions. But that is a debate for another day and I look forward to having it.

I recommend to Deputies that they reject these proposals entirely and instead issue the challenge to Deputy Ferbrache and P&R to show leadership from a group of entrepreneurs to help shape a comprehensive, holistic plan for developing our east coast. Then sell that plan to Members and the public to garner broad support. And finally establish a development agency to deliver the approved plans, rather than try bulldozing through action for action's sake by circumventing the many checks and balances of our Assembly.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Meerveld.

Before we continue, I am mindful of the time. It is now 10 past five. I propose the following motion. That there be a motion:

To continue the debate on the Development Agency and also deal with Future Business this evening but defer the debate on the IDP Plan Monitoring Report 2020 until the April Meeting.

So I will read that again because it is quite a long motion. The motion is:

To continue the debate on the Development Agency and also deal with Future Business this evening but defer the debate on the IDP Plan Monitoring Report 2020 until the April Meeting.

Those who support the motion, indicate Pour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Deputy Bailiff: The motion is carried.

So, Deputy Matthews, you indicated you wanted to speak.

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, madam.

Deputy Gollop mentioned in his speech the democratic deficit that he saw in these proposals and I am afraid that is what I see in them, as well. It looks for all the world like a proposal to outsource Government for the east coast development to a quango, to a commercial organisation, and quite an expensive commercial organisation, with a million pounds' worth of funding.

If you look at the topics that we have discussed during the debate on this, we have talked about the east coast, we have talked about the harbour and the marina and the possibility of luxury flats and hotels and possibly conference centres and cafes and al fresco dining and traffic tunnels. These in general all seem like the sorts of topics that are of interest to boat-y, yacht-y people who are interested in those sorts of things and not so much the sorts of topics that are of interest to ordinary people, who are struggling with bills, the cost of living, the cost of fuel, traffic, rents, mortgages and that is if you can find somewhere to live at all, which many people cannot, or are struggling to find the right type of place to live.

It just seems that there is in general a lack of co-ordination between different visions and a lack of prioritisation. It looks like we are in a bit of a mess. We are struggling with where to put the strategic development brief, the local planning brief, with little direction about where the harbour is actually going to be.

Even when those plans are in place, I have some doubts about whether what actually gets developed really matches up with what is intended or what people think is intended by the contents of the planning briefs and development briefs.

I think, really, we are failing to grasp the real issues that matter to Islanders, which are a shortage of housing, despite an over-development in the north, and the price of housing and the cost of living. I think those are the things that, really, this Assembly ought to be focussing on and I have some doubts about the nature or what this proposal might achieve.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, madam, and I will be brief.

I largely agree with Deputy Meerveld, so I will not repeat the points he has made, although I do not necessarily agree with the bits about working in Asia and taxis and self-catering units, just to make that clear! I partly also agree with Deputy Matthews, although I do actually want to see this development and I think the concerns that he has and improving our Island can go hand in hand.

But my concern, I will not repeat all the comments that I have made about public consultation, I think I have been quite clear about that. But my remaining concern, then, is the public realm. I feel very protective of the public realm. I want it for the public. There is definitely scope within this proposal and this has been confirmed by Rule 14 – (*Interjection*) questions to the Policy & Resources Committee that the Development Agency will be able to, once the land is transferred to them, to create leases on it and lease it out, for any length of time they deem to be appropriate, to private developers and to private interests.

This fundamentally can turn the public realm into the private realm and that is my concern. I think it would be a concern of a great number of Islanders if they were aware and, for those reasons, I will not be able to support the basic Propositions.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, madam.

Please may I try another 26(1)? Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, thank you, Deputy Prow.

So Deputy Prow has proposed that the motion be that the debate be guillotined. Those who wish to talk in the debate, please stand in your place. Deputy Prow, do you wish to pursue the motion?

Deputy Prow: Yes I do, please, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: So, the motion is that the debate be guillotined. Those who support the motion indicate *Pour*; those against.

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.

The Deputy Bailiff: I am going to ask for a recorded vote, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 18, Contre 15, Ne Vote Pas 1, Absent 5.

POUR

Deputy Trott
Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy Aldwell

CONTRE

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Brouard

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Le Tocq

ABSENT

Deputy Taylor
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller

Deputy Blin
Deputy Cameron
Deputy Falla
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Inder
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Prow

Deputy Burford
Deputy Bury
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Matthews
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Queripel
Deputy Roffey

Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

3540 **The Deputy Bailiff:** So the motion that the debate be guillotined under 26(1), there voted Pour 18, Contre 15. There was one abstention and five absences. Therefore the motion was carried.
I therefore invite Deputy Ferbrache to reply on behalf of P&R.

