



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 14th October 2016

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

Volume 5, No. 28

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

Richard J McMahon, Esq, Deputy Bailiff and Deputy Presiding Officer

Law Officers

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

People's Deputies

St Peter Port South

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

St Peter Port North

Deputies J. A. B. Gollop, C. N. K. Parkinson, L. C. Queripel, M. K. Le Clerc,
M. P. Leadbeater

St Sampson

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

The Vale

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

The Castel

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

The West

Deputies A. H. Brouard, A. C. Dudley-Owen, E. A. Yerby,
D. de G. de Lisle, S. L. Langlois

The South-East

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

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives L. E. Jean and S. D. G. McKinley, O. B. E.

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

A. J. Nicolle, Esq. (H.M. Deputy Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur); Deputy J. I. Mooney (*absent de l'île*);
Deputy L. S. Trott (*absent de l'île*); Deputy G. A. St Pier (*absent de l'île*);
Deputy J. P. Le Tocq (*absent de l'île*).

Business transacted

Evocation	1889
Billet d'État XXV	1889
Battle of Hastings - 950 th anniversary.....	1889
III. The Island Development Plan – Development & Planning Authority Recommendations – Debate continued	18890
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 1.08 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.</i>	1934
The Island Development Plan – Development & Planning Authority Recommendations – Debate continued and adjourned	1934
Schedule for Future States' Business – Proposition carried <i>nem. con.</i>	1984
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.47 p.m.</i>	1985

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE DEPUTY BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Deputy Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'État XXV

DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING AUTHORITY

III. The Island Development Plan – Development & Planning Authority Recommendations – Debate continued

The Deputy Greffier: Development & Planning Authority – The Island Development Plan – Development & Planning Authority Recommendations.
Continuation of debate.

5 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, before we turn to the next amendment in this debate, I think it is appropriate to mark a significant anniversary today, because 950 years ago it was the Battle of Hastings. It is one of the reasons that the flag of Normandy is flying at Castle Cornet today and in other places in the Island, and more generally a direction has been given that the Guernsey flag be flown on public buildings. When the Guernsey flag was developed in the
10 1980's, the significance of our association with Normandy was shown by the incorporation of the Gold Cross of Normandy in its centre.

15 The Battle of Hastings, of course, did not take place in Hastings, but nearby at a place called Battle. It is believed that the Normans had 10,000 or so troops against King Harold's 7,000, and it may be at times that the Development & Planning Authority feels similarly outnumbered. There is no direct evidence that Guernseymen actually fought with Duke William at the Battle of Hastings but the Bailiwick of Guernsey is proud to have been associated with the winning side as part of the Duchy at that time and we still, of course, enjoy reminding the English of the fact that we conquered them.

20 Duke William was crowned as King William I on Christmas Day that year, 1066, and our allegiance to the English Crown and its successors has been there ever since. Guernsey and the Bailiwick continued to be governed as part of Normandy until the loss of continental Normandy in 1204. Nine hundred and fifty years is a significant time, but this debate will be over hopefully quicker than that (*Laughter*) and we will move on now to the next amendment which is amendment number 3 to be proposed by Deputy Graham, seconded by Deputy Green.

25 Deputy Graham.

Amendment 3.

To insert at the end of the words in Proposition 1:

'subject to the modification that the boundary of the Cobo Local Centre (see the proposals map inset 7 of Appendix 1 and the proposed amendments shown in map extract 4 at page 20 of Appendix 6) shall be contracted by the exclusion of the area shaded green on the map appended to this Proposition and labelled Cobo Local Centre Boundary'.

Deputy Graham: Thank you, sir. Do you want me to read it out?

The Deputy Bailiff: You are entitled to, or you are entitled to ask the Deputy Greffier to read it out.

30

Deputy Graham: I will do it myself, sir, thank you.

Deputy Graham read the amendment.

There is, of course, the excuse to make a literary reference here to the Graham/Green amendment, and I hope in doing so it might provide an element of light relief after some of the heavy weather that we have encountered so far. But this is Cobo Alice rather than *Brighton Rock*, and it does not even go to the *Heart of the Matter*, sir, in the sense that this does not drive a coach and horses through either the Strategic Land Use Plan, nor indeed a *Stamboul Train* through the DPA recommendations before us. The word 'iconic' is sometimes overused in my view, but this is all about safeguarding an iconic Guernsey scene. What is that scene? Well, if you come out of the Rockmount or the Cobo Bay Hotel, turn left, and within a few yards you find yourself at the junction with the Route de Cobo. Behind you is the built-up area of Cobo Village. Ahead of you is a wonderful scene: on your right you have got the Cobo seawall in glorious Cobo pink granite, up ahead of you winding around the Albecq Headland is the road that goes round Le Guet, and Le Guet itself is immediately in front of you. To your left – you would hardly notice it and that is the point – is an open space; it is a field, it is bordered on two sides by walls, again of Cobo pink granite, and it has even got a tamarisk hedge along it – tamarisk, of course, being an entirely at-home hedge in that particular coastal scene. So that is the scene, and this amendment is all really about safeguarding the continuance of that.

In days of old, people like the former Bailiff, Deputy Bill Arnold, and his wife used to sit on that sea wall and no doubt going from their nearby cottage to get to it, they probably used the field to get there. In more recent years, before he deserted the Castel area for the sophistication of St Peter Port, Deputy Ferbrache could be seen walking his dog alongside it. He may even have used it as a shortcut to cut the corner. But that is the scene and that is the one that Deputy Green and I really want to safeguard, and we invite you to join us in doing that.

The background to this is that our own planning staff and the political Members at the time, in the draft Island Development Plan said, 'Yes, this is a scene worth keeping.' And so they deliberately excluded from the Cobo Centre the field that I am talking about – it was a conscious decision because they saw the value in it. But the English planning inspectors who came along did not quite see it that way. I need to choose my words carefully here, sir, because I am standing very close to a member of the Rural Town Planning Institute. And, just to be clear, I used to be for five years a non-States member of the IBC in its glory days (*Laughter*) and even then it was apparent to me that in the planning staff we had there, we had some really expert planners in their field. But even the best of them needed a bit of time to tune into Guernsey in my view, so it is a bit unrealistic, I think, to expect the 'here today and gone tomorrow' planning inspectors who come over, to perhaps appreciate some of the niceties and the values of playing fields like this to us who have been brought up on them.

For a reason that is not totally apparent, the inspectors recommended that the field previously excluded in the draft plan, should be excluded, and to be fair they do not seem to have stated a reason for that decision. In other words, there was no case really stated for including it. They tended to say, 'Why not?' and part of the 'why not' was really that it was a pretty unpretentious field that had no particularly distinctive landscape features to it. But of course, that is the point. It does not intrude. God forbid, it is one of those fields that has not been manicured into sterility – there are even weeds on it! But it is part of the scene and the thought of it being developed is a rather disappointing thought for me.

The DPA, contemplating the recommendations of the inspectors, I think concluded probably for no stronger reason than it was easier to go along with their recommendations than to go against them, and probably in a very understandable wish to preserve the integrity of the Plan, went along with it. But I have reason to believe they did not, really, necessarily have their heart in that – that is for them to say.

So here we are. To me and to many local people, and I think to many people across Guernsey, that field is worth safeguarding from future development, and that is what this amendment is all about.

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

Deputy Green: I do, sir, and I reserve the right to speak.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Good morning, sir; good morning, all.

The Development & Planning Authority do not consider it necessary to defer this amendment if it is passed. We do not support this amendment, however. Whilst the justification for the boundary of the local centre to include this site or exclude it is finely balanced, the approach to local centre boundaries generally has been to not include open, potentially developable sites on the edge of the built-up area that defines the local centre. To include this site to allow for growth would be inconsistent with the methodology.

While the site may have limited landscape value, it does have amenity value to local residents, with the long-standing use of the land as an informal path. As one of the few plots of land along the Coast Road that remains undeveloped, it is a feature that contributes to the character of the Cobo Centre townscape.

I ask this Assembly to reject this proposal but, sir, as well as the conquered, I do bow to the collective wisdom of this Assembly.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

Deputy Graham has described this area of land in such beautiful and idyllic terms; all I am wondering is whether we ought not to turn it into a conservation area!

A Member: Good idea!

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, sir.

There have been a number of emails exchanged on this referring to the Brehaut Family, and I am no direct relation and we have not spoken since about 1066 when there was a bit of a fall out. But with regard to the piece of land itself, I believe it does have a pumping station within it, so I

think to a degree it is not 'untouched'. But I do not intend to oppose this amendment, I have to say.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

I was amused by page three of *The Globe* which has some extracts from Facebook, and there was a comment by – I will not say who submitted it – but it was a comment that said, 'What clown would want to develop the most sea-sprayed area in the Island?'

I would like Deputy Graham's views on that comment, sir, when he responds.

I think it was a somewhat unfortunate use of the term 'clown', but if you look at the whole of the West Coast you could say that about most parts of the West Coast, and also the seafront at Admiral Park which, particularly in winter with high tides and high winds, is not only sea sprayed. If you look at the waves coming over the wall, they are full of seaweed and full of siftings. But I just wonder what Deputy Graham might think of that comment that was made.

Also, I can see where he is coming from, it is one of the only undeveloped areas along that part of the coast, but at the moment I am not inclined to support this amendment because I do not see any really valid reason to do so. So I would just like to hear a bit more of the reasons from Deputy Graham if he has any response, please.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Sir, thank you.

I second this amendment and I support it. Deputy Brehaut touched upon the views of the owner and I would imagine that Deputy Graham will be addressing that when he sums up at the end, because clearly the views of the owner are not entirely irrelevant in all of this. But I think Deputy Graham made the case very well.

The key point is that in the draft IDP to begin with this field had been excluded from the Cobo Village Centre and it was the intervention of the English planning inspectors that then sought to reintroduce this into the village centre, seemingly without any rational justification or *any* justification whatsoever. I think that really cannot be allowed to stand, as the only justification really seems to have been that it would make a rather neater set of boundaries, and I do not think that can be allowed to stand without any amendment, in my view.

The comments that Deputy Tindall made, I think, should encourage Members to support this amendment, in my view, sir. Deputy Tindall clearly said that this is not a matter that would engage any deferral of the Plan. She does not support it but, in my view, from what Deputy Tindall said, it seemed to be quite a *sotto voce* opposition. So I do not think there was any real attempt to derail this amendment from those comments in those circumstances, so I would try to encourage all Members to support what is essentially a good, old-fashioned Guernsey common sense amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Paint.

Deputy Paint: Sir, having been involved in this area for some time, I do agree with this amendment, although I haven't focussed on the area because of things that happened on the other side of the village for quite some years. In my researches I found that in 1886 land under the Guet, in fact 52 vergées of land, was sold to the States of Guernsey for the purposes of building a sea wall in the road and that 52 vergées of land was sold for £28. So the States of Guernsey bought it and I am sure the States of Guernsey would not be prepared to buy this land, but nevertheless, it is a part of Guernsey and a part of the Cobo area that should not be developed in my opinion.

170 On the other side, of course – and I think this might actually come under the Fief de Carteret as well – there have been huge problems, as you all know, which are not resolved yet but hopefully they will be in the end.

So I do agree with this amendment.

Thank you.

175 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I turn now to the President of the Development & Planning Authority, Deputy Gollop, to speak on the amendment.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you very much, sir.

180 Yet again, I commend the loyalty and dedication in my Committee Members and team, especially Deputy Tindall and Deputy Queripel who have spoken well on this amendment and given a good perspective.

185 It is not for me or any of us here in this kind of Assembly, I think, to speculate on ownership of the land, or aspirations, or that kind of issue that Deputy Brehaut alluded to, although we have been minded to think about that subsequently. But of course it is completely immaterial to the work of the planning inquiry and the way in which land is owned. Those factors, really, we have to distance ourselves from in this context.

190 Deputy Paint reminded me of the sea spray that Deputy Graham mentioned, and he mentioned too about some of the greater development in other parts of the Castel. Maybe he is right, certain pockets of land could be acquired by the States. A personal vision of mine is that we should have more Island national parks and the States needs to be more proactive in managing them. That is a discussion for another day, although I could suggest that maybe the Castel parish should buy certain pieces of land. I know they are not a high-spending parish traditionally when it comes to the utilisation of ratepayers' money, but it still may be an idea for the future.

195 I do not always sit on a planning or environment committee, let alone lead it as the President, because I am more used to subjective maverick analysis, adopting policies that are either interesting or popular of the day and perhaps not necessarily being entirely consistent or particularly in love with process, procedure and legalistic systems. But the very nature of this Plan, for it to have a robust judicial perspective and be competent in addressing the needs of
200 landowners, developers, architects, designers, lawyers and other professionals is a certain degree of consistency, openness, transparency and logical process. It is quite true that at officer-level, and probably supported by conservationists and other parties, we did agree ... and I am quite supportive of the idea of it perhaps being a green area. But it is my duty to point out the way things are as they are.

205 If we turn to page 29, we put in the Billet:

The Authority welcomes the support of the Inspectors for the logic of the Cobo Local Centre boundary which, they consider, relates well to the present urban form.

210 When somebody alluded in the past to Deputy Ferbrache walking his dog, I thought, 'Well, there are a lot of attractions in the area, including one or two of the Island's best hosteleries!' So it is not an entirely rural, idyllic area, it is an area of great entertainment and importance to the tourism sector. But the boundary either marks areas where the built development adjoins open land or where there is a noticeable change in density:

However, they do not consider that the exclusion of the small area of open land at the junction of the Route de Cobo and the Cobo Coast Road appears logical and they do not find the former Environment Department's justification for excluding it from the Centre ... convincing.

That puts me in a difficult position because I was on the Environment Department and it is perhaps not the most important issue we are looking at this time.

It then goes on, at 11.14:

The southern extent of the Cobo Local Centre excludes an open green space ... which the former Environment Department considered had a stronger relationship ... However, the Spatial Strategy of the Strategic Land Use Plan allows for limited development within Local Centres and the extent of this land would not compromise that strategy should it be included within the Local Centre boundary.

Turning the page, and I think this is the most significant paragraph, 11.15:

The inclusion of this land within the Local Centre as recommended by the ...

215 – two very able and learned –

... Inspectors will allow the principle of development on the site in accordance with the draft Plan policies however, other relevant policies are sufficiently robust to exercise appropriate control over impacts.

I think the point is that although it may or may not, depending on how the vote goes today, be included within the local centre, that should not be seen automatically as a presumption for unacceptable development or a loss of facility or enhancement; nor should it be seen that the DPA or any future planning body would grant permission for any hypothetical development there.

That, I believe, is the position and, as Deputy Tindall pointed out, I think it is perhaps time that the States' Assembly as a whole made up their mind on this particular piece of coast frontage.

The Deputy Bailiff: I turn finally to Deputy Graham to reply on the amendment that he has moved, hoping there will be more literary allusions, because in 1990 the author published his collection of short stories called *The Last Word*. Then in 1955 there was one called *Loser Takes All!* (Laughter)

Deputy Graham: He also wrote *The Power and the Glory* and I call upon the power and the glory of this Assembly to come to my assistance on this occasion. (Laughter)

Deputy Gollop makes the perfectly fair point that in the explanatory notes here they do make the point that there are other policies in the Plan that provide a measure of protection against the development of this site. But my question in response to that – and that also of Deputy Green – is, if you are anxious to protect a development in the first place why artificially place it within the area and make it vulnerable to future development? There is a lack of logic there which I have not been able to penetrate.

Another point made is that, really, we are not talking about a field that is not naturally part of the built-up area that is close by, but I would argue that it actually is. When you repeat that journey that I invited you to make to the junction with Route de Carteret, as you look south you are looking at a basically open vista and even where there are dwellings on the left hand side of the road as you look down it, those dwellings are well off the road and all you can see are the hedgerows at the end of their front gardens.

Inland from the field, on that same side of the road, over a stretch of nearly 300 m there are three buildings, and one of them is a chapel with a large car park. It is not the atypical built-up area that the whole of the rest of Cobo is. There is going to be a difficulty in the Cobo Local Centre in finding places that are open to further development, and I do acknowledge that. And so from the planning point of view, I suppose this field is very attractive. But that is the point. In my view it belongs far more to the open vista to the south of that junction than it does to the built-up area to the north. I believe it was probably that which guided the DPA in its first contemplation of this case to come to the conclusion that the field should be excluded from the local centre.

Deputy Lester Queripel refers to a clown, but of course clowns are under strict instructions to behave rather carefully at the moment, as I understand. (Laughter) But there may well be some such plans, but let's get rid of the notion that this field, given where it is and the high value that it would attract if it were vulnerable to development, let's not kid ourselves that it would in any way make a contribution to the low-cost housing stock of the Island. We know what sort of building would go on that site and we could easily finish up, unless other policies constrained it, with

another development where you have got unsold penthouses at £2 million or £3 million a throw, given the iconic place of where it is.

260 So I do not think there is any strategic issue here, it is purely a question of an attractive, local scene that you either want to preserve as it is or you do not.

Deputy Brehaut made reference to the Brehaut family and I had rather hoped that we would not wash family matters in this Assembly. There is nothing sinister to this at all. Deputy Green and I purely out of good faith came to the conclusion that we had the support of the owner in this case. The owner no longer lives next door to it and the property next door, which he still owns, is
265 let. It was a misunderstanding and I gather that the owner's position is that he does not wish to see it developed in his lifetime but, in order to enhance the value of the field to his estate, he opposes the amendment because he would wish it to be within the local centre. So as long as we are clear about that. But I have to make the point that we were only going to ask the owner as a matter of courtesy what his view was, and certainly Deputy Green and I had long before decided
270 that this field was worth protecting, irrespective of the view of the owner.

To sum up, I think you either want to safeguard this view or you do not, and this amendment stands on that. We have been reminded that we had an away victory against the English 950 years ago, how about a home win today? *(Laughter)*

275 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members, we move to the vote on amendment number 3 which is proposed by Deputy Graham, seconded by Deputy Green.
Deputy Lester Queripel.

280 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, can I have a recorded vote, please?

The Deputy Bailiff: We will have a recorded vote.
Deputy Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

285 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, the amendment appears to me to have been carried, and I will announce the formal result when the voting has been tallied up.

Members of the States, the next amendment to turn to, sticking to the Agenda that was published in advance, is amendment number 10, to be proposed by Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle.

Amendment 10.

To insert at the end of the words in Proposition 1:

‘; but with the exception of the recommended amendment to accept the Inspector’s recommendation and amend the Proposals Map so as to identify an additional Local Centre at Forest West (see paragraphs 11.29 – 11.40 of the Report of the Development & Planning Authority, page 46 of the Inspectors’ Report at Appendix 5, reference no. 46 on page 5 + Map extract 7 on page 23 of Appendix 6, and Appendix 9’.

290 **Deputy de Lisle:** Thank you, sir.
Can I ask that the amendment is read out?

The Deputy Bailiff: Could you read it, so that the voting can be counted?
Could you read it, Deputy de Lisle? It is not a long one.

295 **Deputy de Lisle:** Yes, certainly.

Deputy de Lisle read the amendment.

Sir, there are certain parallels to the last amendment here, and I can only hope that the result is somewhat similar to that amendment, in that Forest West as an added local centre was in fact not considered to be appropriate by the Environment Department in the draft plan, but it is being looked at again by the DPA underlining the recommendations of the inspector.

But, sir, the creation of a second local centre in the Forest parish would result in the creation of a much larger development area in the parish, and pressure for the development of open land horticultural sites and also change of use in a number of current business properties. It presents issues of two local centres in close proximity competing and placing undue pressure on development in such a small parish. It would provide for more than the limited development required by the Strategic Land Use Plan.

Just to give people some idea: one-third of the parish of the Forest, which is the second smallest parish in Guernsey, the top third, the northern third, is taken up by the Airport and all the buildings and the runway, and so on. The second third, lower to that, along Rue des Landes, is taken up by the original centre, around the church and the Forest Stores, which is a local centre, one of the six on the draft plan. To the west of that is this particular local centre that is being suggested, or designated, embracing the community along Rue des Landes to the west of that, so essentially extending the area of development to another third of the parish. That leaves you with the lower third of the parish in agricultural open fields and so on – a rural area to the south. The rest has been suburbanised and it is a growing entity in its own right.

I think that just sets the scene to some extent. But the amendment against a second local centre in the parish has the unanimous support of the Forest Douzaine, and I would like to just read their particular communication to Deputies:

'At its meeting on Monday 26th September, the Forest Douzaine resolved unanimously in its opposition to the proposed Forest West Local Centre in the draft Island Development Plan. The Forest Douzaine further resolved to write to all the Island's Deputies asking them to support an amendment to remove the Forest West centre from the draft IDP.

The reason for the objection is the belief of the Douzaine that the wording surrounding the development of the area within the boundary of the Forest West Centre is not clearly defined, with the result that development in this area could be detrimental to the amenity character of the area. Even greater concern was raised over the lack of clarity of the potential for development of rural areas in the vicinity of the Forest West Centre. It is the Douzaine's concern that this lack of clarity would mean that the applications for development in rural or horticultural areas adjacent to the Forest West Centre might easily receive planning permission resulting in a significant alteration to the rural nature of these areas.

The Forest Douzaine firmly believes that there should be a distinct boundary between developed and rural horticultural land and that this distinction should be vigorously protected in legislation. It is the Douzaine's belief that the proposal for the Forest West Local Centre in the draft IDP does exactly the opposite.

The Forest Douzaine earnestly urges you to oppose this part of the IDP and to support any amendment by Deputies which removes the proposed Forest West Local Centre from the draft Island Development Plan. For the avoidance of doubt the Forest Douzaine does not object to the designation of the existing Forest West Local Centre at Le Bourg; in other words, one distinct historic identifiable focus for our community.

Yours sincerely, signed off by the Constable, Pierre Paul and the second Constable, Christine Cowling.'

There is concern there with regard to the problem of lack of clarity and, actually, the inspectors saw this and they report on this in section 25 on page 21 of their Report. They say:

It is clear that there are conflicting views about how the SLUP policy should be interpreted. These conflicts largely arise from the imprecision of phrases such as "limited development" ...

What does that mean?

"... within and around ..."

What is all that about?

... and "to enable community growth and the reinforcement of sustainable communities".

The problem is that Forest West is comprised of huge development opportunities. It is a Mecca for development and it includes the Mallard Centre, the Venture Inn, the Co-op Garage and Convenience Store, the Forest Primary School, Le Rondin School and Child Development Centre, and several dilapidated winery sites, many with past applications for development.

The former Environment Department's view is that the SLUP does not promote the growth of local centres. The local centres, as defined, allow for the 'limited development' referred to in the SLUP. The fear is that allowing too much growth in local centres would result in perpetuating the dispersed nature of development on the Island and take development from the main centres. The mistake here would be to introduce another local centre at Forest West.

To counter the tendency for dispersal it is necessary for the limited growth policy of the SLUP in local centres to be vigorously applied – that is what they say, by 'tightly drawn boundaries'. Adding a new centre just a few yards' distance from the existing centre undermines this SLUP policy.

It is important to note in the SLUP, that Local Centres are not intended to be growth points ... new development within the Local Centres will be limited.

Those are the words from the Strategic Land Use Plan. Yet conflicting views appear in the statement like:

... development complements their existing roles and supports them as socially inclusive, healthy and sustainable communities ...

This surely asks questions.

... development within them does not detract from the objective of ensuring the Main Centres and the Main Centre Outer Areas remain the core focus for economic and social growth.

So the Environment Department considered the option, as reflected in its responses to representations at the planning inquiry, and it did not consider it appropriate to increase the extent of the Forest Centre West, as it would:

... reduce the compactness of the Local Centre ...

It would create a much larger area of development and it would:

... provide for more than the limited development required by the Strategic Land Use Plan This would have been inconsistent with the aims of the Strategic Land Use Plan and could have undermined the vitality and viability of the Main Centres.

They said that:

Including the area to the west, around the primary school and Douzaine room ... would result in pressure for development of open land and horticultural sites ... and in areas of valuable open landscape and would be disproportionate to the amount of development appropriate within a Local Centre.

They had undertaken a fairly comprehensive three-stage assessment process to identify local centres throughout the Island in the draft plan, in order to conclude on six centres. But they declined the extension to Forest West. The new Development & Planning Authority and the inspectors did not commit to that same comprehensive three-stage assessment and, as a result, comprehensive assessment against the other centres using the same criteria is lacking, in their judgement.

In addition, that very Planning Authority have highlighted concerns about the impacts of having two centres in such close proximity and how they might have a negative impact on each other's function, and compete with one another. I must say that is a growth area anyway and it does not require the States to formulate any local centre in order to provide any growth in that area, because it is a Mecca for growth in its own right.

Others would see the dangers of a conurbation developing with two centres in such close proximity along Rue des Landes. In fact we are going to see, if we are not careful, a very similar situation to that in St Martin's, currently. And with St Peter's Local Centre along the same road, just a mile down the road, with the St Martin's Centre a mile and a half the other way down the same road, if this goes ahead we will have four local centres along one route way.

Contrary to the view of the Authority, then, the Forest Douzaine argues that it would not accord with the spatial strategy of the Strategic Land Use Plan. The Island Development Plan seeks to draw local centre boundaries tightly in order to support the spatial strategy of the Strategic Land Use Plan. It guards against having centres on top of one another in close proximity. The Forest Centre, on the other hand, is supported by convenience retail, the Post Office, Forest Stores, public houses and the Parish Church together with the Methodist Church. It is a tightly knit historic centre of the parish and fits as the local centre.

It is important to note that Local Centres are not intended to be growth points. New development within the Local Centres will be limited ... and development within them does not detract from the objective of ensuring the Main Centres and the Main Centre Outer Areas remain the core focus for economic and social growth.

So the Douzaine and parishioners have concerns regarding child safety also in the Nouettes Lane. Around the schools and in the main road there is no footpath on the Forest School side and a filter has been put in to address dangerous crossroads at the Villiaze. A land swap to access the fields at the back of the school and provide playing fields has also been done over the years in order to allow children to access the school from the back rather than from the Main Road.

The Douzaine and the parishioners complain, actually, that this Forest West Local Centre was not part of the Island Development Plan and the idea came up at the hearings in front of the inspectors and most were unaware of it at the time of the hearings with the inspectors. A minority of self-interested individuals put this forward to the inspectors, to the detriment of the whole community. The community has not had a chance to comment on the new planning arrangements for the parish and no opportunity has been given for public consultation on a second local centre, and no discussion has been had with the Douzaine on these new plans. A policy decision is being recommended without public consultation and agreement. This is bad government.

I think when we talk about the urban-rural balance, also, we have to recognise the fact that an 80/20 split compares today with a 90/10 split under the Rural Area Plan and the Urban Area Plan, and the planning inspectors recommend no change, despite the strong potential for growth in the rural areas which, in recent years, has been 65/35 rather than the 90/10 split. The view of the Environment Department is that the actual split under the IDP will probably differ from the indicative 80/20, and will more likely tilt towards a higher proportion of development in the rural areas, than the converse. To counter the tendency, the dispersal, it is necessary for the limited growth policy in local centres to be rigorously applied and this rigour is provided by the tightly drawn boundaries around the original local centres. Allowing a second local centre in one of the smallest parishes is not consistent with applying rigour of tightly drawn boundaries around local centres.

Adding a local centre designated Forest West, what is being done is to create a huge linear concentration of development on the south side of the Airport, accentuating urban sprawl in that particular area. The Airport itself has become an enterprise zone, essentially, for development in itself, with ancillary industry and hangars being located at the heart of the parish. It is a growth area in itself. There is already a local centre, the traditional centre around the Parish Church, Forest Stores, Post Office, hotels and restaurants, and car and motor sales; to create another centre added on to this just a quarter of a mile away to the west is creating a huge growth pole for the future in one of the smallest Island parishes in Guernsey, and it defeats any attempt to control dispersal of population and activity growth outside the main centres.

I ask the indulgence of Deputies to fully consider the concerns of parishioners and the Douzaine and vote against the IDP recommendation with respect to establishing another centre, Forest West, on the draft plan.

405 Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Le Pelley, do you formally second this amendment?

410 **Deputy Le Pelley:** I do, sir, and I reserve my right to speak later.

Amendment 3.

Carried – Pour 25, Contre 5, Ne vote pas 5, Absent 4

POUR

Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Yerby
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Alderney Rep. McKinley
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld

CONTRE

Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Merrett

NE VOTE PAS

Alderney Rep. Jean
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Lester Queripel

ABSENT

Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy St Pier

The Deputy Bailiff: The voting on amendment number 3, proposed by Deputy Graham and seconded by Deputy Green, was as follows: Pour 25, Contre 5, there were 5 abstentions; and that is why the amendment was carried.

415 Deputy Tindall, to be followed by Deputy Roffey.

420 **Deputy Tindall:** Sir, I confirm that the Development & Planning Authority do not consider that this amendment, if passed, will result in a deferral. However, we do not support this proposal, because it is clearly different from amendment 3 due to what we consider the nature of the benefits to Forest West.

425 To explain: the concept of identifying local centres is based on the requirement identified by the States in the SLUP to enable a limited – a *limited* – amount of development and growth to occur beyond the main centres, focused on existing settlements. For limited growth in these areas, the existing services will be supported and the viability of maintaining and establishing new support services will improve. The proposed designation of Forest West is following the inspector's consideration of public representations at the inquiry – a public inquiry.

The local centre at Forest West is supported by a range of facilities. It has the necessary convenience retail store and also schools and community amenity areas, indoor leisure and recreational facilities, a takeaway, a public house and community facilities in the form of the

Douzaine Room. It also has some limited potential for development on a scale appropriate to the centre, which counteracts somewhat the very limited potential in the nearby Forest Local Centre. The designation of Forest West as a local centre would accord with the methodology applied for the identification of local centres in the draft plan as set out in the report, Identifying Local Centres July 2015.

The boundaries of Forest West have been identified by applying the criteria and methodology outlined in the report, Identifying Local Centre Boundaries September 2014, which has been consistently applied in identifying the boundaries of all local centres in the Plan. This approach is considered comprehensive and logical by the inspectors.

In accordance with the spatial strategy of the Strategic Land Use Plan, opportunities for new development within the local centre will be limited. It is important to note that local centres are not intended to be growth points. The intention is that development in local centres will account for only a small percentage of the Island's growth. The extent of appropriate development will be determined by the current scale and function of each local centre to ensure that new development complements their existing roles and supports them as socially inclusive, healthy and sustainable communities, and that development within them does not detract from the objective of ensuring the main centres and main centre outer areas remain the core focus for economic and social growth.

So the Island Development Plan policies will ensure that new development in local centres is of an appropriate scale that complements local centres' existing roles and supports them as socially inclusive, healthy and sustainable communities. I think that needs stressing, hence I said it twice. There were initial concerns about the impact of two local centres in close proximity and how they might have a negative impact on each other's function. However, following the inspectors' recommendation, the authority reviewed the facilities and indicators at each proposed centre and the character of each, and concluded that rather than competing with each other, their different scales and nature of facilities would mean that the two centres are more likely to be mutually supportive.

The identification of an additional local centre at Forest West as recommended by the inspectors, would accord with the spatial strategy of the Strategic Land Use Plan, the aims and the objectives of the Plan, and the methodology that the former Environment Department and the Authority have consistently used to identify local centres in the Island Development Plan. I should also refer you to the Plan which obviously is in the Island Development Plan, but it is also kindly shown again at amendment 23, just in case everyone has not seen it.

As it will result in a lost opportunity because it reduces the potential for some limited, appropriate, beneficial community development, we therefore oppose this amendment.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey, to be followed by Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Roffey: I would like to declare an interest in this debate because I am a director of the Channel Islands Co-operative Society who own and operate a food and fuel retailing outlet in the middle of the proposed new rural centre. I am also actually a co-owner of the Co-op but I hope that will be regarded as *de minimis* because, if not, then I think most of the House will be in the same position.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize, to be followed by Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

I sort of admire Deputy de Lisle; he has put up a good fight on behalf of the Forest Douzaine. I think he has exaggerated slightly; at the beginning of his speech he created the impression that the area we were talking about was a rural paradise, but as his speech went on, it became, and I quote, 'a Mecca for development.' We were going to have a 'conurbation' created here; there was

'urban sprawl' in the area and if the proposed local centre was approved we would have 'huge linear concentration development'. If he went any further I thought we were going to end up with it being the greatest metropolis in the western world.

485 The fact is that Deputy de Lisle creates the impression of a rural idyll, but the two areas he is talking about are separated chiefly by the Mont Marche States' houses and an airport! I know that he knows the area better than anybody but I do not think the picture that he has created of the geography is particularly reflective of reality. He said in a part of his speech that the area under discussion here had a pub, a restaurant-cum-cinema complex, two garages, a fairly large retail
490 outlet, and a school which has community and sports facilities. Now, if that is not an ideal local centre, what is? It does appear to me to have all of the necessary criteria.

The irony is that if the argument is that there should not be two local centres so near one another, actually the one that Deputy de Lisle should have tried to take out was the Forest East, or whatever we are going to call it. Even Deputy de Lisle was struggling slightly in listing the features
495 of that particular local centre; there is not as much retail there, there is not a school there and there is not as active a pub, and cinema and restaurant complex. I think that perhaps is why Deputy de Lisle is trying to take out Forest West rather than Forest East, because Forest West is the more likely local centre to attract future development, because the case for development is stronger as it is more of a local centre than the one Deputy de Lisle is trying to leave in as a local
500 centre.

So I do not blame him for laying this amendment before the States; he is trying to defend his parish as he sees it, but I hope the States today is not going to fall into what previous States used to in debating previous development plans and take an overly parochial approach. I think the area in question clearly meets the criteria and the States should support the authority's proposals and
505 reject this amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel, to be followed by Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

510 In his speech, Deputy de Lisle expressed serious concerns that a policy decision is being proposed without consultation that will result in the implementation of a new policy. But, sir, half of the amendments that have been passed in the Chamber this week have contained Propositions that have not been consulted and will now result in new policies being implemented.

I would like to hear Deputy de Lisle's views on that when he responds, please, because I
515 believe I am right in saying he himself has supported some of those amendments, so surely there is something of a contradiction in what he says, if that is the case. And surely, sir, it could be considered to be yet another example of Nimbyism at play here. So I look forward to Deputy de Lisle's response.

Thank you.

520 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

I rise to support this amendment. I will not go into quite the same depth of detail as my
525 colleague Deputy de Lisle did, as I think he covered most of the aspects extremely well.

We have the unanimous support of the Forest Douzaine, and that is not to be taken lightly. These are the people who live there; this is their country, this is their parish, these are the people that they represent and this is the place that they live – well, you have to live there to actually be on the Douzaine! So these are the burghers of that particular society saying, 'We do not want to
530 have a second centre'. So that gives a lot of weight to me, that the people who actually live there, the community, do not want it from the point of view of the Douzaine. I think the Douzaine is quite a powerful voice in this.

The idea of a second centre was not mooted by the original Environment Department, so all the criteria as to where centres should be, which were gone through with a fine toothcomb by the Environment Planning Authority, did not come up with a second Forest Centre. The birth of this idea of a second Forest Centre came out of a planning inquiry, and I hear Deputy Tindall's words that it could be used for a community project. But I do not think to have a second Forest Centre was to do community projects – I think there were other issues that the people went to the planning inquiry for. But I do not recall it being community functions, as such.

I am not keen on village centre ideas, I never have been, I think it is a UK concept, I think it comes from UK planners. And what is going to happen if you allow a second centre at the Forest with the first centre to the West? Exactly what happened yesterday with the Delancey and the conservation areas. Four conservation areas, I think, have now been rolled up into one and what you are going to do is that somebody, some day will say, 'Why don't we just join the two centres together?'

I do not quite take Deputy Fallaize's point that there is not much in between. There is quite a bit in between, because you do have very large social housing estate, and also you have the Lagan fields, if you remember, where all the work was done, all the batching plants, etc. for the Airport. There is quite a big area there and what is going to happen, I am sure, if we allow a second centre to go through today is that the two of them will be joined, and I do not think that is something that we want to see.

The idea of the village centres we are stuck with – but I do not like it – was that you had very tight boundaries, as Deputy de Lisle was saying, where you can see a real contrast between the rural areas. And that is what the planners were originally saying. I am surprised that the planners have gone along with the inspector in this case, but with the inspectors coming from a country which is used to villages I can understand how they got there.

If you start to look at the criteria for village centres, if you allow the Forest West to come in then I think you are going to see some other village centres being created around the rest of the Island, because it is quite an easy slope to go down, because you are starting to relax the criteria. If Forest West had made the criteria in the first place it would already have been in the Plan being proposed by the Environment Department.

So I would urge Members to think very carefully. We are meant to be looking after our communities, we reflect communities. We have the Douzaine system, we have got the 12 Douzeniers there unanimously, who know their parish and do not want to have a second centre there, and I would strongly urge you to follow their advice and not have this second centre.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: I am going to call Deputy Le Pelley next, as the seconder of the amendment, then Deputy Brehaut, then Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Le Pelley: Thank you, sir.

I shall try and be somewhat shorter than the proposer.

Whilst I am now associated with St Sampson's and have been for a very long time, I spent my early years out in the West. I attended the forest Primary School for seven years and the Fourth Guernsey Forest Cub Scouts from the age of eight to 11. I worked for the National Trust for nearly eight years, during which time I was responsible for a number of those years for the National Trust property at Les Caches, the renovated thatched roof former barn and farmhouse. I know the area well. It is a very rural area, despite the concrete at the Airport.

When I was asked to second the amendment by Deputy de Lisle and with the support of the Dean of the Forest Douzaine, Mr Richard Heaume MBE, I was very happy to accept the invitation. I am sure that other western Deputies would have been pleased to have taken on this task, that of seconding this amendment, and I apologise to them if they feel I have stepped out of my normal area of interest; but we are all Guernsey Deputies and I do not see why we should not look at the

whole Island. Other Western Deputies can show their support by voting in favour of this particular amendment.

There are currently two local areas in this part of the Island, a little over a mile apart, Le Bourg in La Foret, as they like to call it out there, and around Les Brehaut in St Pierre du Bois, as they like to call that area out there. The Forest Douzaine, as we have heard, are unanimously against this proposed designation. They feel that one local area in the parish, and to put another one along the southern side of the Airport with a narrow gap between the two is unwelcome. How long, they wonder, will it be before the two areas in the Forest will be joined up? How long thereafter will it be before there is a suggestion that this new Forest West locality joins up with the local area in St Pierre du Bois?

The letter to all Deputies was read to you by Deputy de Lisle in his opening speech. I notice that there are reports in the media that there may be an application for a change of use for what is now the Mallard Complex, which I remember as the White Gables, a hotel and horticultural centre, so that it could be developed into a centre for extra care provision for the western parishioners. I am quite supportive of that. I think in the Island we are going to need extra care housing and we are going to need it out in the West. I support the concept. But there will remain other routes to follow for such a change of use if this amendment is successful. There are also areas of agricultural land in the proposed area which should not be put at risk of being developed by being covered in concrete and further ribbon development.

As I mentioned above, the Douzaine of the Forest – or La Foret – have expressed their *unanimous view* that this proposal from the Development & Planning Authority should be rejected. And I am going to mention a couple of things that have actually been mentioned in the debate as we have progressed. Deputy Tindall mentioned rules being consistently applied. I should like to ask why was the suggestion that the area around Capelles School down towards Oatlands not supported, even though the St Sampson's Douzaine suggested that it should be considered. We were told, when we asked, that the area failed because the Island Shopper was possibly going to close. It did not. It has not been turned into flats. It is still an Island Shopper. This current proposal refers to what the Mallard currently offers, but as has been mentioned in the media recently, this complex may well be redeveloped with many of the current facilities that have been mentioned removed from the equation.

Deputy Lester Queripel mentions 'not in my backyard' – Nimbyism. Well, here I am seconding this amendment. Yes, I have some history way back in the 1960's and 1970's, but it is not in my backyard and I am happy to second the amendment. And, like Deputy Roffey, I also must declare an interest as I have a joint £1 shareholding in the Channel Islands Co-op.

What I am saying to you here is that one local area in this parish is enough. Please support this amendment.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, sir.

What I would say to both Deputy de Lisle and Deputy Le Pelley is please do not hold the next generation in your past forever, because society is moving on and needs change. There is always a loss of perspective when we are talking about our own parishes. I remember some years ago listening to the radio, when Le Rondin School was complete, there was concern about the movement of children around Le Rondin and Forest School, and speed humps were suggested. And a Constable of the parish was saying that they did not want speed humps there because of an evening lorries would go over and they would rattle and the people of the Forest were not accustomed to that ... you might be accustomed to 146 jets overhead or a busy, noisy airport. And there is a loss of perspective because, like it or not, parishes have changed and they have evolved and things that we valued when we were younger we may have lost, but the next generation also have entitlements and needs and wants too.

What we also have to do, I think, in this Assembly – not to digress too much – is this issue of the involvement in Douzaines. I pose the question: are Douzaines as representative as this Assembly is any longer? Are they? A number of people have said no. In the past you could get elected to a Douzaine with a considerable number of votes. And for whatever reason, maybe it is the loss of Douzaine representation in this House, when there were elections within the parish of St Peter Port, for example, you have uncontested elections and people do not actually get contested and people get elected without anyone standing with an alternative point of view to oppose them.

So, when we add Douzaines in the mix, we really do have to look at what Douzaines do these days. But I just wanted to draw Members' attention to the wonderful words of wisdom of an architect, I thought, who spoke on the radio. He may have had the surname Merrett, from recollection. But what he did say, and I think it was important, because I agreed with him in this case actually ... What he was saying in summary is the word 'local' is in local centres. Now, if you do want sheltered housing and if you do want to keep the elderly, even the elderly Douzeniers, in the parish that they grew up in, in the parish they love, where will they go when they need sheltered housing? **(Two Members: Hear, hear.)** Thank you! *(Laughter)*

Do you want them to go to Rodley Park? Where do you want them to go, if they love the parish, if they were born there, if they have invested all of their life in that parish and you want to help them stay there. It would be very short sighted to support this amendment and not give them that opportunity.

And Deputy Le Pelley is also right. I cannot see how two cinemas can survive on this Island, that area currently has built structures on it. The DPA can be creative about this, although I am not involved in that area of planning any more, without moving into that pre-determination thing. What a great opportunity to keep the people of the parish in the parish with some creative design and some supported and sheltered living.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Merrett, to be followed by Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

Before I speak I wish to declare an interest. As the Assembly may already have realised, my partner in his capacity is a director of Lovell Ozanne Architects, has spoken to the media on this matter.

Firstly, regarding Douzaines, I would like to believe that if the St Sampson's Douzaine were asked if they agree that they do not want any more development in their parish, that they also may agree that they do not want developments in the Parish of St Sampson.

Secondly, I would like to thank Deputy Fallaize for his aptitude and good counsel regarding this amendment. I agree with all of his points. I urge you not to support this amendment.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, yes, I just stand up to agree with everything Deputy Brehaut said in terms of this land and what we are looking at here.

I would take the reference Volume 2, Non-Technical Summary, Appendix 9, page 5, which actually shows the Forest West Local Centre boundary it has proposed. It is so tightly drawn, there are hardly any fields there at all. I struggle to see what the proposer of this amendment really seeks to achieve by getting rid of it because it really just covers the built-up area within the Forest West. So I cannot support this amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, it may surprise some people because obviously the whole kernel of my being here in relation to being a States' Member and at present on the Committee for Economic Development, is to encourage businesses and development. But I have a real difficulty because I agree with the principle that Deputy Brehaut expressed about we have got to look to the future and the generations game – the future. And I know, as Deputy Soulsby said, there are not a lot of fields, etc. She drew attention to that, and that is where we are.

But, don't we want a rural area? Don't we want to develop the area as far we can between the central areas, the main areas, the main outer areas, whatever the terminology is, the spatial area. It reminded me of Space 1999 when I first read that word in one of these plans! The spatial areas, etc., the designations of the plans. So that is the difficulty I have.

Against that, if the amendment was successful, if it meant, *for example* – and I am just using this for an example, not for any pre-determination because that is not my role and that would be a matter for deep and careful consideration in due course, but *if* that were to preclude any kind of care for the elderly type of institutions in the future in the parish, because there would be nowhere else of suitable proximity, of suitable area and of general suitability, then I would not vote for this amendment. And I would be grateful for clarification from any other speaker and particularly Deputy Gollop when he sums up. But it is a difficult balance. It is easy to say, 'Oh well, there is a garage here, and there is something there, and there is something there, but the Forest is a rural parish. I know it has got the Airport and it has got all these jets that Deputy Brehaut talks about and he does not really want too many more coming in because he is against the extension of the runway, but that is for another day and we will talk about that no doubt in the due passage of time –

A Member: There would be fewer aircraft.

Deputy Ferbrache: Well, perhaps there would be fewer aircraft, and there would be fewer people coming to Guernsey, but we do not want that as well.

But the word 'local' is important and do we want ... because there would be the tendency, as was very well expressed by Deputy Brouard, and it might be 10 years, or it might be 20 years, joining the two together and then urbanising what is a rural area. That is what concerns me for generations going forward. I will not be around then – well I hope I might be in 10 years' time, but 20 or 30 years' time will probably stretch the limit. But I am concerned for the future. We have all these English-type ... and I am not against the English, my children are half-English, and my wife is English, so I cannot be against the English people and English principles! But we have these concepts, we bring them in from England, we have these local centres, etc., that I had never heard of until recently and did not realise what it was. That is the danger. And of all the amendments that have been debated today and those that I foresee we have still to debate in due course, this is the one that caused me the most difficulty.

At the moment I think I might just be inclined, unless I am persuaded ... and it has been very well presented so far, may I say, by Deputy de Lisle, but I will probably *just* vote against it unless I can be absolutely assured that there would be somewhere else to cater for the kind of facility that I am concerned about in the parish.