Deputy Ferbrache: Thank you very much, madam.

3545 And I really am, and I know I said it before and I do mean it sincerely, I am grateful to everybody for their contributions in relation to the amendments and everything over the last day, or day and a half, that we have been speaking. Because this is an important step forward, if the States is willing to make it.

3550 Now, we will deal almost in reverse order. I am not going to deal with the speeches, that is not my style, but I will deal with Deputy Burford. When she was speaking, I wrote the word 'trust' as a side note to myself as a memory aid. We have got to trust people to do things properly. This is not turning the public realm into the private realm. There is no dispensing of States' assets. They are and will always remain. Before anything is sold, it has got to come back to this States and the States approves it or otherwise.

3555 The Agency will always – always –
I am not giving way.

Deputy Burford: Point of correction.

3560 **The Deputy Bailiff:** What is your point of correction, Deputy Burford?

Deputy Burford: I was not referring to assets being sold, I was referring to them being leased and will not need to come back to this Assembly.

3565 **Deputy Ferbrache:** I was not saying she was. I was just making my speech. I started off by quoting her words that she was worried that we would be turning the public realm into the private realm. Now, we are not going to do that at all because as I say, *inter alia*, we, the States' Assembly will remain in control of the assets of the States that cannot be sold without the States' approval. The Development Agency will be under the control, under the supervision of the States, there is a political oversight board.

3570 In relation to all of that, we can either stay as we are – and Deputy Roffey said something; I agree with him – that it would have been better if we could have done it but we have done – again, collectively we, the States' Assemblies – have done nothing over the last, whether it is 15 or 20 years, of any consequence. And I am not going to go into the private developments, which really have
3575 nothing to do with what we have been talking about, that Deputy Trott raised yesterday because that showed how the people can do things if they are left to do things on their own in their own guise.

Now, in relation to that, we can move forward, we can be aspirational. Deputy Meerveld talked about his considerable – which I accept – corporate experience. He knows how corporate works. So the essence of what he was saying, he knows better than anybody else, he knows better than Deputy Inder because he has got more commercial experience.

I perhaps do not have as much commercial experience as Deputy Meerveld. I have been non-exec chairman of a bank, I have been non-exec chairman of a commercial bank. I have been a private trustee for many years. I have had businesses. I still run businesses. I have had lots of business interests. But perhaps that does not accord with Deputy Meerveld's considerable experience, but it is not too bad for a boy from Charroterie.

In relation to that, Deputy de Lisle also raised the point, and it is a valid point, about spending £1 million when people are hard up. I fully accept that and what I think we need to do and this is outside of this debate, we, this Assembly, should invite ordinary Guernsey folk ... how we can do our job better, what we can look at, the key issues that we can look at, that we have failed to deliver on for States after States, that we are planning to deliver on now. But that is not for today.

The eastern seafront has been neglected for years. It has fantastic opportunities, as we have talked about. We could continue to just do nothing, we could continue to be mediocre, we could continue to be second rate. We could continue to not give the people of Guernsey the best environment that they could live in, the best environment that they can enjoy and open up to our visitors this beautiful Island even more.

Now this is not a tomorrow solution, this is not a next year solution. There are going to be things that are going to be developed over very many years and I believe there will be a cohesive development. I fully accept the point Deputy Gollop made in a previous debate, it has been emphasised by somebody else in this debate, I think by Deputy Roffey. We cannot go back to the same well and drink the same water that has been provided by that fountain or that whatever it is.

We have got to go to new talent. We have got to go to a different generation. We have got to look at new entrepreneurs. We have got to look at new people who are able to give ideas and I am not suggesting that it is all people who have run big businesses, etc. It is people with nous, it is people with common sense. It is people with a positive outlook. It is people who have got a candour outlook. That is what we are looking for.

Now, the Development Agency, the amendments put forward by Deputies St Pier and Helyar, have tightened the governance. They have given a clear guidance. Deputy de Lisle, sorry he has got famous ancestors, I do not, no need to talk about those, but Deputy de Lisle has made the point in relation to there are only three people that will be on the political oversight board. Well, and again I take it back to Deputy Meerveld, with his considerable corporate experience, how many board of directors did he have with 38 directors who would make decisions on every decision? They would review every decision. I have got board experience, Deputy Trott has got board experience, Deputy Parkinson has got board experience. I doubt that they or I would have sat on a board with 38 members making decision after decision.