I know it may surprise you, but let's not over-urbanise Guernsey, let's consider carefully before we do something as dramatic as making another centre in what has always been in my time, and I hope always will be in the future, a rural parish.

Oh, and by the way, do not ignore the advice of the Douzaine. I do not care that they do not get elected by very many people, but bear that in mind. Do not let it trump your own considerations. Although they might not be elected by anybody, these are men and women – and it applies to every parish in Guernsey – who have devoted a lot of their time in the best interests of the parish and know the parish as well or better than anybody.

So, do not ignore their views. Do not let them tell you what to do, but bear those in mind when you come to vote.

740 **A Member:** Hear, hear.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you, sir.

745 I do think there is a feeling that is being expressed in this House, and I think it goes to the heart of the IDP, and it is that the IDP is different to the urban and rural plans that we are currently under. They do tie-in a lot more understanding of community and they are trying to. I think what we need to possibly do is trust the things they say and hold them to account to these wonderful things they are talking about within the Plan. The idea of sustainable communities ...
750 hold them to account. The fear is that you get a developer coming along and we are going to get this 'urbanisation' of this local centre. It is supposed to be a sustainable community. It is supposed to be able to provide the place, the assisted living and places where you can retire; or a small place that you can have as a first-time buyer. It is not just about urbanising this local centre.

755 The IDP is different to the urban and rural plans. If you continually look at the old plans, I think you just need to trust and also hold the DPA and the planning to account, to all these wonderful principles that they have in the IDP.

And just another point about the Douzaine: I think we all received a letter very early on in the process from a parishioner in the new Forest West who actually wanted to extend the area just so that she could build a second property for her granddaughter. Unfortunately I do not have the letter with me, but you should have all received it, it was a paper copy. So her view should also be taken into account. So it is not just the Douzaine, there are parishioners within that area that do want the local centre.

Thank you.

765 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Yerby.

Deputy Yerby: Sir, as I will seem a traitor to my district, I thought I should at least speak briefly before I vote.

770 As Deputy Soulsby has said, the boundary has been drawn tightly around Forest West and the reason why that was done, instead of simply extending the existing centre at Forest, was in order to protect the rural space in between, so the designation of the second centre was to protect rather than to put at risk the rural space. And, to echo what Deputy Hansmann Rouxel has just said, the designation of a local centre, if you look at the tools that are given to it in the Plan, it is a gift, not a threat.

775 The possibility of developing community plans, of allowing the local community to shape their area, to enhance its character, to make it the place they want it to be and to live in is much more powerful if they use those tools at their disposal. So if the amendment is lost and Forest West is made a local centre, I do hope that the Douzaine and the other organisations in the area will see it as a gift and will use it to their advantage.

780

A Member: Hear, hear.

A Member: Well said.

785 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Graham.

Deputy Graham: I think Deputy Yerby hits the point precisely, and certainly for me. I stand merely to echo the request which, as I understand it, Deputy Ferbrache made for further clarification as to whether if, for example, this amendment was to succeed, to what extent does it make more difficult the pragmatic development which has been talked about this morning to go ahead, as opposed to the prospects of that sort of development if the amendment fails?

790

The Deputy Bailiff: I do not see anyone else rising so I turn to the President of the Development & Planning Authority, Deputy Gollop, to reply to the debate.

795 **Deputy Gollop:** They always say what goes around comes around and having put so many amendments in in the past, that 30 amendments is quite a challenge, especially as we are running out of time, it seems to me, to finish today.

I would also point out that I have made numerous representations in the past to countless planning inquiries, as the planning officers will know. And I should point out here that sometimes, 800 contrary to what some Members might think, I have strong personal views on all of this that the Committee do not share, or the officers do not share. And that was as true when I was on the Environment Board as it is today. And from my point of view I could not have enough local centres, I wanted them all around the Island! I wanted one in Trinity Square; I wanted one at the Castel leading to Landes du Marche and Camp du Roi, maybe, and there are obviously other 805 places, perhaps even St John's.

The local centre is, I would say, not just a UK concept; it is a Channel Island concept. I have always envied, and I should not say that here, the Jersey planning model and the Jersey villages that you see dotted around the Island. They might not have the most beautiful housing, but they have more effectively delivered quantities of social housing and affordable housing than we have. 810 They have created a sense of place and although I would argue their townscape and seascape is not nearly as attractive as Guernsey's, their countryside is more plentiful. As soon as we go over there you can see you are in a rural Island rather than what has happened to Guernsey where too often we have seen suburbanisation.

Deputy de Lisle is right to point out the worry of creeping urbanisation, but we have been 815 closing the stable door after the donkeys, really, have already bolted. (*Laughter*) You only have to look at the Forest Road that links St Martin's and the Forest to see how unrural much of it has become.

In relation to the questions and the points that particularly Deputy Ferbrache and Deputy Graham have raised, the intention of the SLUP and therefore logically and complete with the IDP, 820 is that community development is concentrated in sustainable centres. Outside of the centres the opportunity for development, even community development, is logically very much more restricted in order to maintain the open rural area.

We could probably think of areas that do have facilities, like for example the excellent, newly opened facilities at the Baugy opposite the Vale Douzaine Rooms, which I think are technically 825 outside of that social area. But that of course is on an existing build and was the subject of a significant planning decision. Clearly if they are in the centre, especially in a rural parish or rural area, the opportunities for development especially for community facilities, as Deputy Yerby and others referred to, is potentially very low indeed. But I think we even heard, was it Lois King who is a senior officer here, talk of the need perhaps, if affordable, of somewhere in the country parishes.

830 And just to reflect on what Deputy Yerby said, and I am sure she will not be seen as a traitor to her parish if she is representing the whole district anyway, because Deputy Le Pelley has come in from St Sampson's. But he is an honorary westerner too, because of course I remember back in the day he was Constable of St Pierre du Bois as a younger man. So we all have interests Island-wide and we need to point that out.

835 Deputy Yerby also contributed on this subject on a BBC vox pop, the day more or less that the Plan was published. I recall that they decided, and I did not know about this in advance, the moving radio roadshow decided to broadcast from the Forest and interview various sundry passers-by and community figures. One or two even said, 'We are totally against the Plan and we are totally against everything that is in it!' Then they were asked, 'Well, what do you object to in particular?' And they said, 'We don't know, but we object to it because we do not like the 840 planners'. And that is sometimes the level that the discourse comes down to.

I do know how aware the Forest Parish is of their community and the pride they have. I remember the difficulties they had over the community centre and a ramp for the disabled, which

actually took a lot of working through. But sometimes there is not always unanimity in the parish and one has to be aware that that was a move forward eventually for the sense of community that Deputy Yerby and others have referred to.

I think, too, that it has to be remembered that this is a process, the gestation of which is the initial consultation phase and the questionnaire phase. The follow-up phase is when representations are made and counter-representations can be made at that point. I am aware that Deputy de Lisle made a lot of representations, as he generally does, but I do not believe the Forest Douzaines and Constables made a counter-representation at that time. And unfortunately, in this day and age, it is important that the parishes do follow what is going on in those kinds of areas, rather than just be reactive.

I mentioned Capelles earlier, but Capelles did not have the assurance of the necessary convenience store – the convenience store was under threat and there had been closure of other facilities. But the store in question, near the school that Deputy Le Pelley knows very well, has planning permission for another use, which can be enacted at any time. Maybe if Capelles had retained more of its communitarian facilities it, too, would be a centre. And there has been no assurance that this would not occur given claims of unviability.

The local centres concept comes from the States-approved SLUP, not the English planners. I would also point out that a fair number of staff, who work in the town and country planning section, both present and future, have Guernsey backgrounds. We should not see it in this *cliché* of everyone from outside the Island. The local centre boundaries have been drawn tightly to ensure limited development as required by SLUP, as Deputy Soulsby pointed out. I personally, am sympathetic to the alternative Deputy Dudley-Owen amendment if it is placed, because I think that is much more in accordance with policy and the logic of the situation than Deputy de Lisle's.

To make it clear, development outside of the defined centre would be subject to the policies in the Plan, but outside of these centres. The point is that any area outside of the area, including the green fields that Deputy de Lisle refers to between the two centres, and I know Forest West sounds like a Midlands football team or a parliamentary constituency in the New Forest, or somewhere, but in reality the bit in the middle would be protected. In fact I suggested at the very early stage that it was joined up but that was heavily repudiated by both the officers and the Committee because that would achieve precisely the aim we want to avoid, of a ribbon development across the Forest and the fields which were briefly used when the Airport apron was being tarmacked, being lost to the countryside, the farming community and the pleasant rural vista. And it is unusual to get an airport that is so close to what is still a pastoral scene, but that is the point.

I think, on another level, Deputy de Lisle, being an idealist and also a developmental specialist in a past life, is mixing up two issues. I think the local centres are not designed intrinsically to encourage development. They *support* appropriate development but they do not *encourage* development. They reflect a reality based on the methodology that is already there. And Deputy de Lisle himself mentioned what was there: the Mallard Centre, which may or may not be a cinema in the future; a garage convenience store; the Venture Inn which also serves meals, I believe; the Forest Primary School, Le Rondin School where some of us went to a conference recently, so it is used for a variety of purposes, excellent compliments on child development; the Child Development Centre; and of course the Co-operative Locales Garage and store. Nearby is a disused church, who knows – it might come back into use, ; and a fish and chip shop. So there is quite a lot there.

When you look at the more traditional Forest East Centre that, as Members have pointed out, is almost more of a conservation area, a historic village with ancient properties. If in the, hopefully unlikely, event of a store closing down there that would be detrimental to its function as a centre. The modern society has gone down the route of a development.

I, personally, think it is daft that we have our main cinema for the Island near the Airport in a country parish, about five or six miles from where most people live on the Island. That is poor planning, let's be honest. The States should have protected the Town's cinemas when they had

the chance, (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and the theatre. And they even let things go at Beau Séjour when we had an opportunity to build a cinema there. It did not happen and it is no good going over that past ground, we are where we are and the reality is that the western part of the Forest is a village centre, it is a social centre, it is a local centre and just by putting a statement or a gesture that it should not be, does not change the reality of the situation. So I do have to admit I strongly oppose this amendment despite it being well meaning.

The Deputy Bailiff: I turn to Deputy de Lisle as the proposer of amendment numbered 10, to reply to the debate on it.

Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: I must comment on the very naive comments from the last speaker, (*Laughter*) because in reality I have worked for many years in Canada seeking to revive areas that have got themselves into decline, or to bring in economic initiatives to develop those areas and to provide opportunity for local people to stay, rather than a move to other urban areas elsewhere.

The methodology that has been quite successful has been to put growth opportunity in centres in order to bring in and foster new development around those centres. The UK government has done the same thing in many ways, they have gone for enterprise zones and they have put those enterprise zones in the north and in other regional centres in order to diversify away from the growth factor in London. They have tried to de-centralise growth by enterprise zones in various parts of the country, and they have relocated certain activities like the Post Office and so on, to other cities in order to help them and forge growth.

The big mistake here is actually with these centres, because what we are doing is de-centralising growth from our main centres that are suffering in their own way of the Town and the Bridge, and we are moving them into these local centres. And here, in this one small, little parish you can ask a small population area such as the Forest why, in all honesty, does it need two local centres? What you are doing, actually, is putting two growth centres into that particular parish. I have to also comment more generally because I have written quite extensively on this whole regional impact of population change in Guernsey in the *Société* publications.

I have stated that the process of population redistribution has become a powerful force in Guernsey with major implications for planning and public policy. The pattern of centrifugal movement has gone far beyond suburbanisation to shifts in population down the urban hierarchy towards smaller relatively distinct settlements, associated with expansion of shopping services. Not only has this been evident in St Sampson's with the expansion of new business and shopping services, but regional centres have also grown in the rural parishes to serve the large influx of population. And the Forest has been one of the parishes that have received a large influx of population.

The redistribution of population has left this Island with a legacy of urban blight and rural sprawl. Centrifugal growth into areas outside the Town has placed substantial demands on the public and private sectors to provide land, infrastructure and services in areas of new growth while trying to meet the demands for renewal in Town. The Town has become less of a people place, less of a shopping place, and has suffered a decline in interest value negative to the tourist and Islander alike. The countryside has been transformed into a suburban environment with many land use conflicts emerging as new developments take hold against the more traditional ways of life.

I argue that it will be for the future to tell whether recent policy initiatives taken in light of strong representations by Islanders can reverse the trend of dispersal, regenerate the Town, reduce development pressure on the rural countryside, and repair the damage done to both the urban and regional environments in this Island. That is the major thrust and those are the concerns that we should really be considering. And when I speak of naivety, I speak of a new committee that has been put together with people with not a lot of experience looking at a very difficult area with tremendous implications for planning and public policy.

In terms of Deputy Tindall's remarks: limited growth supposedly, but that is not what we can see happening in the Forest Parish, because in fact what you are doing is giving credence to further development through bringing in a new centre of potential growth which will spill over into the countryside and in time will affect a greater area of that parish.

You are enhancing dispersal rather than concentrating on our competitive advantage with regard to competing against, for example, Jersey. Jersey is concentrating on its town, it is concentrating on St Helier and its development, and that is extremely important; and in Guernsey we are lax that way and we are suffering as a result of not having the competitive advantage that Jersey has. Our Town is important in giving us a competitive advantage and by putting resources out into the countryside we are not doing any favours to Guernsey plc.

I thank Deputy Roffey for noting his directorships and so on, with the Co-op, and staying out of the debate.

Deputy Fallaize: 'There is more retail in the Forest East.' That is not the case. Forest Stores is a magnet, actually, for people utilising their facilities. There is no other store of that size and of course the motor business is the prime motor business in that particular Forest East in the Island. So there is a lot going on. The Parish Church and other facilities as well in that area make it quite prime in terms of its retail function in comparison with any other area in the Forest parish.

Deputy Queripel makes the point of contradiction in terms of the special case in regard to this new centre. The fact is, when we went and spoke about agricultural land in front of the inspectors and we spoke in terms of parking in Town, and so on, that was already in the Plan and we could go ahead and talk about it. But we did not go and talk about this Forest West Centre, because it was not on the Plan. It was not part and parcel of the Island Development Plan at that time.

A few people in the community were talking about it and they had, probably, opportunity to gain and therefore they wanted the whole area drawn out into a large area. But the people that would oppose that were not at the hearings to do so. So in fact this is a nuance, this is something new that has been brought in later, and as a result parishioners and the Douzaine feel that they have been left out. Something has come in that they have had no say on. This, they feel, is not good government. And I agree with them on that.

I thank Deputy Brouard for making the points, particularly with regard to the Douzaine and their comments and their speaking against the development and the adoption of a new village centre. Deputy Le Pelley also, in terms of the significance and sufficiency of one local centre in a small parish like the Forest. His comments on the Mallard Complex, of course, for extra care housing and facilities, they have been outside of a rural centre for some time and it has not stopped them making many, many applications for development in different areas, some of which they have won and some of which they have lost. I thank him also for mentioning the Capelles area because that is another area which could well have been looked at by the inspectors, as it is another area of potential for a rural centre.

Deputy Ferbrache, thank you for your comments on the fact that the Forest is a rural parish, and it is of concern to you that there is a possibility of further urbanisation of that parish and the rural area in future. I thought, as a result of that, that I would read those few sentences with regard to the overall concern that I have with regard to the whole aspect of population change and regional development in our Island. As you say, let's not over-urbanise Guernsey or the rural parishes. You also expressed the fact that we should not ignore the views of the Douzaine, which I feel is very important because they are the local government, which we should be looking at more and more for assistance in our endeavours, particularly at a time when we are trying to cut back on costs, and surely this is an opportunity particularly as everybody at the Douzaine works free, gratis and it is up to us to be utilising them; and also giving some respect to the Douzaines for the work that they do free, gratis, and the knowledge that they have in local matters. So I think it is very important that point was brought up by Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Rouxel, you tried to define sustainable community and you had some difficulty there. And others were having the same sort of difficulty.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Point of correction.

1000 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: It is Deputy Hansmann Rouxel. Thank you.

Deputy de Lisle: My apologies, *Deputy Hansmann Rouxel*.

1005 You had a letter from a parishioner and of course several Deputies, three I think, spoke to that parishioner and gave her some comfort in terms of the way she should apply for development in her particular case outside of any worries with regard to local centres.

Deputy Yerby seems to be off-piste. (*Laughter*) Is it a gift she has had? She talks about a gift and I think it might be fairly naive of you to be making the statements that you have been making. (**A Member:** Ooh!) But then, we can excuse you for your age, my dear.

Several Members: Ooh!

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

1015

Deputy de Lisle: Yes, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: I have been patient with you, more than perhaps I should have been. But you are perhaps the most guilty of the Members who have been speaking at breaking Rule 17.1. Rule 17.1 says:

1020

When speaking in the States a Member should always address the Presiding Officer and must not address another Member.

What you have just done was to address another Member directly. That is a breach of the Rules; do not let it happen again, please.

Deputy de Lisle: My apologies to you, sir.

1025

In conclusion, there is already a local centre, a traditional centre around the Parish Church, the Forest Stores, the Post Office, hotels and restaurants and car and motor sales in Forest East. To create another centre added on to this, just a quarter of a mile to the west is creating a huge growth pool for the future in one of the smallest Island parishes in Guernsey. It defeats any attempt to control dispersal of population and activity growth outside the main centres.

1030

I ask you all to support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, we move to the vote on amendment 10. Deputy Lester Queripel.

1035

Deputy Lester Queripel: Recorded vote, please, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: With a recorded vote. This is the amendment proposed by Deputy de Lisle and seconded by Deputy Le Pelley.

1040

Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, by my reckoning that amendment was lost. The consequences –

Deputy Brehaut: Sir, I am sorry, can I just ask –

1045 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: I beg your pardon, sir.

Deputy Roffey took the opportunity to remind Members of an interest. Deputy de Lisle posed the potential for the loss of trade within St Peter Port if there were growth areas outside when he is a retailer in St Peter Port.

1050 Sir, can we have some clarification on Members' interests, please, just to ask them to bear it in mind when they get to their feet, if that is not too presumptive on my part. I am sorry.

Amendment 10.

1055 *Not carried – Pour 11, Contre 19, Ne vote pas 4, Absent 5*

POUR

Deputy Lowe
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Prow
Alderney Rep. Jean
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Le Pelley

CONTRE

Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Graham
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Yerby
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Saumarez
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Roffey
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Leadbeater

ABSENT

Deputy Le Tocq
Alderney Rep. McKinley
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy St Pier

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, well ...

Members of the States, as a consequence of what I think was a loss of amendment number 10, can I ask you to find amendment 23 next, because that is related to the same area.

1060 When I call amendment 23 in a moment, the proposer of the amendment, Deputy Dudley-Owen will be making her maiden speech.

The voting on amendment 10 was there voted: Pour 11, Contre 19, there were 4 abstentions, and therefore the amendment was lost.

So, amendment 23, I invite the proposer, Deputy Dudley-Owen, to move the amendment.

1065 Do you wish, first of all, to move the motion under article 7.1 to permit the amendment to be put?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Yes please, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: And that is seconded by Deputy de Saumarez?

1070 **Deputy de Saumarez:** Yes, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States, this is similar to previous motions of a similar nature because of the timing of submission of this amendment because it is to the proposals for a development plan.

1075 I will simply put it to you unless anyone wishes to debate it.

Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour

The Deputy Bailiff: I declare that motion carried and therefore invite Deputy Dudley-Owen to place amendment 23 and to make her maiden speech.

1080

Amendment 23.

To insert at the end of the words in Proposition 1: 'but subject to the modification that the boundaries of the additional Local Centre designated at Forest West, as indicated on the Map at Map extract 7 at page 23 of Appendix 6 be altered to exclude from the Centre the school playing field which lies to the east of the La Planque Lane west and any area of land which lies west of the La Planque Lane west which runs to the south as shown on the Map below (the red lines showing the modification of the boundaries).'

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, Deputy Bailiff, sir.

May the Greffier read for me, or should I read it myself? I am quite happy.

1085

The Deputy Bailiff: It is your choice.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I am sure he has a better speaking voice than myself, so please ...

The Deputy Greffier read the amendment.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you.

1090

Mr Deputy Bailiff, sir, given the desire amongst Members to speed up proceedings, I will endeavour to be brief and apologies, therefore, if my maiden speech is less rousing than would ordinarily be expected.

1095

I am speaking today regarding amendment number 23 to the Island Development Plan which I have laid and is seconded by Deputy de Sausmarez, to alter the proposed boundary line of the Forest West Local Centre. I would like to point out that I do have a specific interest in this area as I have lived in the Forest for nearly 20 years now and know the parish very well, especially the area which is covered within this amendment.

1100

The purpose of my amendment is two-fold: to protect prime agricultural land and to ensure that the Forest School retains their playing field. The inspector's recommendation number 10 on page 46 includes the Forest Primary School playing field which lies on the eastern side of La Planque Lane West, and also takes in a boundary further to the west including a greenhouse site and grazed field which lies adjacent to Les Nouettes Lane and is directly opposite to open and currently farmed prime agricultural land. A detail which seems not to have been taken into consideration is the severely restricted access in this area, given the narrowness of the lanes. Should permission be sought for either a modest office site or housing within the current proposed bounds of the local centre in this area, the access would be a real concern.

1105

1110

In addition to the extreme narrowness of these lanes, this is a well-used walkway to school used by many children and their families from the immediate and nearby communities, but that appears not to have been considered. The inclusion of the school field in the plans affording development opportunity would be detrimental to the ability of school children being able to play sports, as the field next door is also owned by the school and is, I understand, subject to a covenant which curtails the ability of the school to use it for many of the sports that school children need to play.

If Members consider page 25 of appendix 1 of the Report, which deals with 'Supporting a healthy and inclusive society' and:

... seeks a continued and expanded use of existing recreational facilities, including those in schools outside of school hours, to ensure the full utilisation of existing leisure and recreational infrastructure.

1115 This supports the requirement to protect our school fields and it could be said that, as a rule, these areas of land should fall outside of development potential unless exceptional circumstances arise.

1120 As Deputy de Lisle has already mentioned, there were some misgivings about the inclusion of this whole area. I would like to further draw Members' attention to the 'dilemma' which the inspector faced in including the Forest West as a local centre, which is mentioned on page 46 of the Report. I would like, sir, for Members to note, in appendix 9, page 5 as well, that the inspector was:

... not in a position to recommend the precise boundaries of such a centre.

1125 I do not need to labour the point and tell you of the importance of preserving our agricultural land, because you will all already know that. But Members may not know that local farmers believe that the 15,000 acres set aside for agriculture in the IDP include areas such as back gardens and car parks, and they believe Environment did a sweep of areas rather than a concerted survey of land. This is according to James Watts, Guernsey's Farmers' spokesman. These points lead me to be concerned that the nuances of this area of the Forest have quite possibly been overlooked by the planning inspectors and former Environment Board. The boundary line has

1130 possibly been decided without the benefit of the fullest knowledge but we are lucky enough to have this forum here today to rectify some of these issues.

Some may consider that I am speaking on behalf of and in favour of a Nimby view on development, but this is not the case; after all the largest commercial area of land used since 1938 in Guernsey, the Airport, sits in our small parish and is our neighbour. In addition, land around the

1135 Airport perimeter has been developed. One of the reasons the Forest Parish has one of the lower densities of housing compared to others, is because so much of our prime quality land, some 610 vergées to be exact, or 247 acres, has been given over to the Airport and the remaining other large areas of prime land supports current agricultural and horticultural activities.

Lacking in consideration in this recommendation is the fact that the boundary line covers undeveloped land in an area identified as having one of the richest deposits of alluvial soil in the Island and, as such, must be safeguarded for agricultural use. A detailed study and inspection commissioned and managed by our own well-respected Dr Andrew Casebow, in the late 1980's, looked at the quality of the soil Island-wide, surveying and assessing virtually every field in the Island at that time. I will not go into the nitty-gritty of the report, as it is rather academic for

1140 today's debate, but in summary the highest quality soil in the Island was found to be on the southern plateau of the Island in which the Forest squarely sits. The best land, therefore, for agricultural cropping in Guernsey is on this southern plateau. In consideration of the results of the aforementioned study, Dr Casebow's opinion is that it is important to conserve this highest-quality land wherever possible.

1150 Currently, available land stretching all the way from the Forest School playing field along the Airport boundary through to a nearby junction at St Peter's is regularly farmed and/or grazed and provides a valuable contribution to our local fresh food stocks. The natural line of the boundary is at La Planque Lane West, running south from the back of the school towards the junction of Les Landes. If Members think of the lane running in front of the Forest Chip Shop, looking right

1155 towards the airfield and left towards the direction of the Mallard.

The inspector's own admission that there is a lack of clarity and practical reasons surrounding the line which has been drawn around the centre, I believe, could lead in future to a gateway for development with inappropriate access roads, the further loss of prime agricultural land and, as significantly, the possible loss of a playing field and outside sporting activities for the Forest School children.

1160

I believe that this amendment has no impact on higher strategic policies and, sir, I therefore ask Members, through you, to support this amendment to alter the boundary to exclude these two areas from the Forest West Local Centre, making the boundary run along La Planque Lane West where it runs south to meet Les Landes. Guernsey's smallest, but arguably in agricultural terms richest, parish needs all the protection it can. This can be acknowledged by alteration of this boundary line.

Thank you. (*Applause*)

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

Deputy de Saumarez: I do, and reserve my right to speak.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Tindall, to be followed by Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

This amendment, if passed, would not result in a deferral of the Plan. However, for the same reasons as I put forward in respect of amendment 10, which I do not propose to repeat all of it, but as it will result in a lost opportunity because it reduces the potential for community development I would refer to those particular points I made. There are also policies in the Plan which I would highlight which protect the playing fields for community use. I cannot refer the Assembly to the particular paragraphs but obviously they are in the Plan.

I also mentioned that as a member of the Douzaine Liaison Group, I too really appreciate the work and commitment of the Douzaine. I would therefore like to hear from Deputy Dudley-Owen as to the opinion of the Douzaine on the amendment that she has put forward. In any event, the Development & Planning Authority, as a Committee, do oppose this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize, to be followed by Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir; and I commend Deputy Dudley-Owen on a very good opening speech and I thought that she made her case very well, and although she said her speech was not going to be rousing it was nonetheless very good.

I would seek some clarification. I do not think Deputy Dudley-Owen will be able to provide it, but I am hoping that Deputy Le Pelley might be able to provide it as President of the Committee for Education, Sport and Culture. The last States decided, very wisely in my view, that the policy of the States as far as primary school education is concerned would be to favour two- and three-form entry schools. It would have been better if it had been restricted only to three-form entry schools, but it was decided that it would be restricted to two- and three-form entry schools.

There are two schools very close to each other here, one which Deputy Dudley-Owen has referred to, the Forest, and another just down the road is La Houquette. Forest has operated as a one-form entry school for a long time; La Houquette, I think, has capacity to operate as a two- or possibly one-and-a-half form entry, it has not always been a two-form entry intake in recent years, which speaks to this policy to favour two-form entry schools.

Now, does he foresee that approving this amendment may have any impact on the ability of his Committee and their successes to rationalise those two primary schools in the way envisaged in the States' policy? If he could advise the States on that point at some point during the course of this debate I would be very grateful.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, yes, my question follows on from Deputy Fallaize's actually.

1215 We have heard from Deputy Dudley-Owen about why she wishes to take two areas from this proposed local centre, but I would like to know more specifically from members of the DPA because it was not very clear from Deputy Tindall's speech why they specifically want to include those two areas.

Thank you.

1220 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Sir, I really want to re-emphasise the point that Deputy Fallaize has made. *If* there is an intention, particularly in the current financial climate, to rationalise the two western primary schools, it seems to me that there are compelling reasons why it should be on the Forest site and not on La Houquette site. Firstly, the Forest is a far newer school and if it could be extended to become a two-form entry school we would not then be throwing away the capital investment that we made relatively recently unlike that of La Houquette, which is a very tired and old building. But, just as importantly, there was an overwhelming reason why Le Rondin was built where it was in order to be co-located with a mainstream school. If the two were to be rationalised on the Houquette site, it would no longer be co-located with a mainstream school. It would be going back to the bad old days, as if we had not gone for integration of mainstream and special needs in Guernsey but at least we had gone for co-location. It would go back to the bad old days of isolation.

1230 So coming back to this debate, I would only vote for this amendment if I could be *absolutely* sure that it will not prevent the Forest School being extended into a two-form entry school in order to facilitate that rationalisation that has already been flagged up by this Assembly.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

1240 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you, sir.

Following on from Deputy Roffey's comments, I would like some assurance that if that rationalisation does take place the playing facilities are safeguarded. I think it is even more important if it is going to become a bigger school.

Thank you.

1245 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Le Pelley.

Deputy Le Pelley: Sir, I stand just to try and answer the question that was posed by Deputy Fallaize, through you.

1250 I would just like to remind the Assembly that when the presidential election for Education, Sport & Culture took place the question was actually asked whether the Forest School would be closed or not. I said that in my opinion it should not be and that I would actually fight to retain it to being kept open.

1255 The Education, Sport & Culture Department have not actually gone down the road of discussing that yet, so I cannot give any other assurance other than my own personal assurance that I will try to protect the school.

I hope that helps.

Deputy Fallaize: Can I ask Deputy Le Pelley to clarify something that he has just said?

1260 It is understood that is his personal opinion, but it is a policy of the States to have two-and three-form entry primary schools, and his Committee is under a States' Resolution to report back on those two particular schools, Forest and La Houquette, by 2020, which falls within this term of the States.

1265 So notwithstanding his personal views, could he still please clarify whether, if the States stick to their policy, it would be possible to extend the Forest School notwithstanding this amendment, if it is approved?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Le Pelley, I thought you had answered that, but never mind.

1270 **Deputy Le Pelley:** I find it difficult, sir, because that is some way down the road and we have not actually decided where we are going yet. So I cannot answer it.

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, as I do not see anyone else rising to speak in this debate, I invite the President of the Development & Planning Authority, Deputy Gollop, to reply on the amendment.

1275 **Deputy Gollop:** Sir, thank you.

I think we do not have much time in a way and, how can I put it, we have been hijacked already by a traffic debate and it seemed to me we had a little bit of a boost to an education debate there somehow, as some of us have diverse views on the rationalisation of primary schools and the necessity of that in the first place. And I think the amendment did not wish to go down this route.

1280 Deputy Tindall was of course correct in saying that there were reasons why the boundaries were chosen. And if you restrict the boundaries you take bits off, bits we have not actually visited as a States, and in taking little bits off Le Planque Lane in two directions you do limit the possibility of community or other appropriate site-specific development there, as I think is a point Deputy Roffey and others have picked up on.

Le Planque Lane, funnily enough, before the Airport was built, as Deputy Dudley-Owen in a good maiden speech mentioned, once extended to St Saviour's, so you can find the other end of it near a famous silversmith's. So that certainly was an area lost.

1290 In relation to the more complicated question that was raised about the boundaries by Deputy Soulsby and others, the boundaries of all the local centres in the Plan were determined by applying the same methodology which is set out in this evidenced technical report and included the site survey. Now, it is paradoxical because somehow the site did miss initial inclusion in the local centres but, once the inspectors had demanded its inclusion and we had accepted that, we then set about with the same rationale in looking for appropriate areas that are covered. And the areas it included were adjunct to community facilities such as the school, and also included a residential line of properties, from a quick glance.

1295 I personally, given the fact that this is a new site and that we have heard passionate pleas about Douzaines and about creeping urbanisation that Deputy Ferbrache mentioned, as well as Deputy de Lisle, and I think that as this is a new centre that we want, but not necessarily completely urbanise the parish, I am relaxed about whether this amendment is adopted or not. But I think you can understand the methodological reasons why the DPA want the boundaries that are there rather than be as Deputy Dudley-Owen has suggested.

1305 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I invite the proposer of this amendment, Deputy Dudley-Owen, to reply to the debate on her amendment.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

I will be brief in my response because I think that some of the questions posed do lead into much larger and lengthier debate and this is not the time for it, in my opinion.

1310 Deputy Tindall asked about the view of the Douzaine. I am afraid I have not consulted the Douzaine on this matter because, given that they were unanimously opposed to the inclusion of the local centre, I felt that there would be support. Obviously you alluded to the fact that I am on the Douzaine so, knowing the people well there, they would be looking to retain as much agricultural land and also definitely to safeguard development opportunity on the school playing field.

I think that the other concerns were only raised by Deputies Fallaize and Roffey in regard to the school and I can only say that I would want to seek to protect the school playing field as far as possible. But what may be in the future is not my concern today about enabling children to be able to play tomorrow.

1320 So I would urge Members to support this amendment. It is a small alteration but it is actually quit important in the bigger scheme of things.

Thank you.

1325 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, we move to the vote on amendment 23, proposed by Deputy Dudley-Owen and seconded by Deputy de Sausmarez.
Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: A recorded vote please, sir.

1330 **The Deputy Bailiff:** We will have another recorded vote, Deputy Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, that amendment was clearly carried by a significant majority.

The next amendment that we turn to will be amendment number 1, proposed by Deputy Roffey and seconded by, as I understand it, Deputy de Sausmarez.

1335 Deputy Roffey.

Amendment 1

To insert at the end of the words in Proposition 1: ‘; but subject to the modifications that the Agriculture Priority Area (see the Proposals Map following page 353 of the Draft Island Development Plan at Appendix 1, and recommended amendments at insets 9 to 12 and 14 to 16 on pages 117 to 120 and 122 to 124 of Appendix 7) shall be extended by the inclusion of each of the following areas shown outlined in red on the maps annexed to this Proposition and labelled:

- a) MAP 1 TORTEVAL;*
- b) MAP 2 ROUTE DE FARRAS, FOREST;*
- c) MAP 3 FONTENELLE, FOREST;*
- d) MAP 4 LES BLANCHES, ST MARTIN;*
- e) MAP 5 VAUGRAT, ST SAMPSON;*
- f) MAP 6 LES COTTES VALE/ST SAMPSON;*
- g) MAP 7 FOREST ROAD, FOREST’.*

2. To insert at the end of the words in Proposition 1: ‘[but subject to the modification that] [and] the Agricultural Priority Area (see the Proposals Map following page 353 of the Draft Island Development Plan at Appendix 1, and recommended amendment at inset 13 on page 121 of Appendix 7) shall be contracted by the exclusion of the area shown outlined in red on the map annexed to this Proposition and labelled MAP 8 BRAYE DU VALLE, ST SAMPSON ROUTE MILITAIRE, VALE’.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

1340 I feel perhaps I ought to start off with a sincere apology to this Assembly. This amendment was drafted over a month ago and put on the States’ website so that every Member of this Assembly could understand exactly how I was trying to amend the draft Island Development Plan, and so every member of the public could understand exactly how I was trying to amend the draft Island Development Plan. I have not changed the wording since, I have not withdrawn it and replaced it with amendment number 42, I have not asked for the Rules of Procedure to be suspended. Clearly

1345 I have not got a clue about how modern politics works! (*Laughter*) No doubt I will get the hang of it eventually.

Sir, in debating the draft Island Development Plan over the last two and a half days, we have been surely trying to do several things: we have been trying to balance many competing demands for the precious 24½ square miles which is Guernsey. We have been trying, as far as possible, to ensure that sufficient land is available for all of the activities that Islanders want to carry out, whether those are work-related or leisure-related. But at the same time, surely, we have been desperately trying to maintain our Island's unique character, its beauty and its charm. It is a tricky challenge.

Luckily for us, though, there are a small number – fewer than 20 – of family-run businesses which between them probably do more to maintain Guernsey's countryside, its bucolic charm and its character, than the other 63,000 of us put together. I think we really need to look after them today. Of course I am talking about our farmers, who work hours that few others would even countenance, for not particularly high returns and, in doing so, maintain our unique patchwork of small fields and ancient earth banks which do not only look special but are ecological gold dust; not to mention keeping our iconic Guernsey cow in the fields. Theirs is a vocation that few of us would envy, because of the sheer hard work involved, but from which every Islander benefits. As I say, if we are going to safeguard any activities today, then farming surely has to be top of the list.

Fortunately this new Plan contains an innovation called Agricultural Priority Areas, or APAs, and I really congratulate the Planning Department – I suppose it was the former Environment Department – on this innovation. As they say in paragraph 13, point 3.4: the APA seek, to quote them, 'Guernsey's most valuable agricultural land.' And I have to say they have made a pretty good fist of identifying most of those sites. They have applied a set of standardised formulas, one of them is that it has to be more than 30 vergées of contiguous agricultural land. Actually, I do not think they should have used vergées, I agree with Deputy Paint that we should be maintaining our historic terms and over 20 vergées you go into bouvéés, so it should have been one and a half bouvéés, or maybe one-eighth of a carucate if you prefer.

Anyway, that was one of the criteria and there are a number of others, they fed them into the computer and the result does indeed throw up most of the most important farmland in Guernsey; but with a few really glaring exceptions. And I know from speaking to farmers that they would ideally like to see far more sets of important, or simply useful, fields given this new highest level of protection. As a former Agriculture & Countryside President, I empathise with them, of course I do, but it just cannot go as far as they would like.

I understand this new designation is only there for the most important sites. It is not there for a few small fields, however useful they may happen to be for the industry or for individual farmers.

Anyway, just because those fields are not zoned as APAs they will not necessarily be lost to farming, they will still have some level of more general protection from the policies governing areas outside the designated centres. That said, if we are going to have this new designation of APAs for the 'most important' farmland in Guernsey, then it is obviously important that all of that most important farmland is actually covered by that designation. At the moment it patently is not. That is why I am placing one amendment covering seven areas which will either see APAs existing or new ones created. All of those amendments have the wholehearted support of the Guernsey Farmers' Association; indeed I think that ideally they would have liked me to go much, much further.

I will not address each side individually at this stage, but I am happy to respond to any comments about individual sites when I sum up. My understanding is this amendment could also allow each side to be considered independently, indeed I did originally plan to put eight amendments and the then Procureur persuaded me it was better to put one that allowed each one to be looked at separately.

Actually, I will just mention one in passing as I go along, because I was contacted by the Director of the Airport – or should that be the Director of Airport and Harbours these days? – about whether this could have any impact if they needed to relocate Taxiway Delta, I think it is

called. My understanding, and I will wait for DPA to confirm it, is that a strategic requirement like that, and we have only got one Airport and it needs to keep operating, and there is nothing in the policies covering APAs that would prevent a development of that sort.

1400 Sir, I am also proposing one amendment to delete part of one of the DPA's proposed APAs. I do that because I feel I have to be consistent. Land allocation has to take into account many competing demands for a very finite resource. So if I am asking for vital tracts of farmland to be give protection I think it would be hypocritical of me not to flag up that one area earmarked for such protection ... patently does not deserve it. I can only put the designation down to an
1405 unforeseen flaw in the way the criteria were applied by the computer programme.

The site which I do not think measured up as an APA is the area of grassland to the south of the Vale Pond, an area that floods at the drop of a hat. The new zoning then, even more bizarrely, stretches across Route Militaire to encompass the former Kenilworth Vinery site, about as far from an area of crucial importance to Guernsey's farming industry as it is possible to imagine.

1410 My first thought was to delete the whole APA because I do not think any part of it is worthy of the designation but, after speaking to the planners, I have agreed to compromise and only seek the deletion of that part to the east of Route Militaire, in other words Kenilworth Vinery, as was, and the land next to it.

In closing, I want to reiterate my congratulations to the former Environment Department for
1415 having the vision to create APAs. However, there is one point on which I must publicly and strongly disagree with them about, and indeed disagree with the inspectors that carried out the Inquiry. The idea that Guernsey has enough land zoned, not only for current agricultural activity but also for any potential expansion, is absolutely wrong; so wrong as to be perverse. Figures are bandied around such as 15,000 vergées zoned as agriculture but only 8,000 used at the moment,
1420 and 10,000 would be the maximum that would ever be needed.

They sound impressive but they totally ignore the reality on the ground. Much of that theoretical agricultural land was absorbed into domestic curtilages decades ago and will never be used for farming ever again. Much of it is simply unavailable for other reasons and, of course, a massive amount of it is used for grazing horses. I am not in any way anti-horse, in fact I am very
1425 pro-horse. Equestrian activities are not only healthy but they help maintain significant areas of open land in good order. But the fact is that the same land cannot be used for two different purposes at the same time. So that entire significant amount of land zoned for agriculture but used for 'horsiculture', has to be deducted from the land that is theoretically available to farmers; and it is a massive amount in Guernsey.

1430 Speak to those farmers and they will tell you the reality on the ground is that it is very hard indeed to find good, useable land in decent-sized blocks. I think we all need to remember that not only today when voting on, and hopefully passing, my amendment but also when this trite and utterly untrue claim that there is far more agricultural land in Guernsey than farmers need, is inevitably trotted out time and again over the months and years ahead, as a result of the
1435 comments in this IDP, by any developer who want to encroach on important greenfield sites. It is just not true.

Sir, I hope Members will pass this important amendment.

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

1440 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** I do, sir, and reserve my right to speak.

The Deputy Bailiff: But when you are doing so can you remember to stand in your place when you are called, please?

1445 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Sorry, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

1450 The voting on amendment number 23, proposed by Deputy Dudley-Owen and seconded by Deputy de Sausmarez was as follows: Pour 31, Contre 3, and that is why it was carried.

Carried – Pour 31, Contre 3, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 5

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Fallaize	Deputy Roffey	None	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Lowe	Deputy Tindall		Alderney Rep. McKinley
Deputy Laurie Queripel	Deputy Merrett		Deputy Mooney
Deputy Smithies			Deputy Trott
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel			Deputy St Pier
Deputy Graham			
Deputy Green			
Deputy Paint			
Deputy Dorey			
Deputy Brouard			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Yerby			
Deputy de Lisle			
Deputy Langlois			
Deputy Soulsby			
Deputy de Sausmarez			
Deputy Prow			
Deputy Oliver			
Alderney Rep. Jean			
Deputy Ferbrache			
Deputy Kuttelwascher			
Deputy Brehaut			
Deputy Tooley			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Parkinson			
Deputy Lester Queripel			
Deputy Le Clerc			
Deputy Leadbeater			
Deputy Le Pelley			
Deputy Stephens			
Deputy Meerveld			

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

1455 This amendment does not require a deferral. However, we do have a concern with this amendment as the inclusion or exclusion of the pieces of land is inconsistent with the methodology.

1460 Sir, I take maps 1, 3, 4-7 first. These areas of land proposed to be added to the Agricultural Priority Area, were not identified as APAs as they do not have 30 or more vergées of contiguous land that is in use for agriculture, and/or best and most versatile land as described previously by Deputy Dudley-Owen. Taking account that in some cases these rows separate land, to include them would be inconsistent with the APA methodology which is considered consistent with the SLUP and has been accepted by the inspectors. To not include the land with the APA would not prevent agricultural use from continuing. However, the addition of 257 vergées, 1.7% of the APA, would not undermine the policy approach to achieve a balance between protection of land for agriculture while ensuring land is available to meet other legitimate development requirements.

1470 To map 2 which, as Deputy Roffey pointed out, we do have rather more concern. The land at Route de Farras, Forest, is adjacent to the Airport land designation. The map 2 area includes some land in use for farming and BNV but also contains some Airport land and does not form a contiguous swathe of agricultural land over 30 vergées and therefore did not meet the threshold for APA. To include this land in the APA would potentially conflict the Airport Land Policy Approach, policy IP4, which supports development for Airport-related uses which add to the

overall viability and success of the operation of the Airport on adjacent sites where a suitable site is not available on Airport land. While the land is currently not safeguarded for Airport use, to apply the APA designation would unnecessarily remove an element of flexibility. To include the land would also be inconsistent with the APA methodology.

Finally, sir, to map 8. The area is proposed to be excluded from the APA. Part of the area was an addition to the APA made through Environment Department's amendments, accepted by the inspectors. It was identified following a review of the application of the APA methodology and its consistency. There is no evidence to support this area being excluded from the APA and there is a risk that there could be seen to be inconsistency with other areas with similar characteristics, made up of small fields in different ownership, and glasshouses.

The APA policy is flexible enough to consider alternative uses should any site be considered not appropriate for agriculture, following a review of all relevant issues. The APA includes a significant buffer over the land required for dairy farming going forward, despite Deputy Roffey's assertion this is what we have been told. Therefore the loss of this area from the APA would not have a significant impact on the purpose of the policy.

We therefore do not support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Stephens, followed by Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Stephens: Thank you, sir.

I intend to support this amendment. My research into the amendment has raised some general concerns about the identification of the Agricultural Priority Areas. To demonstrate the concerns, I am going to speak particularly about the area of land on map 8, Braye du Valle, St Sampson's, Route Militaire, Vale – which is the area that Deputy Roffey wishes to remove from the Agricultural Priority Area. I actually would have gone further than Deputy Roffey in the first instance but I am content with the area of land that he has identified.

My concerns with the identification of the Agricultural Priority Areas are two-fold. Some of my concern has a historical context but rest assured, sir, I am not returning to Boxing Day 1066, I will begin my speech a little later than that.

Firstly, the inclusion of the portion of land Bray du Valle, St Sampson's, as an APA was an afterthought by Planning, prompted by the former Commerce & Employment Department in July 2015. Second, the land included in this particular area has soil of the very poorest agricultural quality. As Deputy Roffey has said, Members can see on the map in the centre there is a large area abutting the Route Militaire which is a disused vinery but is now used for light industry and has one residential unit included on the site.

My reading of the response of the then Environment Department to a submission by Commerce & Employment to the Planning Inquiry is that the applicants were concerned that insufficient land was being protected by the draft IDP for Agriculture, and a review of the methodology for identifying APAs included parcels of land at Pleinmont, Mont Cuét and La Bailloterie, the last mentioned being the land running from the vinery towards the Braye du Valle.

The response to Commerce & Employment states that Environment was seeking land that might not be in agricultural use at present but is of good quality. The vinery site in the centre of map 8 does not fit that requirement of good quality agricultural land, in fact it has concrete embedded in the land over most of the site. The rest of the site on that page also does not match the requirement of good agricultural land. There is very little likelihood of this area being of important use to the agricultural industry.