You generally trust, even if a board, I have never been on a board that big, but you generally trust two or three directors to get on with a particular project or projects. That is the way the real commercial world works. And that is how this would operate in this particular case.

And that political oversight on behalf of the States would have to report back to their colleagues. There is a reporting mechanism, which is set out in the policy letter. The policy letter, when I originally was going to do my closing speech, because I do not generally tend to write speeches because I am not quite sure what I am going to say next, but in relation to that, I had lots of points I was going to quote from the Billet.

It is not necessary. Everybody has read the Billet, everybody has read it probably three or four times. It is clear that the only way forward is to take this step. It is not actually a step into the unknown. It is a gentle step. It is little steps that we are taking to move the development of this Island forward by setting up a new vehicle, a development agency, as I say will be under the ultimate control of the States.

Now, it is 1726, I think I have said enough. It is for this Assembly to decide whether it wants to move forward or it wants to take the negative view of Deputy Meerveld and reject the proposals.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Queripel?

Deputy Queripel: Madam, I ask for separate recorded votes, please.

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to each Proposition?

Deputy Queripel: Proposition 1 on its own, then Proposition 1A through to 3 together, then Proposition 3A separately, Proposition 4 separately, Proposition 5 separately and finally Proposition 6A and 6B together. So to clarify, madam, that is a total of six separate recorded votes, please.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Burford: Madam?

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: I would quite like to have separate votes on everything except 6A and 6B together.

The Deputy Bailiff: So, there will be separate votes on 1, 1A, 2, 2A, 3, 3A, 4, 5 and then 6A and 6B will be together.

Deputy Taylor: Could I request 6A and 6B as separately, madam?

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Taylor.
We will do 6A and 6A separately.
Deputy Queripel, do you want a recorded vote on each of those aspects?

Deputy Queripel: No, not the As and Bs, madam.

Deputy Burford: Yes please, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, thank you, Deputy Burford.

Deputy Queripel: Well, actually, yes. To clarify madam, yes, the 1A, yes.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Queripel, Deputy Burford has asked for recorded votes so, we will go for record votes on each of the Propositions and in relation to 6A and 6B, the sub-propositions.

Deputy Queripel: Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: States' Greffier, perhaps you could read out which Proposition you are dealing with each time, so we can be clear?

The States' Greffier: Proposition 1. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee in consultation with the States' Trading Supervisory Board to set out the options for Guernsey's future operational harbour and commercial port infrastructure requirements for approval by the States.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 1.

Carried – Pour 34, Contre 1, Ne Vote Pas 0, Absent 4.

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Meerveld	None	Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy St Pier			Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Deputy Taylor			Alderney Rep. Roberts
Deputy Trott			Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Vermeulen			
Deputy Aldwell			
Deputy Blin			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Burford			
Deputy Bury			
Deputy Cameron			
Deputy de Lisle			
Deputy de Sausmarez			
Deputy Dyke			
Deputy Fairclough			
Deputy Falla			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Gabriel			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Haskins			
Deputy Helyar			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Le Tocq			
Deputy Leadbeater			
Deputy Mahoney			
Deputy Matthews			
Deputy McKenna			
Deputy Moakes			
Deputy Murray			
Deputy Oliver			
Deputy Parkinson			
Deputy Prow			
Deputy Queripel			
Deputy Roffey			

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

3685 **Deputy Oliver:** Madam, may I suggest that because we are doing recorded Propositions on all of them that people can stand up if they, say, want Contre and je ne vote pas, and then that would be much quicker?

3690 **The Deputy Bailiff:** It would be quicker, but it would not be a recorded vote, I am afraid, in the proper sense of the word, Deputy Oliver, even though I am sure there is some sympathy in the Chamber for your –

Deputy Oliver: No because you could record the people that are standing up –

3695 **The Deputy Bailiff:** No, Deputy Oliver, we are going to do it in the normal way. Thank you, though, for your suggestion.

There voted Pour 34, Contre 1, there were 4 absentees. That Proposition was passed. I will save your voice, States' Greffier, we are now voting on Proposition 1A.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 1A.

Carried – Pour 26, Contre 9, Ne Vote Pas 0, Absent 4.

POUR

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Trott
Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Blin
Deputy Cameron
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Falla
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Prow
Deputy Roffey

CONTRE

Deputy Taylor
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Burford
Deputy Bury
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Matthews
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Queripel

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

The Deputy Bailiff: Relating to Proposition 1A, there voted Pour 26, Contre 9, there were 4 absences. The Proposition is passed.