The States of Guernsey Agriculture & Environment Adviser informs me that: the Forward Planning Group that wrote the new Draft Island Development Plan and prepared the original map did request information from him on the use of farmland in the Island and on soil and land classification. However, he was unable to understand some of the decisions regarding the

inclusion of areas of land in the APA; or, conversely, why some areas were left out. He repeatedly told them that he disagreed, but to no avail.

Some of the land has been used by a dairy farm, however it was very low-lying traditional meadow land and has always been prone to flooding in the winter. It had only ever been used either for grazing heifers in the summer or as a mowing area for the conservation of either quite poor-quality silage or for traditional meadow hay. When the farmer moved away from dairy farming because this was poor land and, even though it was set at a very low rental, he still could not justify keeping it.

I am informed that although the draft IDP shows some areas of this parcel designated as a site of special significance and an area to the south as an area of biological importance, in the opinion of the Agriculture & Environment Adviser, this land is agricultural land of the very poorest quality due to the wetness of the soil and the limited use that can be made of it. Neither the adviser nor the Director of Agriculture, Countryside & Land Management Services can understand why this area was included in the proposed APA on the basis of size criteria. They say that the area of agricultural fields was not sufficiently large according to the criteria set by Planning and although they would also have issue with that sizing, and it was only of a size greater than 30 vergées – the criteria set – if the land on the opposite side of the road at the Kenilworth Vinery was included. I am told that the quality of soil on the vinery site is likely to be very similar to the very poor quality of soil on the other side of the Military Road. This area is of almost no value for agricultural purposes in its current state.

So I think, sir, what I am saying is that my research into this area caused some concern about those decisions of the Authority. This old vinery was bundled up with a poor-quality parcel of land in an attempt to meet a size criteria that is not universally accepted as the optimum size. Take the vinery away and on the size criteria the argument for inclusion in an APA is lost. Consider the quality of the soil and the argument for inclusion in an APA is lost. And even if I factor in a further condition for inclusion of this area as an APA, which is that it is adjacent to existing operations and therefore very suitable to contribute to the agricultural industry, the vinery fails that test because the surrounding land is of poor agricultural quality. And as a footnote, the vinery was actually very recently included in a trawl of properties that might possibly accommodate some of the tenants from the Fontaine Vinery site.

So, sir, as I said at the beginning, I would have perhaps gone further than Deputy Roffey but I would certainly urge Members to support his amendment in terms of the removal of the areas he has identified from the APA.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Thank you very much, sir.

Deputy Roffey is absolutely right when he says this was published a long time ago on 8th September and I thought, what a sensible amendment! Oh yes, and it is Deputy Roffey and there is no conflict between the two. So when I saw that I thought it makes sense because what he said is correct: these are, effectively, a joined-up lot of fields, each one has got a joined-up lot of fields. What farmers hate is having to have a field here and a field there, and a field somewhere else. So although there may be numerically sufficient land and perhaps in some ways an oversupply of land for agriculture, it is on agricultural land like this where you have got joined-up sites where farmers can go from field-to-field and carry his or her trade out. So I understand that.

The only issue that I have, and Deputy Roffey has explained it very well in relation to these various points, is map 2, Route de Farras, the Forest – that is the Airport one, if I can call it that. What I do not understand is, when I hear words like ‘methodology’ what on earth does ‘methodology’ mean? It means madness to me if you cannot support the bulk of the amendment. These areas should have been included because, as I say, farmers want joined-up fields. So if you have got a methodology that does not suit practicality and common sense, it is the methodology

that does not make any sense; and I just hate hearing jargon like that when it is contrary to blatant common sense.

But where I hear, and I heard Deputy Tindall say it, and no doubt Deputy Gollop will pick it up in his closing remarks, if that one was approved it could potentially in some way affect future Airport development. Well, surely, as Deputy Roffey and Deputy de Sausmarez put this, this is amendment number 1, put in a long time ago before the rest of us even thought about what precisely we were going to say. Why haven't the Planning Authority been able to say it will, or it will not? Where has this word 'potentially' come in? How does the adverb add anything in these particular circumstances?

Perhaps Deputy Gollop could also cover ... when he makes his closing remarks, I would be very grateful if he could, to say if we approved the Route de Farras bit and the Airport bit, if I can see the bit I am looking at in the aerial photograph has not got grass on it. And if there was an Airport development in due course – one year, three years, five years – whatever it may be, forget the runway, it is not the runway bit anyway in the sense we are talking about. Whatever development it may be, how would that be impinged upon or affected if we were to approve the Roffey/de Sausmarez amendment in connection with that part 2?

If it does not concern it at all or if we would be able to develop the airport in some way in three, or five, or ten years' time, without in any way concerning ourselves with this amendment i.e. the amendment has passed and we have regard to it but it is not going to hold anything up, can he tell us that? If he says it cannot be and it could hold us up and we would have a Planning inquiry, and we could do this, that or the other, then as regards route 2, Route de Farras, I would oppose that. I would vote against it because I do not want to see any potential Airport development held up in the future, albeit I do not think that really should be necessary and I think Deputy Gollop, sir, if I may respectfully say, should be able to deal with that now, unequivocally and unreservedly, and dispense with this word 'potentially'.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Yes, sir, I may be able to assist Deputy Ferbrache.

I think possibly any comment on this area was absent because of the lamentable absence of the President of the States' Trading Supervisory Board and therefore the interests of the Airport perhaps was not properly reflected in the process as it should have been.

I think if I could help Members by explaining what the problem is, if Members will look at map 2, they will notice that the taxiway towards the western end of the Airport closes in towards the main runway, and essentially the taxiway at the eastern end of the Airport is compliant with the regulations that apply to airports. But where the taxiway swerves to the north and therefore closer to the runway at the western end, it is actually non-compliant with safety requirements.

Nevertheless, the Airport Renovation Project was approved by all the authorities and permissions were given and an exception was made for this non-compliant feature of our Airport facility. But it is always a possibility that at some future stage the Civil Aviation Authority may say, 'This is non-compliant and you have to rectify it' – in which case the taxiway at the western end will have to move south and in fact into the area of land which Deputy Roffey is trying to safeguard.

The reason why the States' Trading Supervisory Board has not created a fuss about this is that we have been advised that the policies within this Plan, including policies around developments of strategic importance, etc., trump the agricultural land protection. Therefore if it was required to move the Airport taxiways then, notwithstanding any decision made today, we would be able to move the taxiways, because Guernsey clearly cannot function without a legally approved airport.

Sir, that is why we have not made any formal objection to that but, having said that, I am not going to support this element of Deputy Roffey's amendment both because of this potential future conflict and because it seems to me to conflict with – although Deputy Gollop will explain this much better than I can – the policies around development around the Airport which is singled

1630 out as a specific area of interest. And also, frankly, because the ribbon-like area of land that Deputy Roffey is seeking to protect does not really appear to me to be a particularly sensible description of a farm. In other areas, the parcels of land he is trying to protect seem to me to make some more or less coherent sense but in this area, for the reasons I have given, I am not going to support that aspect of his amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen, to be followed by Deputy Soulsby.

1635 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you, sir.

Just tackling that particular issue, I refute that this is not a particularly good area of land to safeguard. It is actively used at the moment by people farming; today, there are cows grazing next to the Airport perimeter. It may not have the compliance that is required of other airports but we are unique; and Lagan had never worked so close to a community before, they have told us, when they came here.

1640 Thankfully, freed of the shackles of my maiden speech, I am speaking today in support of this amendment to increase the amount of agricultural priority areas identified. I see it as no coincidence that three of the seven sites identified in the amendment are in the Forest and one is in Torteval. This is due, as I have already explained to Members, to the excellence of the soil quality along this stretch of the Island. That said, I think all of the seven sites included are essential additions and very important.

1645 After many years of growth, and in conjunction with the decline of growing industry, much of our agricultural land has been developed in Guernsey. But with a heightened awareness of the importance of our environment, and now in less certain times of our food security, there has been a discernible shift in recent years towards ensuring that agricultural land is protected. I will give you just a few recent and current examples which I think show well this shift in local public opinion.

1650 The petition of 1,000-plus individuals, including some Members, to save valuable and important agricultural land in St Martins from development last month was supported by the planning inquiry and the development was refused permission. An increasing interest over the last 20 years in small-holding with a vibrant and discernible group of enthusiasts, some of whom are in this Chamber; I myself have bred and kept Tamworth pigs and I am sure we all know someone who to a greater or lesser degree grows their own.

1655 Growing and sustainability projects locally, such as the St Peters' tomato growing project this summer, Edible Guernsey, and not forgetting the wonderful floral groups who are acknowledged regularly with prestigious awards from Britain in Bloom. And also recently introduced are horticultural courses run by the Guernsey College of Further Education which are available for full-time students as well as work-based apprenticeships; and I am pleased to say that they are also available to those in Guernsey Prison.

1660 As I mentioned in my earlier speech, James Watts, Guernsey Farmers' spokesman, has this week on the radio confirmed that farmers believe that many agricultural areas used by the industry have been left out of the IDP. I do not wish to criticise the previous Department but it does appear that valuable, actively used agricultural land was missed from this Plan, hence the absolute need for this amendment. We do not want to lose more agricultural land to development and, despite Guernsey's growth since the war, we are still lucky to maintain an active agricultural and horticultural industry.

1670 Sir, through you, I urge Members to please vote in favour of this amendment to help safeguard our most precious resource and protect our agricultural land.

1675 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, Members may be aware that I have been one of the many campaigners fighting to save part of the site at Les Blanchés from development. I am delighted that in the most

1680 recent episode of this long-running saga the Development & Planning Authority have refused yet another application to build on the site.

This comprises prime agricultural land. Deputy Dudley-Owen referenced a survey undertaken by Dr Casebow in the 1980's when she spoke to her amendment. Well, in that survey Dr Casebow also identified this land at Les Blanchés as grade A agricultural land, with the best quality soil on the Island. Recently he undertook a further sampling of that site and confirmed his earlier findings. Frankly, if Deputy Roffey had not been so quick off the mark I would have laid this amendment myself.

1690 But I am disappointed that, despite representations made to the inspectors, this land was not included purely because it did not make up an area of a minimum of 30 vergées – land that has been farmed for centuries. It does certainly seem to me to be a rather nonsensical approach, as Deputy Roffey alluded to, where land that would clearly not be capable of being farmed is included in the agricultural priority areas, whereas the best quality of land on the Island is completely excluded. It seems quantity rather than quality has been the approach.

1695 So I will therefore be supporting this amendment and, should it fail, I will seek to try and lay an amendment purely on the Les Blanchés site.

The Deputy Bailiff: Can I just have an indication of how many Members wish to speak on this amendment? We have got two Members. It is 12.30 p.m. now so the Rules say that we adjourn until 2.30 p.m. But I am going to propose that we complete this amendment now.

1700 Those in favour; those against?

Members voted Pour.

The Deputy Bailiff: We will continue sitting.
Deputy Paint.

Deputy Paint: Sir, I will be voting for this amendment.

1705 There is a little bit of clarification I would like on map 8. I fully accept that this is not very good agricultural land but could Deputy Roffey assure us that this land is wetlands, really, and might be used by migrating birds in the winter?

1710 If it is, we have very little land left where migratory birds could actually go, particularly on wetlands. I would like to be reassured that, by removing it, he would be happy that we would not lose any of our migratory birds.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

1715 **Deputy de Lisle:** Sir, I have to declare an interest, as an owner of agricultural land in the West. But I note and I fully support the amendment of Deputy Roffey.

1720 The Island Development Plan protects large areas of course of contiguous agricultural land for the farming industry. But it is of concern to me that many fields and areas of agricultural use are undesignated, white areas on the proposals map and lie outside of agricultural priority areas, and outside also of the areas that Deputy Roffey is intending to bring forward.

These undesignated green field areas are essential to the viability of the current farming industry and should be protected, sir. It is of some concern that these fields may be given a higher chance of being lost to agriculture. The designation of agricultural priority areas needs greater rigour on the proposals map.

1725 Sir, I would like to ask that all agricultural and open land should continue to be protected and the white areas particularly on the proposals map are left undesignated, and recognise the fears that fields undesignated are more vulnerable to being lost to other uses and likely to be developed in final analysis. I would like the assurance that perhaps that is not the case, and I

1730 would like to see an added statement actually with respect to these policies OC5(A) and OC5(B) to protect agricultural lands for agricultural use, and thus protect the land resource for the future of the dairy industry and farming generally in Guernsey.

I think that is a statement that should be appended to these two policy statements which I mentioned to the inspector, but obviously it has not been carried forward. I think there were concerns from the farming representatives, too, and they seemingly made a lot of points to the inspectors that have not come through in their statements and their response to the inquiry, sir.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

1740 **Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

Very briefly, following on from the speech of Deputy Parkinson, I am wondering whether you are going to permit separate votes either when we vote on the amendment, or on the substantive Proposition if the amendment gets through, on (a) to (g) please?

1745 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I have given a prior indication that we would take Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 distinctly, and in respect of Proposition 1 if any Member wishes to vote for one paragraph separately from the others. We might not need seven votes, but we might take two or three.

Deputy Brehaut.

1750

Deputy Brehaut: What is with the long face? I will be brief.

There is a disconnect before we got here today, because there is a view that ... well, it is accurate, the Environment Department handed over the solid body of work to the DPA and some months later the DPA are presenting it. But if you trace that back, something significant happened before we got here. Some years ago Deputy Roffey was President of the Countryside & Agriculture Committee as it was – or the other way round, sorry. So there was an acute focus, there was a Committee with a primary concern with a mandate in this area. Then what happened, unfortunately in my view, was the Agriculture & Countryside Board was subsumed into the Commerce & Employment Department.

1760 Nobody in that Department could see the relationship of the Guernsey cow to the digital economy, (*Laughter*) so it was forgotten. You cannot get three bars on a good dairy herd so it was ... But I make a serious point there, that is not where the focus was, to the detriment of some of the information and some of the policy formation that we have in front of us, in my view.

1765 But there were just two things I wanted to point out further than that. We have to be honest what we are trying to do here. If you want to look after and preserve, and have the best agricultural land and look after it, be honest that you are doing it for that reason. If you want a green field to look at, be honest and say, 'I want a green field to look at.'

1770 If you take Les Blanchés, for example, it is one of the most impractical sites from a farmer's point of view to access. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) In the days when you had a Massey 135 tractor it was probably easier, but it is a difficult piece of land to manage if you are a farmer and actually at the very top, I realise of course that they grow beets and they grow silage and of course that is the contribution it makes as well as potentially grazing at times. But the top field of the Les Blanchés site is notoriously difficult to access – it just is. So it is not farmed on a regular basis.

1775 So if we are to look after the number one top agricultural land, be honest and say, under another policy even perhaps, 'We are doing it because it is a space, it is a green field.'

I will give way to Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, Deputy Brehaut.

1780 That top field was farmed continually until the landowner withdrew the tenancy rights to the farmer.

Deputy Brehaut: But it is not now and has not been for some time. There we are, I am trying to recover, Deputy Soulsby.

But be honest why we are trying to keep agricultural land. If we are doing it because it is good agricultural land, let's say so. If we are doing it because people just like a natural break and people like open spaces, then be honest about that also.

And just one more thing, in closing. Quite rightly, what we are saying with regard to one of the other maps in the former Kenilworth Vinery is ... because the public's understanding is what are now greenhouses is agricultural land once you take the greenhouses off. And we have to be careful if we are challenging that, because other people would say, 'Well, actually, you yourselves were offered a vinery site for agricultural land and you were saying it was not of a good enough quality to be agricultural land'. So if that is the direction that this States' Assembly has taken, then do blame other developers coming forward, saying, 'Hold on, yes, it is an old vinery site but is it of good agricultural value? No it is not, so let's push the margins a bit more and get it developed'.

So we need to guard against that as well.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

It is amazing the number of Members who did not stand when I asked for an indication who have now stood. (*Interjection*)

Deputy Dorey: I apologise, sir, I was not quite sure if I was going to speak.

I will just pick up on the point made about agricultural priority areas, because I think that they do not actually deliver what they say – 'it is not what it says on the tin'.

If I go back to the Strategic Land Use Plan, it said:

... large areas of contiguous agricultural land and other areas well related to established agricultural operations identified as being of value to the industry to be protected for agricultural use.

That is on the Strategic Land Use Plan. And I read now from the IDP and it says, in relation to agricultural priority areas:

These areas should not be regarded as being protected exclusively for agricultural use and development but as areas where regard should be given to the impact of any proposed development on agriculture when considering proposals for other forms of development.

That is quite different.

So I will support all parts of this amendment, but I would just say that it is important people know that they are not really delivering what was in the Strategic Land Use Plan and really the DPA needs to go further if we are really going to protect agriculture.

And I add that I have a son who has been trained in agriculture and has worked in agriculture for a number of years over here, and he is currently off Island but he intends to return to work in agriculture over here.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: I turn to the President of the Development and Planning Authority, Deputy Gollop, to reply on the debate.

Deputy Gollop: Sir, I can but agree with what Deputy Dorey has just said about the need to conserve farming, and agree in part with what Deputy Brehaut has said about the fact that actually, as Deputy Paint observed, some of these fields have a purpose far beyond their pure agricultural use for food – the sustainability point that Deputy Dudley-Owen made – because they are important elements of biodiversity protecting bird life and other areas as we heard at the Environmental Conference recently.

1825 I quite like the horses and the ponies, the 'horsiculture', although of course some of that is illicit change of use that we have to be aware of. And maybe we should not have had a digital greenhouse, but a digital farmstead, instead. But I do remember Commerce & Employment wanted a tourist farm park.

1830 I think that the specific points here are: I can assure Deputy de Lisle that the Plan continues to support agricultural uses that fall outside of the agricultural priority areas. Those areas are not earmarked for development, they will remain as their current use. It is just that the agricultural priority areas as I understand it, give an extra lock and an extra sense of its importance and a strategic sense of where we want to go as an Island.

1835 Deputy Roffey is quite right when he refers to the Airport development. But there is a gateway, and the gateway is implicit within this process, of the planning policies allowing on occasion for essential strategic development, completely necessary for the Island. But Deputy Tindall has made the point too that, by creating an agricultural priority area, you do give an assumption that that is its predominant use, and that it would be leased or bought by the farming community for years to come; and I believe it would act as an extra impediment to the strategic issue of a possible airport runway extension or, as Deputy Parkinson observed, the essential safety extensions. We do run quite close to the main road, and I know Deputy de Lisle wants to conserve the integrity of the main road linking St Pierre du Bois with the Forest, but in reality it is extremely close to a functioning airport in much of that area. I think if the States unwisely voted with the Route de Farras amendment in the Forest it would act as an additional barrier to any strategic debate on the runway, and would strengthen the see-saw as to whether the States as a whole would feel obliged to reopen a public inquiry.

1840 The policies in the Plan specifically allow Airport-related development in a positive way adjacent to the Airport. Not so much essential strategic development as other Airport development and we have already heard about hangars and maybe boundary issues and that kind of thing. The APA policy in place puts an additional test on such development, as I have said, a stronger presumption against it. And as such, development proposals that have a standard approval to demonstrate the land is not required for commercial agriculture. Ironically enough, that might mean the States divided within itself, and I appreciate Economic Development no longer looks directly after the countryside but they still have a vested interest in Guernsey industries. We will not stop the principles of such Airport-related development that places additional burdens on it and reduces flexibility.

1855 The States' Dairy Review, which is an officer-led professional process, has given us the figures for what is required for agriculture now and in the foreseeable future. The arguments that Deputy Dudley-Owen, Deputy de Lisle and others might raise about increased sustainability – and even senior politicians' liking for little piglets and so on – has perhaps gone further than where a more official base has come from.

1860 The 15,000 vergées of the agricultural priority area gives a more sizeable buffer than that shown to be required in the Dairy Review because, to a degree, farming is a supported industry now. But whether it could stand alone without States' support and subsidy, and a state-owned dairy, I am not sure. But that is not the point. The point is that we have gone further than where I think Commerce & Employment and the Dairy would have gone. The SLUP requires a balance between agricultural and other uses and we simply cannot give all land over to agriculture.

1865 Now, turning to the specific sites, I will make some brief comments on two or three of them. I am neutral, personally, on a lot of these sites. We have a process, as Deputy Tindall has outlined, a methodology based upon economic size. I do think it is a matter for this States, particularly in this instance Environment & Infrastructure, to look again at whether we can support the farmers more and have more meaningful pockets of land and land tenancy and land ownership for the future, to sustain a future there. But that slightly goes beyond it.

1870 I am, personally, relaxed about Torteval; opposed with the Farras, Forest; the Fontenelle, Forest, I am not so sure about; and the St Sampson's ones and Forest Road.

And I will make special mention now of two sites: Les Blanches; St Martin's is a curious one to say the least given the history of it, and although today in both the Billet and in the speeches we have opposed Les Blanches, but the reasons Deputy Brehaut outlines – access, size and other quantum – frankly, if my Committee Members wanted to vote to ensure that there was not development on it I do not think it up to me to oppose that particular site, because we appear to want it to be an agricultural site.

I do strongly oppose, though, as we all do, part of the amendment that Deputy Stephens in particular supports. We should not be taking out valuable pieces of land, and the fact that part of the land has been underlined for development does not take away the strategic importance of realising that ex-greenhouse land is horticultural green land. And there are ecological aspects to this land as well.

But I have a more practical reason for not wanting us randomly to take off pieces of land. It is one thing adding a few more on that just miss the size test, but to take one off that has made the grade is unfortunate and not particularly green. In a way I wish we had broken for lunch earlier, for two reasons. Firstly, I would have made a luncheon appointment (*Laughter*) and, secondly, it would have given Members the opportunity to have gone into the Members' Room and look at the map again. I was horrified when I saw the map, I have to be honest and I speak off-piste sometimes, because the agricultural priority areas are there for good methodological reasons, which are processes, and it has been sensibly and logically done. But there is virtually nothing in the north-east of the Island, the Vale. The Vale is mostly part of the rural area and the Plan is slightly mistaken when it lumps St Sampson's/Vale together, it is more the Bridge social centre than the Vale. But the Vale has lost its agriculture for all sorts of reasons: ribbon development, the quarrying history, the horticultural history. This is a good area to include in the Vale. And I do not want it taken out.

Deputy Lowe wants me to give way.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you for giving way. I just wanted to remind Deputy Gollop it is because it is all developed on. (*Laughter*)

Deputy Gollop: Still nominally, at least, part of the rural area, and I think we should keep what is there as rural and therefore I certainly do not want to support in any shape or form the Roffey/de Sausmarez amendment in relation to the Vale site. I think we should follow Deputy Lowe's example and be wary of too much development in the Vale.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey, the proposer of amendment 1, to reply to the debate.

Deputy Roffey: Sir, am I replying to all of the debate on all of the amendment, rather than –

The Deputy Bailiff: All of the amendment, yes.

Deputy Roffey: Okay, that is fine.

Deputy Tindall was first off and she basically had one overriding reason for opposing my amendment as it did not fit in with the methodology that had been applied. She is absolutely right, it does not, the methodology was wrong. (*Laughter*) How could any methodology that could be right show up Kenilworth Vinery as one of the most important bits of agriculture in Guernsey and yet leave out huge swathes of really important interconnected fields of grade A agricultural land?

Maybe the logical and sincere thing to do, instead of doing site-specific amendments would have been to try and get a new methodology applied. What would that have meant? The whole process grinding to a halt, where they went back out and then to another planning inquiry, and all of the good things in this Plan being delayed. So I think they should be grateful that I have done it

site-by-site to try and repair some of the damage their faulty methodology has thrown up rather than actually doing it in the process-driven way which would have caused an awful lot of delay.

1930 I agree, absolutely, with Deputy Stephens. And I think Deputy Ferbrache was the first one to raise the Route de Farras issue, followed by Deputy Parkinson. Deputy Parkinson is absolutely right, and the reason that his Committee has been relatively laid back about it is that a strategically required development does trump the requirements of the APA, absolutely. And I have to say, if I did not think it did I would be voting against my own amendment, or this section of it, because we have only got one Airport and it needs to be kept operating. I like to go off the
1935 Island occasionally and I would not dream of doing anything that would stymie that.

Deputy Parkinson went on to say, though, that he would vote against it anyway because he did not think this was a particularly rational block of fields, and it could not be that useful to agriculture. Well, I know I used to be President of Agriculture & Countryside, but I can let
1940 Members into a secret: I did not actually go out and just try and draft all of these myself by driving around on my scooter and thinking, that would be a good block of land or that would not – because a little knowledge is a dangerous thing. And that is all I have got, a little knowledge.

So I actually got together first with Dr Casebow, the Agricultural Adviser, and Mr Nash, whatever his title is, basically the agriculture supremo, then I got together with the Guernsey
1945 Farmers' Association and I thrashed through with them really what were the most important sites for agriculture in the Island. Now, I ask Members: you judge! Deputy Parkinson does not think this is a particularly important area for agriculture, but the Guernsey Farmers' Association are absolutely sure that it is and that it is ergonomic, and it is very important to the industry. One is right and one is wrong, and I will not try and tell you which one; you have to make your own mind up!

1950 Deputy Paint's wetlands: actually the land next to the Vale Pond, which is occasionally used for steers or whatever, although I actually think that Deputy Stephens is right, there really was a case to remove the whole area from the APA because it simply is such low quality agricultural land. That bit is not being removed, so I do not see a lot of migratory birds swooping down on Kenilworth at the moment, but on the other side of the road then, yes, near the Vale Pond there
1955 are, so I think he can be assured on that front.

Deputy Brehaut, Les Blanchés: I think he is getting exercised over something which is almost irrelevant, because whether or not my amendment is passed there will be no planning window under the new Plan for development on the field that has recently had applications for it because policy RH2 disappears on the other new plan – that is the one that allows development near rural
1960 centres. So I guess there may be appeals against the current refusals which were done under this Plan, but nothing in my amendment will actually make a blind bit of difference to the site going forward. He is utterly wrong, it is really useful for farming; and the farmer concerned, I think, would very much like to carry on using this part of this block of fields as well, if he were permitted, but it is almost an irrelevant argument and lunch looms so there is no point in me carrying it too
1965 far.

He is absolutely right that we must not get away from the fact that greenhouses are temporary structures over agricultural land, and there are many, many greenhouse sites in this Island that, if they were cleared, I would be the first to say absolutely must we refer them to agriculture? But Deputy Stephens is right, the land under this particular glasshouse, like the one across the road is
1970 of particularly poor quality. It is of the lowest quality. And that is not to say that you cannot insist it goes back to agriculture, but what you cannot say is that it is an APA. An APA, read the definition in the document, is *the* most important agriculture land in Guernsey; and this is grade C agricultural land, very low quality.

I agree with Deputy Dorey, I do not think the level of protection under APA is quite as high as I would like, but he could have brought an amendment if he had wanted to.
1975

Deputy Gollop and biodiversity: I do not think we should actually think that farming in Guernsey is quite the green wilderness that it once was. What we did do, when we had a dedicated Agriculture & Countryside Board that really fretted about these things, was to bring in

1980 farm management plans and to access the support from the States to access the extra money towards the milk that comes from the taxpayer. They had to draw up plans that show borders left on farms around the outside, or some other compensating factor to help with biodiversity. So I do not think it is a choice between farming and biodiversity.

1985 Deputy Gollop goes back to this myth about there being lots and lots of land. That may have been what was thrown up by a staff-led initiative. I know of farmers who are having to stop growing forage crops for their herds and having to import more feed, who are having to stop growing wheat that they started going into as an arable diversification, because they cannot find the land and are no longer able to keep some of the land that they have had on short-term leases. It is really difficult out there; not to find any old field, but to find fields in workable blocks, as Deputy Ferbrache said.

1990 Can I just say this is not, Deputy Gollop, a north-south divide. If it were I would be the first passionately trying to keep this site as an APA, the one down at Route Militaire. You can take the boy out of the Vale, but you cannot take the Vale out of the boy. I care very strongly about loss of farmland in the north. Indeed, I helped my mother write a letter objecting to the Guernsey Housing Association taking over a small agricultural field for a fresh development recently. It is simply, whether you are north, south, west or east, APAs have to be judged on how good they are. 1995 And I would point out that two of them that I am trying to insert are in St Sampson's or St Sampson's/The Vale. So it really is not a north-south thing here.

2000 So I get the impression that people are happy with 90% of it. There is perhaps a question mark over the Farras. I do not think there should be. It is *absolutely clear* that if there is a strategic requirement to break into that land it will trump the use of the APA. But it is important farmland and therefore it should be protected from willy-nilly development for other things. Farming should be the second priority on that land after the Airport requirement. The Airport comes first if they should need it, then comes farming. But by making it an APA you would make sure farming at least is there in second place.

2005 So I hope people will pass all parts of this amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States, we move to the vote on amendment 1 proposed by Deputy Roffey and seconded by Deputy de Sausmarez.

Are there any requests first to take separate votes on the paragraphs in Proposition 1?

2010 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Please could we take separately 1(d), sir?

Deputy de Lisle: Paragraph 1(b), sir.

2015 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Right, what I propose we do is I will put to the vote paragraph 1(b) which is Map 2 the Route De Farras to be added.

Those in favour; those against?

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.

I think we might have to have a recorded vote on that one, but we will come back to that if we may?

2020 Paragraph (d) which is Les Blanchés, St Martin.

Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Please could we have a recorded vote on that one, sir.

2025 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Okay, well we will have the recorded vote on 1(b) first, then.

So 1(b) we are dealing with first, taking separately there will be a recorded vote because I thought it was quite close.

There was a recorded vote.

Amendment 1, Proposition 1(b).

Carried – Pour 20, Contre 12, Ne vote pas 3, Absent 4

POUR

Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Yerby
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Prow
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Stephens

CONTRE

Deputy Lowe
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Meerveld

NE VOTE PAS

Alderney Rep. Jean
Alderney Rep. McKinley
Deputy Le Clerc

ABSENT

Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy St Pier

2030 **The Deputy Bailiff:** According to my reckoning, Members of the States, that part of the Proposition 1 was carried.

The voting on Proposition 1(b) of amendment 1 was Pour 20, Contre 12, 3 abstentions; therefore that part of the Proposition is duly carried.

2035 We will now move to a recorded vote on Paragraph 1, Proposition 1(d) which is to include Les Blanches at St Martin.

There was a recorded vote.

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, that paragraph of Proposition 1(d) was, in my view, clearly carried.

The remaining paragraphs of Proposition 1, so that is (a), (c), (e), (f) and (g), I will put to you collectively. Those in favour; those against?

Members voted Pour.

2040 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I declare that duly carried.
Proposition 2, I put to you. Those in favour –

Deputy Lester Queripel: Can we have a recorded vote on that please, sir?

2045 **The Deputy Bailiff:** There will be a recorded vote at the request of Deputy Lester Queripel.

There was a recorded vote.

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States, what I propose to do is to announce the formal voting on those two recorded votes after the luncheon adjournment, but it is quite clear that the entirety of Amendment 1 has been carried. (**A Member:** Yes.)

2050 Members should have received, during the course of the last half an hour or so, an Amendment 31. I am proposing to take that amendment immediately after lunch, (**A Member:** Yes, please.) because it is a further amendment to the written statement of the Development Plan, before moving to Amendment 15 thereafter, in accordance with the running order.

We will now adjourn till 2.30.

*The Assembly adjourned at 1.08 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

**The Island Development Plan –
Development & Planning Authority Recommendations –
Debate continued and adjourned**

Amendment 1, Proposition 1(d).

Carried – Pour 26, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 5, Absent 4

POUR

Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Alderney Rep. Jean
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld

CONTRE

Deputy Lowe
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Merrett

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Yerby
Alderney Rep. McKinley
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc

ABSENT

Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy St Pier

Amendment 1, Propositions 1 (a), (c), (e), (f), (g).

Carried – Pour 29, Contre 5, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 4

POUR

Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Yerby
Deputy de Lisle

CONTRE

Deputy Lowe
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Gollop

NE VOTE PAS

Alderney Rep. McKinley

ABSENT

Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy St Pier

Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Alderney Rep. Jean
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld

2055 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, the two recorded votes that were taken just before lunchtime and not announced are as follows: in respect of Proposition 1(d) of Amendment 1 there voted Pour 26, Contre 4, and 5 abstentions.

And in respect of Proposition 2 of Amendment 1 there voted Pour 29, Contre 5, 1 abstention and, as I said before, the mixture of recorded votes and *aux voix* led to the whole of Amendment 1 being carried.

2060 Deputy Laurie Queripel, if you wish to move a motion under article 7(1) of the Reform (Guernsey) Law 1948 ...?

Deputy Laurie Queripel: I do, sir, thank you.

2065 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Before being able to place Amendment 31, so Members need amendment number 31 in front of them. That is seconded by Deputy Ferbrache, is it?

Deputy Ferbrache: It is, sir.

2070 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, you are getting familiar with this process now. Nothing more needs to be said. The motion is to suspend Rule 24(2) of the Rules of Procedure to the extent necessary to permit this Amendment 31 to be debated.

Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

2075 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I declare that motion carried and therefore invite Deputy Laurie Queripel to place amendment numbered 31.

Amendment 31.

To amend the wording of Proposition 1 as amended by Amendment P. 2016/25 Amendment 30 as follows:

1. (a) by deleting the inserted wording –

‘iiiA. the proposal includes the clearance of all redundant glasshouses from the site but for these purposes “redundant glasshouses” does not include any ancillary structures;’, and

(b) substituting the following wording –

“iiiA. the proposal includes the demolition and removal from the site of all glasshouses and ancillary structures which are not capable of being used for a use in accordance with the relevant policies of the Island Development Plan;”

2. (a) by deleting the inserted wording –

"if all the redundant glasshouses (but for these purposes not any ancillary structures) are cleared from the site", and

(b) substituting the following wording –

"if all glasshouses and ancillary structures which are not capable of being used for a use in accordance with the relevant policies of the Island Development Plan are demolished and removed from the site".'

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

Could I ask the Deputy Greffier to read the wording of the amendment, thank you.

The Deputy Greffier read out the amendment.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir. And I thank the Deputy Greffier for reading that amendment.

Sir, this amendment is being brought as a result of the successful Deputy Dorey/Deputy Green amendment from yesterday. Yesterday I voted eventually for the new amendment that Deputy Dorey and Deputy Green brought, because Deputy Dorey is a very trustworthy chap! (*Laughter*) And when he said it was an improvement on what had gone before, I tended to believe that, but I have taken some advice from the planners since then, sir, and actually it is not really an improvement and actually it does not do what I wanted it to do. In fact the existing policy proposals that came via the Island Development Plan were closer to achieving what I wanted to achieve than the amendment turned out to be, so this is why the amendment is being brought. So it did not tick all the boxes I wanted it to tick.

The point of bringing this amendment is that I still do not understand why perfectly sound structures in the form of glasshouse frames, particularly if they are metal-framed glasshouses, have to be pulled down where they could be utilised for further use. It is a way of thinking that fits in perfectly with the Guernsey way, the Guernsey characteristic; and I referred to that approach in my manifestoes of 2016 prior to this term beginning, and in 2012. And I would just like to read a few lines from my 2012 manifesto to illustrate that point. I said this, sir:

Currently many vergées of land in the form of vineries lie dormant and serviceable structures remain empty and unused. Insufficient headway has been made regarding the provision of premises for light industry, small businesses and 'Fred in the shed' type operations. Consequently, once thriving businesses that provided employment and valuable services to the community have ceased to trade. I am not necessarily advocating concreting over these spaces and creating industrial parks but rather utilising and, where required, upgrading the existing facilities for storage and workshop use. Guernsey people are, by nature, resourceful. Historically all of our main industries utilised local resources – so that is quarrying, fishing, agriculture, horticulture etc. And as a result the Island's ability to be self-determining was far greater. A more balanced and rational approach to land use is required. Local businesses and employers need genuine support. This in turn would help to widen the skills base, add diversity and resilience to the economy and lead to greater sustainability.

I would certainly vote for the person who wrote those words, sir!

One of the key words there is 'rational', but another word I use a lot is 'proportionate' because they both apply here. I probably use the word 'proportionate' a little too much, and some of my colleagues might testify to that, especially the ones that were States' Members in the last term. But that is because I like to remind myself and others, when I can get them to listen, that we are a little Guernsey, we are a small Island, and sometimes we are in danger of over-egging the pudding or reaching for the grandiose, whereas often simpler, less fussy, less costly ideas and actions can be sufficient.

I think we need to rediscover that spirit of our forebears that served this Island so well. At this point, sir, I am not tempted to go into much depth, as sometimes Deputy Ferbrache does, about the old days but I will say that my grandmother had a tin bath and an outside toilet! (*Laughter*)

And, despite the outside toilet having no lights in it, it still seemed to me that I could see the spiders so I very quickly got out of it! (*Laughter*)

2110 My point is, why go to so much trouble and cost of clearing a site when perhaps with just a little bit of work, a structure could be used as is. The fact is we know that some vinery sites, there are structures that have been used for years to services, businesses. We would be naive to think that over these years just because they have not been allowed to be used for industrial use that they have not been used; they have. I have seen them in use. These sites have been used for years and the sheds have been used and so have the greenhouses.

2115 A good example of that would be ... and I am never very keen to name particular businesses but it seems during this debate we have named and identified a number of businesses. But there is a business by the name of *Bean 14* that I think a year or two ago were using a greenhouse just to store their materials, and I think they were told they were not allowed to do it and they had to stop. Now I do not know how that ended up, I think it might have been resolved and I think in the
2120 end they were allowed to carry on using the greenhouse. But that is a ridiculous situation when you have a perfectly good structure that could be utilised and used in a very light footprint way, that would not cause any problem to anybody else, and yet it was not allowed to be used. As I say, that might have been resolved and it might be used now, but that is the kind of thing that I am thinking of, that we could allow those kinds of businesses to use these kinds of structures for
2125 that kind of thing.

Also, I had a case with a parishioner during the last term of the States, who owned a small vinery site and the family home was on the edge of the vinery site, but this parishioner kept the vinery site in impeccable condition. It only had two greenhouses on it but they were kept beautifully, they were maintained, all the land around it, the grass etc. was kept superbly, and this
2130 parishioner had a small business and he did not even want to actually use the greenhouse, this is just an example of how these things work at the moment. He did not even want to use the greenhouse, he had a small business and he wanted to store his truck on the land and a digger that he used in his business and he was not allowed to do it. And now what he has done, because he was so disappointed about that, is he has let that vinery go to waste basically and the
2135 structures are not being maintained, the surrounding area is not being looked after and simply because he could not keep a couple of pieces of equipment on that land to service his business.

Those are the kind of situations we really need to address, aside from the points I am making here, sir, because that would be a very easy way for the States to facilitate and support small businesses and what those kind of businesses need are support and our help. Those are the kind
2140 of anomalies, really, that we need to address. And this Island Development Plan, thankfully, will go some way to doing that.

I think Deputy Dorey made a fair point yesterday when I raised this issue of being able to use all the serviceable structures on the vinery site. He said really as far as he is concerned the idea of this was really to create an open compound industrial facility, but perhaps just have access to any
2145 ancillary buildings that are useable or serviceable. And it is a fair point, and perhaps with some of the larger vineries he has got a point. It might be that there are three or four greenhouse frames on a vinery site that perhaps would be serviceable and could be used so there might be a danger there of creating, almost by accident, an industrial park.

But I think actually – and I got some reassurance from the planners this morning – that kind of thing could be dealt with or could be catered for, or there could be some sort of provision that would perhaps limit the amount of use of these structures. Perhaps Deputy Gollop can address that point afterwards. But it is a very unlikely event and most vinery sites, especially in the areas
2150 outside the main centres, are smallish sites. Most of them have wooden greenhouses on them, so I think it is a very rare case that you find a vinery site under those circumstances that have a lot of serviceable structures on it.
2155

The point I am making here is that this is something that harks back to a very laudable Guernsey spirit of making the best use of what we have. In other words, an existing resource, in a low cost, practical, proportionate way in order to bring many vergées of land back into use; in a

2160 way that should be beneficial economically and, if done in the right way, perhaps environmentally and at the same time provide help and support to the small businesses that we all have professed in our manifestos and in the last term as well, we all profess that we want to help and support.

So I ask Members to support this amendment.

Thank you, sir, and I thank Deputy Ferbrache for being the seconder.

2165 **Deputy Ferbrache:** I formally second it, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Tindall.

2170 **Deputy Tindall:** Thank you, sir.

I confirm this proposal will not require a deferral and the DPA supports this amendment as we consider it clarifies the issues raised by Amendment 30.

Thank you.

2175 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, sir.

Deputy Queripel said in his speech about some of these sites that are smallish sites. Well, I have got the list of sites that were identified and one of them is four hectares which is –

2180 **A Member:** A lot of vergées!

Deputy Dorey: Yes, it is a lot of vergées – (*Laughter and Interjections*) 24 vergées.

2185 So I really think that saying these are small sites is not accurate. There are sites, (**A Member:** Some) which are very large sites, that this would apply to.

I would welcome, when they sum up, to explain to me the point about:

... in accordance with the relevant policies of the Island Development Plan.

I have just tried to look through the Plan and I cannot see any policies about the conversion of glasshouses. There are policies about the conversion of ancillary buildings with the Plan but I cannot find ... and in fact OC7 makes it very clear by saying:

The Planning Law considers horticultural premises, including redundant glasshouse sites, and any ancillary structures to be agricultural land so, on clearance of the structures, the land is expected to revert to other non-horticultural types of agricultural use. Therefore there is a presumption that when an horticultural use ceases the site will be cleared of glasshouses and ancillary structures and returned to agricultural use.

2190 Sir, I would like some clarity about what are 'the relevant policies in the Island Development Plan' about converting glasshouses because I cannot find any. There is now a policy about converting ancillary buildings, but not glasshouses. So I would ask for that clarification.

Thank you.

2195 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Thank you, sir.

Paragraph 17.5.6 of the Draft Island Development Plan says this, on page 125:

Proposals to use redundant glasshouse sites for other purposes will be subject to an assessment of possible alternative uses of the site.

So that seems to me, in my view, in my opinion, to open the gateway in appropriate circumstances. Otherwise that sentence would make no sense at all.

2200 And what we are told in relation to the Plan, one of the introductory remarks in connection with the Plan is to read all of it. Every single sentence has to be read. The preambles, as I used to call them until I was corrected many times by judges and others in relation to calling them preambles, have just as much bearing as the actual policy that comes at the end of several paragraphs.

2205 So bear in mind that sentence, if you would please, colleagues, if I can ask you to ensure that they do so.

Then over a couple of pages, page 127 of paragraph 17.5.14 says:

It is important to note that land planning alone cannot provide a comprehensive solution to the clearance of redundant glasshouses and ancillary structures, which can only fully be achieved through joint working across the departments of the States and action by landowners.

2210 Now, we all know there are a heck of a lot of derelict glasshouses that we all want to see cleared; they are a blight on our community. There have actually been a lot cleared in the last 20 to 30 years. There is a lot more open space than there used to be when Guernsey had whatever percentage of its landmass covered by glasshouses. Sadly, that industry has died and sadly that is an industry almost exclusively of yesterday, so therefore we have got to use that land today.

2215 I very much support the amendment brought by Deputy Laurie Queripel because it clarifies matters. What Deputy Queripel is seeking to achieve, and I fully support it, is something that makes sense. If we accept that in certain circumstances, and in accordance with the policies of the Plan, and I would be surprised, though I will wait to hear what Deputy Queripel says in due course, if he is going to take us in a two-hour learned dissertation through the whole of the Plan to satisfy Deputy Dorey's concern. That one sentence I read at the beginning of my remarks is good enough for now, frankly.

2220 This is not going to create any kind of precedent causing the opening of the floodgates. My goodness me, I have heard planners say that so many times over the last 30 years. It never really does, but it is always going to 'open the floodgates' and I expected to be like Noah and get on my ark and float off somewhere, because the floodgates were always going to be opened and the Island was going to be submerged; but it never happened.

2225 Here we have got a practical solution because in many instances, even in the relatively limited circumstances whereby it would be possible to use a redundant glasshouse site for other purposes, there will be the old wooden glass that has got to go, the old packing shed that is rotten that has got to go, the old boiler shed that has got to go, but there is some good metallic glass that has got another 30 years in it. Now, if you can put a paint sprayer's business or a carpenter or a storage facility of some kind in that business, that is good for Guernsey.

2230 It has got to meet all the other policies of the Plan, it cannot be unneighbourly or unfriendly, it cannot do this, it cannot do that; and of course it is not going to give the person who owns the land any great fortune, whether they continue to own the land and then rent it out for another purpose, they will probably get more rent than they get at the moment because they get nothing.

2235 But they will not get fortunes under this particular policy, if it is achievable, and if they sell the land they still sell it subject to a very limited improvement.

2240 They are not going to go from, whatever it was, £90,000, I do not know, was it a hectare, vergée, acre, semi-acre or whatever it might have been the other day, to £2 million. The aggrandizement and the increase in the value of their land will be marginal. So it is very sensible and what it means is you do not have this ridiculous thing that you might have had to do where you would have had to knock down the glasshouse, knock down the ancillary building and then build another ancillary building which was in exactly the same form as the previous one, at considerable expense, to achieve what is the aim of this amendment.

I give way to Deputy Dorey, sir.

2245 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: He said that you would have to knock down the ancillary buildings. As a result of the amendment yesterday you would not have to knock down the ancillary buildings.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Thank you very much, sir, whatever I said.

My understanding of Deputy Dorey's unamended amendment, originally, was that you may have had to knock down the ancillary structures, even if they were redundant. Now, it does not matter because we are dealing with this, and that is why we do not want to get into any argument and that is why this seeks clarification. This seeks to give positivity to the planners, to any potential landowner and to any particular person that needs to consider the relevant policies of the Plan. That is all it is seeking to do and I commend it to the Assembly.