3700

In relation to Proposition 2, which is to establish the political oversight group, States' Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 2.

Carried – Pour 28, Contre 7, Ne Vote Pas 0, Absent 4.

POUR

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Taylor
Deputy Trott
Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Blin
Deputy Bury
Deputy Cameron
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Falla
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy McKenna

CONTRE

Deputy Brouard
Deputy Burford
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Matthews
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Queripel

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Prow
Deputy Roffey

The Deputy Bailiff: Proposition 2, there voted Pour 28, Contre 7, with 4 absences. The Proposition is passed.

3705 Proposition 2A, which is to direct the P&R Committee to develop and set out for approval by the States the terms of reference etc.

States' Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 2A.

Carried – Pour 30, Contre 5, Ne Vote Pas 0, Absent 4.

POUR

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Taylor
Deputy Trott
Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Blin
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Bury
Deputy Cameron
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Falla
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Prow
Deputy Roffey

CONTRE

Deputy Burford
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Matthews
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Queripel

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to Proposition 2A, there voted Pour 30, Contre 5, and there were 4 absences. Therefore the Proposition is passed.

3710 In relation to Proposition 3, relating to directing the P&R Committee to make available a maximum of £1 million of funding over the first two years, etc.

States' Greffier, would you do the vote, please?

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 3.

Carried – Pour 24, Contre 11, Ne Vote Pas 0, Absent 4.

POUR

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Trott
Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Blin
Deputy Cameron
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Falla
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Prow
Deputy Roffey

CONTRE

Deputy St Pier
Deputy Taylor
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Burford
Deputy Bury
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Matthews
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Queripel

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

3715 **The Deputy Bailiff:** In relation to Proposition 3, there voted Pour 24, 11 Contre. There were 4 absences. The Proposition is passed.

Proposition 3A, to agree that the Development Agency is added to the existing list of entities whose activities fall within the scope of the States of Guernsey Freedom of Information Code.

States' Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 3A.

Carried – Pour 26, Contre 7, Ne Vote Pas 2, Absent 4.

POUR

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Taylor
Deputy Trott
Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Blin
Deputy Burford
Deputy Bury
Deputy Cameron
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Falla
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Matthews
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Parkinson

CONTRE

Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Roffey

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Brouard
Deputy Oliver

ABSENT

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

Deputy Prow
Deputy Queripel

3720 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Proposition 3A, there voted Pour 26, Contre 7, 2 abstentions and 4 absences. I therefore declare the Proposition passed.

3725 Proposition 4, to direct the P&R Committee to establish a clear land management transfer policy for approval by the States and consult with the States' Trading Supervisory Body on the areas of land to be transferred and on the revenue implications that would result and to effect that transfer once the Development Agency has been established.

States' Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 4.

Carried – Pour 24, Contre 11, Ne Vote Pas 0, Absent 4.

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Taylor	None	Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Brouard		Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Deputy Trott	Deputy Burford		Alderney Rep. Roberts
Deputy Vermeulen	Deputy Bury		Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Aldwell	Deputy de Lisle		
Deputy Blin	Deputy de Sausmarez		
Deputy Cameron	Deputy Gollop		
Deputy Dyke	Deputy Matthews		
Deputy Fairclough	Deputy Meerveld		
Deputy Falla	Deputy Oliver		
Deputy Ferbrache	Deputy Queripel		
Deputy Gabriel			
Deputy Haskins			
Deputy Helyar			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Le Tocq			
Deputy Leadbeater			
Deputy Mahoney			
Deputy McKenna			
Deputy Moakes			
Deputy Murray			
Deputy Parkinson			
Deputy Prow			
Deputy Roffey			

3730 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Proposition 4, there voted Pour 24, Contre 11, there were 4 absences. I declare the Proposition was passed.

Proposition 5, States' Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 5.

Carried – Pour 33, Contre 2, Ne Vote Pas 0, Absent 4.

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Gollop	None	Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Meerveld		Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Deputy Taylor			Alderney Rep. Roberts
Deputy Trott			Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Vermeulen			
Deputy Aldwell			
Deputy Blin			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Burford			
Deputy Bury			

Deputy Cameron
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Falla
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy Matthews
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Prow
Deputy Queripel
Deputy Roffey

The Deputy Bailiff: Proposition 5, there voted Pour 33, Contre 2, and there were 4 absences. I declare the Proposition passed.