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States, I am carrying forward all of the declarations of interest that were declared in relation to Amendment 30, because otherwise Deputy Ferbrache would not have been allowed to speak until he did it! (*Laughter*) But we are working on that basis.

Does anyone else wish to speak in debate?

Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

My concern with this is that the cost of removing these greenhouses, I am led to believe – and I am happy to be corrected – is approximately £10,000 per vergée. If we want people to use this land – *use it* – then how are they going to afford to clear these greenhouses without having some income?

Some of these greenhouses, I believe, have been in families for generations. I would like them to use the land; I think that is the purpose of this amendment. What I do not want them to have to do to get the uplift is have to sell their land. I want them to use it in the most practical purpose, and to be able to clear it in due course as and when they are able to.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

I think the purpose of the whole policy that Deputy Queripel is trying to amend is to clear ... and although the wording in the IDP is 'redundant' what we are really talking about is derelict glasshouses. Now, there may be glasshouses which are not remotely derelict but which are redundant. There is no purpose in requiring the landowner to take down those glasshouses before the site is then put to use, so long as it is being put to use in accordance with all the other planning policies, but it is a matter for the Development & Planning Authority to control that through their schemes of development application. But I do not think the word 'derelict' appears anywhere and I suggested to Deputy Queripel yesterday, if he was going to work an amendment like this that he might try and use the word 'derelict' because that is really what we are talking about.

Unamended, the position that we could be in is that derelict glasshouses which are not redundant – and it is possible to have derelict glasshouses which are not redundant – would not have to be cleared ... I will give way in just a moment. The derelict glasshouses which are not redundant would not have to be cleared, but redundant glasshouses which are in a perfectly good condition would have to be cleared. Now that must be illogical.

I will give way to Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Sir, as a surveyor it is very difficult to actually define what 'derelict' is.

2300 **Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, okay, I accept that, which is probably why the wording is not being used
in the Island Development Plan. Nonetheless, if I can paraphrase Deputy Ferbrache, we must not
deal too much in theory, we must deal in practice; and we do know what we are talking about
when we talk about derelict sites and it is those that this policy is trying to clear, and that is not
2305 achieved by including in that policy 'redundant glasshouses' which actually are in a perfectly good
condition.

I am not saying the amendment is perfect, but I will support it because I think it is an
improvement on where we got to yesterday.

Thank you, sir.

2310 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I invite the President of the Development & Planning Authority, Deputy
Gollop, to speak in reply on the amendment.

Deputy Gollop: Thanking you, sir.

2315 I agree entirely with what Deputy Oliver has said because I have sometimes in the past lived in
properties that some surveyors might have considered to be derelict, but I was still living there,
after a fashion. (*Laughter*) But anyway, moving on from there.

The point was made, I think, by Deputy Queripel and Deputy Dorey, particularly. He asked for
the evidence as to the Plan being specific on the use of redundant greenhouses. It is weird
because it seems to be the same debate we had yesterday. We are going to Policy OC7, the page
2320 numbers are not here, but in broad terms:

The Planning Law considers horticultural premises, including redundant glasshouse sites, and any ancillary structures
to be agricultural land so, on clearance of the structures, the land is expected to revert to other non-horticultural types
of agricultural use.

That is the presumption. But:

Proposals to develop redundant glasshouse sites will be supported ...

– that is the proactivity –

... where:

a. the site is not within or adjacent to an Agricultural Priority Area, unless it is demonstrated to the Environment
Department's satisfaction ...

–or the DPA's –

... that the site cannot positively contribute to the commercial agricultural use ...

b. the site would not contribute positively to a wider area of open land; and,

– the crucial one –

c. the proposal is for small scale,

2325 – emphasis on the *small*,

... industrial ...

– whatever that means, because that covers a fairly wide area –

... storage and distribution use and is in accordance with the requirements of Policy OC3: Office, Industry, Storage and
Distribution Outside of the Centres; or,

d. the proposal is for the change of use of glasshouse land so that it may be incorporated into the curtilage of a
building ...

Also, and the green people might like this:

... infrastructure for the harnessing of renewable energy.

Now, without going too much into that, it is clear that there is a proposal, a gateway, in this current new Plan for small-scale industrial storage and distribution use.

2330 Deputy Laurie Queripel, who probably knows more than anybody else in this Chamber about the needs of – well, we will call them ‘Fred’s in the shed’ – but the light industrial and distribution sector, although I know Economic Development are rapidly catching up on that front. And he has made the case that not everybody might fit into these structures. That is obvious for size reasons, logistical reasons, use of vehicles, bad neighbour principles, and all kinds of other reasons that the industries would have to consider – and possibly Economic Development, up to a point in an advisory role only – and us in a statutory role, clearly, in identifying the new use as appropriate.

2335 But the redundant glasshouse policy does require various criteria to be met when changing use – that is the point – such as impacts on neighbours and the local road network, for example. We know that oversized vehicles generally, unless they get a permit from Environment and Infrastructure cannot go on most of the Island’s roads. In some cases they might never get permits to use certain tracks and lanes so obviously that will be a restricting factor, a limitation. And, as we have said, the glasshouses can or could be used for a range of uses.

2340 Now, as have you heard from Deputy Tindall we broadly support this policy. I kind of agree with Deputy Merrett that there is a danger of sites not becoming available because of the cost implications, but I think the work we jointly have done on this amendment, over two or three iterations now, has made it more robust and easier to mix the balance of people who want a cleaner environment and people who want a more competitive environment.

So I think we can all support Deputy Laurie Queripel’s amendment.

2350 **The Deputy Bailiff:** And finally, Deputy Laurie Queripel, the proposer of amendment number 31.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir. I will be as brief as I can.

2355 I thank Deputy Ferbrache for his support and very wise and practical words, and his clarity in regard to the fact that he brought some clarity in regard to the policy. I appreciate that, and the point that he made once again that this is the idea of making use of an existing resource in a low-cost way, sir. A practical solution to a long-term problem and it would be a waste to lose some of these buildings when they are perfectly serviceable.

Deputy Merrett made very similar points and I thank her for that too.

2360 Deputy Fallaize, once again, he made some very good points and he brought further clarity regarding the policy, and he did give me some helpful advice yesterday when I was considering this amendment, and I thank him for that.

2365 Deputy Gollop, once again, not only brought some clarity in regard to the policy but also in regard to the criteria, the gateway, for the use of these places. I thank those speakers for their words and their support, sir.

I think Deputy Ferbrache answered most of the queries raised by Deputy Dorey, sir. So I ask Members to support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

2370 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, we go to the vote on Amendment 31, proposed by Deputy Laurie Queripel, seconded by Deputy Ferbrache.
Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, I would like a recorded vote, please.

2375 **The Deputy Bailiff:** We will have a recorded vote.
Deputy Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

The Deputy Bailiff: I think that was just carried, Members of the States. (Laughter)

2380

We will move swiftly on while the voting is taking place, to Amendment 15 and I invite the proposer of the amendment, Deputy Brouard, to place it.

Amendment 15.

To insert at the end of the words in Proposition 1: ' ; but to direct the Development & Planning Authority amending Section 6 General Parking standards of the Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance: Parking Standards and Traffic Impact Assessment, in the following manner:

Type of Development	Standard Required (maximum provision for car parking spaces)	
HOUSING	Main Centres	Main Centre Outer Areas
Less than 3 habitable rooms	Assessed on merits	± 2 spaces per dwelling
3 to 4 habitable rooms	± 2 spaces per dwelling	± 2 spaces allocated to the dwelling
5 to 6 habitable rooms	± 2 spaces allocated to the dwelling plus 1 space per dwelling in the form of adjacent communal parking, or all 3 spaces provided on site	± 2 spaces per dwelling allocated to the dwelling plus 1 space per dwelling in the form of adjacent communal parking, or all 3 spaces provided on site
Above 6 habitable rooms	2 spaces per dwelling allocated to the dwelling plus 1 space per dwelling in the form of adjacent communal parking or all 3 spaces provided on site	3 spaces per dwelling

Type of Development	Standard Required (maximum provision for car parking spaces)	
OFFICES		
Professional services	Assessed on merits	1 space per 70 sq.m 1 space per 40 sq.m
Other offices	1 space per 100 sq.m 1 space per 50 sq.m	1 space per 100 sq.m 1 space per 50 sq.m

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

2385

Amendment 15 in your pack is one of the unaltered ones and it is probably going a little bit yellow now, it has been there for quite a bit of time. The basic thrust of the amendment is that this amendment seeks to retain the new principle of maximum parking standards on new developments, but to increase the potential number of parking spaces associated with new residential and office development within main centres and the main centre outer areas.

2390

I am not going to go through all the arguments we had yesterday; they still apply, which we talked about with Deputy Kuttelwascher's amendment, but I believe if we are going to restrict developers by having now a maximum parking provision there needs to be a little bit more flexibility. Developers now will not have to provide car parking spaces, as they had to in the past, but it gives them the chance that where they have suitable sized properties they can do so up to this new maximum.

Just for a bit of clarity as well, habitable rooms, if people look at Amendment 15 the actual changes are shown in red; I do not know if that comes out for people as light grey, but we have tried to show the change of the existing standards by the red on the amendment itself. Habitable rooms count as basically bedrooms, living rooms and dining rooms. Non-habitable rooms are bathrooms, hallways, landings, utility rooms and kitchens.

I would like to thank Deputy Stephens for her support and I am just going to use one piece of paper which I have got which may help us this afternoon and may speed things up, I am just going to read it out now. People can borrow this after me if they want to:

'The Development & Planning Authority has no objections to this proposal, amendment 15, and all five Members will support the amendment.'

So I hope that helps.

We need to be realistic with these standards. This is the first time that we are literally having a flip from minimum to a maximum, and I think it is only right that maximum should just allow developers a little bit of flexibility where they want to provide car parking spaces, at their expense, on their property to accommodate cars.

I understand that Deputy Lester Queripel may or may not be proposing a guillotine on this because of the position we have now found ourselves in. I have no problem with that. Unfortunately, I will not be able to vote for it myself because I still have the scars from the last time it was used, and I would recommend to the States that we accept Amendment 15.

Thank you.

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

Deputy Stephens: I do, sir.

Amendment 31.

Carried – Pour 34, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 4

POUR

Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Yerby
Deputy De Lisle
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy De Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Alderney Rep. Jean
Alderney Rep. McKinley
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel

CONTRE

Deputy Dorey

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy St Pier

Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, the voting on Amendment 31, proposed by Deputy Laurie Queripel and seconded by Deputy Ferbrache, is: 34 votes Pour, 1 vote Contre and that is why the amendment was carried.

2420 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: May I ask, sir: this is not amending the document that it is in front of us, it is amending supplementary planning guidance, which is not in front of us today; does it therefore go beyond the Propositions in that regard, whichever Rule it is? I am sorry, I do not have the Rule to hand.

The Deputy Bailiff: You want to seek to invoke Rule 24(6) so that there be no debate on it.

Deputy Brehaut: Yes.

2430 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Mr Comptroller, what a timely arrival! *(Laughter)*

The Comptroller: Sir, very timely indeed. A most unexpected thing to walk into as well.

2435 **The Deputy Bailiff:** This is Amendment 15, dealing with maximum parking standards. Deputy Brehaut is seeking to invoke Rule 24(6) as to whether or not this amendment goes further than the original Propositions. Do you have any advice for me on that before I reach a decision?

The Comptroller: And the reason being, if I might ask, in that –?

2440 **The Deputy Bailiff:** The reason being that this is dealing with a document that is not currently before the States because it is in supplementary planning guidance.

The Comptroller: Which is referred to in the draft plan. I mean, the fact that there is supplementary planning guidance, I think, is referred to in the draft plan.

The Deputy Bailiff: It is.

2450 **The Comptroller:** And to that extent I would have thought that it is a matter that was within the Proposition.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you very much.

I am going to rule, Deputy Brehaut, that Rule 24(6) of the Rules of Procedure is not engaged and debate continues.

2455 Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, can I invoke Rule 26(1), please?

The Deputy Bailiff: Remind me what it says. *(Laughter)*

2460 This is a proposal from Deputy Lester Queripel that we move straight to closure of the debate on this matter. This is the so-called guillotine motion.

Can I invite any Member who would intend to speak in the debate to stand in their places?

In the light of that, Deputy Queripel, do you still wish to put the request pursuant to this paragraph of Rule 26 to the vote?

2465

Deputy Lester Queripel: It depends how long the speeches are going to be, sir. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Kuttelwascher: One minute, sir!

2470

The Deputy Bailiff: Nobody is entitled to speak at the moment, please.

Deputy Queripel, do you want to or not, because it will take more time to put it than the two people who have indicated they want to speak.

2475

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, yes, I would like to continue with the request, please.

The Deputy Bailiff: Okay, well the motion is that the debate on this particular amendment be closed, but there will be the wind-up in any event. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Contre.

The Deputy Bailiff: Debate continues.

Who wishes to speak?

2480

Deputy Kuttelwascher.

2485

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Sir, I just want to highlight one point and it relates to the failed amendment I had yesterday. I have checked as regards Charles Frossard House and the parking that is available there for those office premises. If one takes the next space it works out at 17.7 m² for one space.

2490

Sir, Frossard House is going to have more people in it and it is already crowded as regards parking; and although I will support this amendment I still think it is woefully inadequate in the provision of parking if we consider Frossard House as other offices. One space per 50 m will only provide one-third of what is at Frossard House, and I cannot see that that is of any value to any prospective office developers at all, because it is not something that will become commercially marketable. But that is life.

Thank you, sir.

2495

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

Following on from Deputy Kuttelwascher, I think this is an absolutely excellent opportunity to lead by example and put into place some fantastic educational initiatives, as suggested by Deputy Merrett, and really get a lot of productive, active travel initiatives off the ground.

2500

I toyed – Deputy Brouard might be amused to hear – with the idea of standing in support of this, and I do support it to a degree. I do support the degree of flexibility and acknowledge the fact that this is something new that we need to tread carefully with.

2505

I have absolutely no problem whatsoever – I say that. I think I have no problem with the residential limits, not because I necessarily agree with the limits themselves but because I think our residential parking limits have reached their natural limit anyway, because the maximums that were set were very much in line with the planning permissions that had come through in the last five years. So as far as I am aware there would have been hardly any, if any, planning permissions in the last five years that would have exceeded these maximum limits. So to my mind that tells us that our residential parking limits have reached their natural limit there.

2510 What worries me still is the commercial premises. And it is something that Deputy Kuttelwascher rightly raises because in our current form if everyone that currently drives to work continues to drive to work, we will continue to see the problems that we are beginning to see more and more. If we think back to the example of the proposed Admiral Park development yesterday, I would just like to remind Members that creating the parking is the easy bit; it is the road infrastructure, the road capacity and the junction capacity between those parking spaces which is a far more difficult challenge to address.

2515 So basically the way I see it is this, and we know a few things for sure: we know that increased parking increases car journeys and therefore will increase traffic volumes, and therefore we have two choices in the way I see it. We can either limit parking supply or we can increase the capacity on our roads and I would very much like to hear of anyone who has some clever suggestions on how we do that. I do not know – compulsory purchase? I certainly would not have the appetite for it. I think the most pragmatic option is to really work hard at delivering far better alternatives in order to make a fuller range of options much more viable for all those people working in offices. And I would also like to say that offices are actually the easier bit. If you have got a large development like Admiral Park, that is absolutely the kind of establishment we can be working with and really make some success with.

2520 So I speak as a Member of the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure. I am looking forward to the challenge. I am sure we can make a lot of headway. I am sure this is the beginning of a significant modal shift. But I would like to speak against the maximum limit proposed for the offices.

2530 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

2535 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, I was not going to speak but Deputy de Sausmarez calls me to speak. And it is really the point made by Deputy Kuttelwascher.

The recent Admiral Park development was – and I appreciate that was a professional service – one per 80 m², or whatever it was, and Deputy Brouard says one per 40 m². So it is a big improvement on the one per 70 m² and I am extremely grateful to Deputy Brouard for what I think is a very pragmatic amendment.

2540 But the other offices, and again I make the same point, one per 50 m². I did not realise until Deputy Kuttelwascher just said it that it is 1.17 point something m² at Sir Charles Frossard House. I invite the States, as employers, from a month's time to say to their employees at Frossard House, we are going to follow the guidelines, so in future instead of there being ... I don't know the number of spaces – 300 spaces, I am making that up, it might be 500. It is over 300 spaces, you have only got 100 spaces, folks, because we are going to follow the supplementary planning guidance. Let's give some leadership in relation to that, let's see what *chaos* that causes around Charroterie, an area well known to me! (*Laughter*) And that car park that Deputy Roffey was speaking about yesterday could be called the Ferbrache Car Park, because I am not the Duke of York and I am not the Kray twins, my area of Guernsey is Charroterie.

2550 But in relation to that, I invite now the States of Guernsey and the people who are allowing this to go through, as it should do, to in a month's time give notice that we are going to follow the supplementary planning guidance and therefore from a month's time there is only going to be 100 car parking spaces.

2555 **A Member:** Hear, hear.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

2560 **Deputy Oliver:** I have to say I agree with Deputy Kuttelwascher. I personally do not feel this amendment goes far enough. Generally speaking as a surveyor, when you build an office you

need roughly 1 to 20 per car parking spaces, so one car parking space every 23rd, which is a bit less than what is actually at Frossard House.

2565 Deputy de Sausmarez said that we have alternatives. Well, at the moment we do not really have alternatives to get to work and therefore we need to be realistic and we need a car parking space within office works.

Thank you, I give way.

2570 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, to be followed by Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: I do not want to take up too much time. I just want to say I think that is an excellent suggestion from Deputy Ferbrache and I hope that we do lead as an example (**Three Members:** Hear, hear.) in *all* aspects of policy in the States.

Thank you.

2575 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you.

2580 Look out for all the resignations coming from all the staff, because they will not be wanting to work where they are not able to park their cars. (**A Member:** Very true.)

You cannot just pick on Frossard House; if you are going to do the job properly do it properly. You do it at the Hospital, you do it at Lukis House, you do it at Burnt Lane, you do it on all States' premises where there are staff employed, you do not just pick on Frossard House – (*Interjection*) and schools, yes, thank you very much, the list goes on. So do not just cherry pick Frossard House.

2585 But added to that, of course, if you are going to do that and you are going to say, 'You cannot park at Lucas House. You cannot park at Frossard House. You cannot park at all the other places in town which are States' premises,' and then, listening here yesterday, there are some of you that also want to close the piers, which will not only affect Town and help to close Town down, but you are also wanting to actually put people off coming to work for the States. I say to all of you, err on the side of caution. Please be realistic. You want people to work here, you want people to be flexible with their working, to be able to go from A to B. The dreamland of being on a push bike or getting on a bus and not coming into work with a car and having that flexibility is just unbelievably not achievable, in my opinion.

2595 **Two Members:** Hear, hear.

The Deputy Bailiff: Can I just remind Members that what you are debating at the moment is an amendment to direct the Development & Planning Authority to amend the supplementary planning guidance. This is not the time or place to talk about proposals to change parking arrangements for buildings that are already there. This is about future building.

2600 Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

2605 I did declare an interest on Amendment 15 yesterday. Would you like me to repeat that declaration of interest, sir?

The Deputy Bailiff: If it is the same interest I think we have probably got it now! (*Laughter*)

2610 **Deputy Merrett:** Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: I turn to the President of the Development & Planning Authority, Deputy Gollop, to reply to the debate on this amendment.

Deputy Gollop: We started on a bit of a diversion with some Members about potential Civil Service sites. I would just say it might make more room for Deputies if we had that regime, but that is another matter.

The wider point, the broader point, has been about realism. This is regarded to be the more realistic option that we have all come to accept. I think the rationale for having stricter guidelines for the future buildings than exists currently in Sir Charles Frossard House, or other places we could think of, is precisely to encourage the dreams that Deputy Lowe does not dream and Deputy de Sausmarez does. I have been involved with vulnerable road users – Living Streets, formerly STEPS – the organisation that has been going for a number of years and that organisation has encouraged travel plans. I am not sure I like the phrase ‘travel plans’ because it sounds like going on holiday on a package tour or something, but it is a reality. We saw it as the DPA in the open planning meeting for Admiral Park the developers had made an effort with the architects to get one, I think from Ove Arup. We should be doing them across the States. Deputy Lowe actually has a point, we should lead by example, (**A Member:** We are!) as Deputy Hansmann Rouxel said and, certainly for new build, we should bear those in mind.

The point is that you can make the difference with travel planning. It only requires a small proportion of the population to modal shift to make an appreciable difference, not just for residential and office buildings, but for congestion. The issue was raised by junctions, of problems with the road network, and I would never agree with those who say Guernsey does not have a traffic problem because that may be true when all the roads are open but if you see two roads that are closed in a busier part of the Island that are parallel to each other, and it does happen, you suddenly see very lengthy tailbacks, despite our small population.

I think we do need to be responsible and I therefore support this amendment; although it is unusual for me to support a Deputy Brouard amendment on transport and traffic, but there you go.

The Deputy Bailiff: And I invite the proposer of the amendment, Deputy Brouard, to reply to the debate.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

I thank the support from Deputy Kuttelwascher on this amendment. I do appreciate that, certainly for offices, and I think this is the same point that Deputy Oliver made, that perhaps my amendment does not go far enough, but it is a start from where it is.

And I do take some comfort from paragraph 1.1.1 of the Parking Standards which I have here and it does say, and this is the very first, and the key part of it:

Although the standards will be expected to be met they are intended as guidance and are not, therefore, inflexible.

So hopefully that will come through.

Deputy de Sausmarez is in the enviable position on Environment & Infrastructure, if I understand rightly, because you have the mandate for traffic. All these things –

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Brouard, I do not need to remind you not to address another Member directly, please, sir.

Deputy Brouard: Through the Chair, sir.

Deputy de Sausmarez is in an ideal position on Environment & Infrastructure to bring forward parts of the traffic strategy that were not amended and some of those were things like parking plans for large organisations. I think actually large organisations have to go ahead and do it. I have not seen anything coming forward yet. I know it is still early days and the Committee is still getting their feet under the table but that is one that we are looking forward to seeing.

Car sharing: a lot have talked about it. Again, it is a great opportunity for you to come forward and do that. Taxi buses and all the rest of it: again, that is something that I have been looking for

for a long time. And despite the previous Department saying that they could not do it because the bus company did not come forward with something, that did not then stop them from still doing something.

So I really hope that, together with your Chairman, you can bring forward some of those ideas. But we do also have to live in the world today and we are making quite a major change from going from minimum standards to a maximum, and I think we should afford developers the slight flexibility that this amendment gives.

So I please urge everyone to support it.
Thank you very much.

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States, it is time to vote on Amendment 15 which is proposed by Deputy Brehaut and seconded by Deputy Stephens.

Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, I rise to ask for a recorded vote, please.

The Deputy Bailiff: We have a recorded vote request.
Deputy Greffier, please.

There was a recorded vote.

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, the voting appears to show that that amendment has been carried. I will declare the results in a moment.