Proposition 6A, States' Greffier.

3735

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 6A.

Carried – Pour 25, Contre 9, Ne Vote Pas 1, Absent 4.

POUR

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Taylor
Deputy Trott
Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Blin
Deputy Burford
Deputy Bury
Deputy Cameron
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Falla
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Matthews
Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Prow
Deputy Roffey

CONTRE

Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Queripel

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Brouard

ABSENT

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

The Deputy Bailiff: Proposition 6A, there voted Pour 25, Contre 9, there was 1 abstention and 4 absences. I therefore declare the Proposition passed.

Proposition 6B, thank you, States' Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Proposition 6B.

Carried – Pour 26, Contre 8, Ne Vote Pas 1, Absent 4.

POUR

Deputy Soulsby
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Trott
Deputy Vermeulen
Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Blin
Deputy Burford
Deputy Bury
Deputy Cameron
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Dyke
Deputy Fairclough
Deputy Falla
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gabriel
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Haskins
Deputy Inder
Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Matthews
Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Prow
Deputy Roffey

CONTRE

Deputy Taylor
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Helyar
Deputy Mahoney
Deputy McKenna
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Moakes
Deputy Queripel

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Brouard

ABSENT

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

3740

The Deputy Bailiff: Proposition 6B, there voted Pour 26, Contre 8, there was 1 abstention and 4 absences. I declare the Propositions passed.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

**7. Schedule for Future States' Business –
Proposition carried**

Article 7.

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 Ordinary States Meeting on 27th April 2022, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.

STATES OF DELIBERATION SCHEDULE for FUTURE STATES' BUSINESS

(For consideration at the Ordinary Meeting of the States commencing on the 30th March 2022)

Items for Ordinary Meeting of the States commencing on the 27th April 2022

(a) communications by the Presiding Officer including in memoriam tributes;

(b) statements;

(c) questions;

(d) elections and appointments;

(e) motions to debate an appendix report (1st stage);

(f) articles adjourned or deferred from previous Meetings of the States;

(g) all other types of business not otherwise named;

No. 7 of 2022 – The European Union (Sea Fisheries, etc.) (Brexit) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2022

No. 8 of 2022 – The Abortion (Guernsey) Regulations, 2022

No. 10 of 2022 – The Parochial Elections (St Peter Port) (No. 2) Regulations, 2022

No. 12 of 2022 – The European Union (Trademark Law Treaty) (Brexit) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Regulations, 2022

No. 13 of 2022 – The Air Navigation (Restriction of Flying) (Russian Aircraft) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Regulations, 2022

No. 14 of 2022 – The Sanctions (Implementation of UK Regimes) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Brexit) (Amendment) Regulations, 2022

No. 15 of 2022 – The Sanctions (Implementation of UK Regimes) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Brexit) (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 2022

No. 16 of 2022 – The Customs and Excise (Inbound Passenger Information Reports) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Regulations, 2022

*P.2022/19 – The Human Rights (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2022**

*P.2022/22 – Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure – L'Ancrese East Management Approach to 2030**

*P.2022/21 – Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure – Proposed Amendments to the Public Highways (Temporary Closure) Ordinance, 1999 to allow the Designation of Al Fresco Zones**

*P.2022/20 – Policy & Resources Committee – The Church of England – The Attachment of the Bailiwick of Guernsey to the Diocese of Salisbury**

*P. 2022/23 – Policy & Resources Committee – Review of COVID-19 Response**

*Amendments to the proposed meeting dates and order are permitted only for those items marked with an *.*

Items for Special Meeting of the States commencing on the 14th June 2022

P.2022/xx – Government Work Plan

P.2022/xx – Accounts Items for Special Meeting of the States commencing on the 1st November 2022 P.2022/xx – States' Budget

P.2022/xx – Non-Contributory Benefits Rate

3745 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Now can I invite Deputy Ferbrache, on behalf of Policy & Resources, to present the next item on the agenda ... which I should probably ask the States' Greffier to head up. Sorry, States' Greffier. I ran before myself too!

3750 **The States' Greffier:** Article 7, the Policy & Resources Committee – Schedule for Future States' Business.

Deputy Ferbrache: Nothing to add, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Those who support the Schedule for Future States' Business, indicate Pour; those against?

Members voted Pour.

3755 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I declare the Proposition passed.
Thank you everybody. States' Greffier, if you would like to close the Meeting. I wish everybody a Happy Easter!

The Assembly adjourned at 5.57 p.m.