The next amendment on your running order is Amendment 19. Deputy Laurie Queripel, do I understand that you do not wish to place that at this particular moment?

Deputy Laurie Queripel: That is correct, sir. It is just undergoing some rewording at the moment and should be with us, hopefully, in the next 20 minutes, half an hour; but if we could defer it for now I would appreciate it.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: It will not be numbered 19 by the time we get to see it then! *(Laughter)*
Deputy Dorey, amendment number 8.

Members, I am asking you to turn to amendment 8 now, which is to be proposed by Deputy Dorey and seconded by Deputy Fallaize, I think. We will move straight on once people have got there.

Deputy Dorey.

Amendment 8.

To add a further proposition as follows:

'3. To note that Policy GP11 of the Island Development Plan makes permission to construct dwellings subject, in certain circumstances, to a proportion of the developable area being allocated for affordable housing; and to direct the Development & Planning Authority, in consultation with the Committee for Employment & Social Security and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, to examine the case for an alternative requirement for developers to make a tariff payment equivalent to the value of the land which Policy GP11 would require to be set aside for affordable housing; and to direct that by no later than the 30th April, 2017 the Authority shall submit a policy letter on this matter together with any propositions which it considers appropriate.'

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, sir. Could I ask the Greffier to read it, please?

The Deputy Greffier read out the amendment.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

2700 I will only make a short speech, as I think the case for my amendment has already been made in the debate for affordable housing amendments. (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.)

The idea for this amendment came from a letter sent by the Guernsey Housing Association in which they suggested tariff payments be paid by developers for sites that are too small to provide enough developable land to make them viable for the Guernsey Housing Association, and that those payments are ring-fenced for affordable housing.

2705 There is currently no law for developers to make tariff payments for commuted sums, as they are often called. This amendment is to simply direct the DPA, together with the Committee for Employment & Social Security and the Committee for Environment & Infrastructure, to investigate the potential for financial contributions and to submit a policy letter with the appropriate Propositions by the end of April 2017. If the States then accepts the proposals the legislation can be drafted and there will probably have to be a planning inquiry so that the IDP can be amended.

2710 The reporting date is deliberately tight, as the current situation is not fair if we approve the Island Development Plan. A site with 20 or more dwellings would have to provide a portion of the developable land of the site for affordable housing but sites with less than 20 dwellings will not have to provide any land or any finance. This needs to be rectified as soon as possible.

2715 In preparing for the debate I read a number of reports on planning covenants, and I referred to them during the debate on Wednesday. Most places have a system for commuted payments to be made for sites that are below the threshold for providing developable land. The two reasons usually provided are fairness and not to encourage under-development, which in the Guernsey case with the amendments to the IDP we will be proposing a plan which only results in 19 dwellings.

2720 The need for this piece of work to be done has been accepted by the DPA as in their draft supplementary planning guidance for affordable housing, paragraph 7.4, says the following:

The potential for the provision of a financial contribution towards affordable housing in lieu of direct provision of land or completed units is not currently possible. The Authority will continue to investigate the potential for financial contributions and will bring forward suitable amendments to the Affordable Housing policy and supplementary planning guidance in light of any changes to the existing legal framework relating to affordable housing as considered appropriate by the States of Guernsey.

So supplementary planning guidance for affordable housing has those words in, so they are planning to do this. This is really just putting a strict timetable because of the situation of fairness.

2725 So I would ask you just to support this investigation so we can go forward with this.

Thank you.

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

2730 **Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, I do, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you very much.

Amendment 15.

Carried – Pour 31, Contre 3, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 4

POUR

Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Graham

CONTRE

Deputy Langlois
Deputy De Sausmarez
Deputy Brehaut

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Yerby

ABSENT

Deputy Le Tocq:
Deputy Mooney:
Deputy Trott:
Deputy St Pier:

Deputy Green
Deputy Paint
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Alderney Rep. Jean
Alderney Rep. McKinley
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld

2735 **The Deputy Bailiff:** The voting on the previous amendment, which was Amendment 15, proposed by Deputy Brouard and seconded by Deputy Stephens, was as follows: *Pour* 31, *Contre* 3, 1 abstention and therefore the amendment was duly carried.

Deputy Ferbrache.

2740 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, I am understanding the amendment as just having the matter investigated, so when it comes back before the States in April, or whenever it may be, six months' time, it can be properly considered then because there needs to be a lot of work. And if people believe that the six-month timetable is achievable that is fine, but it is such an important topic it needs to be thoroughly investigated. There needs to be lots and lots of consultation to see how practical this would be in the Guernsey context at the present time.

2745 So I am not going to vote against it but if the States are indicating today that, by voting for it, it means that this proposal will be, whatever proposals might come forward in six months' time or thereabouts, then that is a matter of concern. This matter should be looked at with an open mind to see how practical it is and there must be very, very detailed public and professional consultation.

2750

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Langlois, to be followed by Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Langlois: Thank you, sir.

2755 I am going to support this amendment, (**A Member:** Hurray!) but I think Deputy Dorey is over-simplifying the matter and I think Deputy Ferbrache alluded to the fact. I think *he* understands it is going to be a lot more complicated than it appears.

2760 I think he uses a vehicle of planning covenants for the States to acquire a percentage of a residential site. That is a fairly basic and fairly straightforward thing. It does not matter whether the landowner is the developer or whether the landowner conveys the land to a developer, or what method they use to convey the land. The percentage of that site is for affordable housing, and that cannot change.

But if what you are trying to do, which is what they are trying to do here, is use planning covenants to acquire some cash, maybe a percentage or whatever of the value of the site, that is a very different matter because, for instance, if the landowner is also the developer he will not be

2765 conveying the site and so there will not be a trigger for the cash payment. If somebody inherits a site with planning permission, and maybe the inheritor, maybe she is a developer, for instance, again there would not be a trigger for the cash payments. So somehow you have to build a trigger system in when there might not be a conveyance and the land will not have been valued through the market. So you would need a valuation, which is another complication.

2770 I think, from my reading of the planning covenant section of the Planning Law and the ordinance which enables it to be used for the provision of affordable housing, it is not the ordinance that would be the problem, it is the clauses in the Law themselves which, to me, do not seem to enable something like this to occur, so we might end up having to amend the Law. My instinctive feeling is that we are drifting towards a development land tax and it is going to be so complicated to use planning covenants for this purpose, somebody is eventually going to turn around and say, 'Really this is a development land tax we are talking about here.'

2775 I have fond memories of development land taxes because the Labour Government introduced them exactly the same year I took my final professional exams, so for a very brief period in my life I knew everything there was to know about development land taxes, until the Conservative Government repealed them less than three years later, so it was a bit of a waste of time on my part. But the one thing I do remember about them is that a development land tax is a complicated concept, because of some of the reasons I have been explaining.

2780 So it is not as straightforward as Deputy Dorey seemed to be implying, that for smaller sites instead of a percentage of the site being used for affordable housing, the developer will just hand over some cash. It is *a lot* more complicated than that and I have got my concerns that we have not really thought this through. The exercise of trying to come back to the States by this due date might be interesting, but I do not think the States is going to get the simple proposal they might imagine they are going to.

Thank you.

2790 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, sir.

2795 On the second line of this draft it uses the term 'in certain circumstances'. Can I just confirm that with the amendments that have been passed this would only apply to developments of 20 houses or more, because any smaller development would not require a proportion of the development or developable area to be allocated to affordable housing?

2800 That, I now know, is easily circumvented and I agree with Deputy Langlois this is a veiled form of a land tax; that is what it is all about. And in fact if you want a land tax it should be applied to all developments, so I find this draft slightly confusing.

But I just want to confirm at the moment 'in certain circumstances' means *only* in developments of 20 or more houses, because that is what it is actually saying. I am not sure if that is the intent.

2805 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

Apologies for not being first to the Assembly, but I am dealing with Amendment 19.

2810 Sir, dealing with amendment 8, I confirm that this amendment will not result in a deferral, mainly because it is a Proposition.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Tindall, these are to add Propositions. None of these are amendments to the proposals for the Development Plan, so we do not need that anymore.

2815 **Deputy Tindall:** I beg your pardon, sir.

It just says it is amendment 8 at the top, so that is why I was just clarifying that it is not an amendment, it is a Proposition.

The Deputy Bailiff: But it does not matter.

Deputy Tindall: Sorry. In that case, I withdraw what I have just said and I add that I confirm that the Development Planning Authority have no objections to the Proposition.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Paint.

Deputy Paint: Sir, I find this amendment is something similar to the Dorey Acres. It is just not Guernsey. People have worked very hard in their lives for paying for small pieces of land which they might be able to develop if they are very lucky.

As has already been said, this amendment only makes a land tax which Guernsey has never paid, other than through their rates.

I could not possibly agree to this amendment, I will vote against it.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Sir, yesterday we spoke in great detail about affordable housing and saying how difficult the construction industry was having it. I just do not understand why we would want to put a development tax, which is being implied in this.

I strongly recommend everyone votes against it.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Sir, I think if we do not pass this and eventually, hopefully, implement something along the lines of the system to be investigated, we will be exercising sort of a discriminatory 'Lilliputism'. Any development of 20 houses or more – in order to relieve the hard-burdened taxpayer of this Island of some of the burden of providing social housing – will be expected to transfer a section of their land across to a social housing developer. But anybody wanting to develop 15, 18 or 19 will be expected to make no contribution whatsoever! How on earth is that remotely fair? It simply is not fair.

Now, I agree with Deputy Ferbrache, the devil may be in the detail, and I am not guaranteeing that I am going to ... My inclination is entirely in favour of supporting this because otherwise it is not fair at all.

I think this is something very different to a general development land tax. We had a draft IDP; it went through a process, it went through a planning inquiry, it had the evidence. What came out of it was suggesting that any development above five units of residential accommodation should make a contribution in the form of land to social housing to take some of the burden. I think by estimating from Deputy Tindall's remarks about my amendment and others, probably about £20 million worth of the burden off the general taxpayer.

We chose to amend that, and I think rightly so, for pragmatic reasons, because doing it all by land would have resulted in a nonsensical situation of one or two houses here or there having to be administered by a social housing provider. But the principle remains exactly the same. It is just the practicality.

So I think we *definitely* need to look at this. If we do not, I think we are really discriminating between the 21-house development and the 19-house development; and I warn you, if you do that I bet you are going to have to bring in lots of new legislation to stop developers actually exploiting that and going for the 19-development on every occasion instead of going for the 21.

So, sir, it may be difficult and we may have to turn our back on it when it comes back but, for goodness' sake, let's take a look at it.

2870 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize, to be followed by Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

I think the Members who have said it may be difficult are right. And I do not think Deputy Dorey did suggest that it would be easy, I think he was trying to summarise the concept in his opening speech. It could well prove difficult in the construction and in the implementation of such a policy, but it is done elsewhere. This is not specific to Guernsey; it is already in place in various forms in other jurisdictions. I am sure the Authority's investigations, if the amendment is successful, will include the way that this operates in other jurisdictions and they will be able to include that in their report back to the States.

2880 We are not here debating now whether we should have an affordable housing policy, or whether private developers, once they are afforded permission on relatively large developments, should make available, either financially or in property terms, a portion of the site or the value of the portion of the site. We have already debated that, or we will have once Proposition 1 is approved as amended, as hopefully it will be if not today before too long. We already have, or we will have, an affordable housing policy. It would be absolutely bizarre, having inserted that policy for certain development sites, not to carry out investigations for commuted sums to apply for other types of sites. It would leave the policy completely cockeyed, unbalanced and discriminatory.

I think, technically, Deputy Kuttelwascher is right about the wording of the amendment, but the important thing is that the amendment, if it is approved, would spark the necessary investigations. It is quite clear the concept that the States would be voting for the Authority to investigate and they would be able to carry out that investigation. As Deputy Ferbrache says, it would have to be thorough, it would have to be comprehensive. They will have to do a great deal of work to look at the arguments for and against and to look at the application of this in practice. Then they could come back to the States and the States could take a considered view.

2895 But it seems to me that to vote against the amendment and to close off all possibility of commuted sums, given that we have inserted the affordable housing policy that we have in the previous day's debate, I think that would be absolutely bizarre. Therefore I hope Members will vote for this amendment, not least of all because the Development & Planning Authority has no objection to it. I think they should be free to carry out these investigations with the authority of the States. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

2905 **Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, I will be very brief.

I agree with everything that Deputy Fallaize has just said.

This is not the time to be debating the merits of the tariff payment or not. Really it is very simple as to whether developers should be charged in cash or in kind, as I see it, and I think we should definitely be undertaking investigation.

The Deputy Bailiff: I do not see anyone else rising and therefore I will turn to the President of the Development & Planning Authority, Deputy Gollop, to reply on behalf of the Authority to the amendment.

2915 **Deputy Gollop:** Sir, I agree with the kind of arguments Deputy Fallaize, in particular, has made about: the focus today – says I, giving us more work to do, maybe – is to investigate, not to decide. So I will take on board the points Deputy Paint and Deputy Oliver have made

2920 Now, as you can see, although we are officially conceding and accepting this extra Proposition – Deputy Tindall has explained that – Deputy Oliver has spoken against it. It was interesting because I sat on the fence a bit here because I was totally against it when it came to us at DPA, and then I went to Employment & Social Security and they were totally in favour of it! So I had to be in favour of it, really, but no ... *(Laughter)*

2925 We considered it and there was actually a tactical reason. I do not want this to be seen ... but it is not now, because we have had the debate on Deputy Roffey's amendment on the covenants. I do not want this to be seen as a cop-out, as an easy way out of building maybe social inclusivity into the new building developments, because I do not think this is meant to be a development tax.

2930 Some of us know a senior figure who told some of us that this is unfair. Deputy Kuttelwascher mentioned that this could be seen as a development tax on some sites and not others, but this gentleman said we might as well have a capital gains tax because this is taxing land and not other forms of investment, or inherited wealth, as Deputy Paint has implied. I think you can take it too far.

2935 It is not meant to be a tax. It is not for Treasury & Resources, although hopefully they might input to the report. It is specifically a tariff rate of the value of the site in preference to building. And if one looks on Google you can easily come across areas like Durham, like Waverly, I believe, in Surrey that have gone down that route. They might not be Guernsey. Guernsey has had a history of other land taxes, not just chicken tax but the Congé, document duty and so on, which is not a tax on land, it used to be a tax on first-time-buyers, which perhaps is not the way we want to go.

2940 So I urge the States to accept this sensible Proposition.

The Deputy Bailiff: We turn to Deputy Dorey, the proposer of the amendment numbered 8 to reply to the debate.

2945 Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

2950 And I thank Deputy Gollop for his support. I am glad he supports it because it is in their own guidance notes for affordable housing that they want to do the investigation. So I was slightly surprised that Deputy Oliver was opposed to it because it is in their own documents from their Committee.

2955 Deputy Ferbrache started by saying it needs a lot of consultation and I totally agree with it. This is not a simple matter and I never used the word 'simple', Deputy Langlois. I do not wish to oversimplify it. All I say is that it has been done elsewhere in a number of other places and they have been doing it for a period of time. We can benefit from their experience and learn from it. We have already had a number of reports which have looked at other areas and looked at their schemes and reached some conclusions on it. So we have information to date but I fully agree we need to do a lot of consultation and, yes, will probably need to amend the Law.

I will try and keep it as short as possible due to the time.

2960 Deputy Kuttelwascher referred to the wording in the amendment but I think Deputy Fallaize has covered that. Partially why we put 'in certain circumstances' was because we knew that in the proposal from the DPA was five, we knew there was an amendment with 10 and there was an amendment with 20 and we had to have some wording to cover those different situations, and I did not know which was going to be successful so we put 'in certain circumstances'.

2965 I would be happy to give way.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Sir, my question is because we have now got 20 – is that it? Is that the circumstance or is it in new circumstances?

2970 **Deputy Dorey:** I accept that perhaps it could have been slightly better worded but the idea is to investigate in all circumstances. I will expect it to go above 20. There might be some circumstances where it does go above 20, but this is an investigation and whoever investigates it can go far wider than the Resolution of the States.

2975 **Deputy Fallaize:** I thank Deputy Dorey for giving way.
I think also it is important to point out around this term 'in certain circumstances' that there is the potential for an applicant to demonstrate that it would not be viable for them to make provision for affordable housing, even on sites of 20 houses or more. So the policy GP11 will be applied only in certain circumstances because there is an opportunity for derogation, or whatever the right word is.

2980 **Deputy Dorey:** I agree and that is part of the validity test, isn't it, that you would have to look at a site. You might have a brownfield site where there is extensive cost in clearing that site, so that is part of what would be the outcome.

2985 But this is talking about investigation, and I completely agree with Deputy Roffey that it would be discriminatory and unfair not to bring this in, because sites with 20 or more houses would have to make a contribution and quite a significant contribution in terms of the value of land, but those below will not. So I do not understand Deputy Paint's comments saying he would never support it because effectively the Assembly has supported a tax by way of providing land for sites of 20 or more, so it is unfair not to do it for sites below that. And as the Assembly has decided that it is not right for them to provide land because it is not viable for the Housing Association to develop on small sites, the fair bit is that they have to provide the money instead of the land. But that is what the investigation will be about.

2990 I think I have covered all the points that have been made. I just ask the Assembly to support this amendment, which is fair and right for us to investigate and report back on, and then you can make the decision once we have done the consultations, done the investigations and you see the outcomes and make a decision then.

Thank you.

3000 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, we go to the vote on amendment 8, proposed by Deputy Dorey, seconded by Deputy Fallaize.
Deputy Lester Queripel.

3005 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, could I have a recorded vote, please?

The Deputy Bailiff: We will have a recorded vote.
Deputy Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States, that amendment numbered 8 appears to be carried quite comfortably.

3010 The next amendment which I propose turning to is that numbered 21, to be proposed by Deputy Soulsby. We are down to 21 and 18 only, that are currently in circulation, plus the replacement for number 19 coming along. So we will go to number 21 next.

So once Members have got that in front of them, I invite Deputy Soulsby to move the amendment.

Amendment 21.

To insert a new Proposition 3;

'3. To direct the Committee for Economic Development to submit a policy letter to the States of Deliberation setting out a Tourism strategy for approval by the States by 31st October 2018. Such policy letter to include;

a. a review of the Visit Guernsey and Chamber of Commerce Strategic Plan 2015-2025 (also known as the Guernsey Tourism Strategic Plan 2015-2025) as referenced in paragraphs 7.6.3 and 13.4.3 of Appendix 1 of the report of the Development & Planning Authority (pages 70 and 98 of Appendix 1, subject to the changes set out at pages 11 and 16 of Appendix 7); and

b. an assessment of the current stock of visitor accommodation and the stock of visitor accommodation necessary to support the future viability and growth of the industry.'

Deputy Soulsby: Could I have it read out for me, please?

The Deputy Greffier read out the amendment.

3015 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, Members will be pleased to hear that I will be relatively brief.

I do understand this is supported by the Committee for Economic Development and has been developed in discussion with the President and other Members.

3020 As I said in earlier debate – it seems like an awful long time ago now – the reason why we are in such a mess when it came to tourism over the treatment of the visitor accommodation, is that the Development & Planning Authority have taken into account, when developing their policy, a strategic plan that is purely aspirational, something which the authors of the report clearly acknowledge. To be honest, it is very clear that is the case when reading it. It is a great upbeat
3025 document and I felt a cosy warm feeling reading it, but it is not the States of Guernsey Strategy.

It also talks about the need to evaluate new and stronger route connections, encourage competitive fares on all routes, discuss opportunities to maximise potential of the new Aurigny jet and last, but not least, question runway length and the ability to attract airlines with wider reach and larger jets. The cost estimates run to millions and millions of pounds and require States' approval, yet this document has been used as a basis to determine policy on visitor
3030 accommodation.

In paragraph 7.6.11 of the draft IDP, it states that, and I quote:

The Environment Department [*successor*] will take into account any relevant States of Guernsey strategy relating to visitor accommodation when determining a planning application in relation to such accommodation.

In other words, documents pertained to be strategic plans will be read as States of Guernsey strategies, whether or not they are endorsed by the States. When it comes to a sector
3035 representing an important, if shrinking, contributor to our economy that is concerning.

In my earlier speech I gave both occupancy and visitor figures which demonstrate a decline in tourism. Something has to be done to address that trend and the Committee for Economic Development needs to know that it has the support of the States in the approach it takes and that the IDP is aligned to that strategic direction.

3040 Finally, Members will note that the amendment not only requires a review of the Guernsey Tourism Strategic Plan but an assessment of the stock of visitor accommodation and that is necessary to support the future viability and growth of the industry. This goes to the heart of SLUP and seeks to address specifically what is considered adequate.

3045 Sir, this is a simple amendment but that should not be taken to mean unimportant, far from it. Agreeing that a tourism strategy should come to the States means that not only can we give support to the Committee for Economic Development to turn around what is a troubled sector, we can ensure that our land use policies and plan will help make that happen.

I ask Members to support this amendment.

3050 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Prow, do you formally second the amendment?

Deputy Prow: I do, sir, and I reserve the right to speak.
Thank you.

Amendment 8.

Carried – Pour 31, Contre 3, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 4

POUR

Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Yerby
Deputy De Lisle
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy De Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Prow
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld

CONTRE

Deputy Paint
Deputy Oliver
Alderney Rep. Jean

NE VOTE PAS

Alderney Rep. McKinley

ABSENT

Deputy Le Tocq:
Deputy Mooney:
Deputy Trott:
Deputy St Pier:

3055 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members, the voting on amendment 8, proposed by Deputy Dorey and seconded by Deputy Fallaize, to insert a new Proposition was Pour 31, Contre 3, there was 1 abstention and the amendment was duly carried.

Deputy Ferbrache.

3060 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, can I just commend the mostly excellent amendment and the excellent presentation of that amendment by Deputy Soulsby.

We are a new Committee, Economic Development; we inherited a policy that was the previous committee's. I am making no criticism of it but there are *many* concerns in relation to the tourist industry and for all the several points of importance that Deputy Soulsby elaborated in her introduction, we need to carry out a thorough review of the policy.

3065 We will know within the next two years how the land lies, whether people can get here better, whether they can fly away from here better, with all the other things we will be able to discuss more fully than perhaps has happened in the past with the tourism sector and I look very much to my colleague, Deputy Merrett, to do the lion's share of that work, but she will have the assistance of all of us.

3070 I believe that we will be able to better inform the States on this very important sector and these very important considerations if this amendment is accepted.

Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

3075 **Deputy Tindall:** Sir, as I tried to explain in the last speech I made, just for clarity, because it is a Proposition then therefore it will not be a question of a deferral of the Plan; but I also confirm that the Development & Planning Authority have no objections to the Proposition.

Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

3080

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

I rise to support this new Proposition 3 as laid out in Amendment 21. I thank the President of the Economic Development Committee for supporting this amendment.

3085 As you have already heard from Deputy Soulsby, and from me, there are clear issues with how the Island Development Plan has both perceived the needs and dealt with the tourism sector. I outlined what I believe is the true picture in my earlier speech, so I will not go over that again. The visitor sector is a traditional Guernsey industry and it needs all the help it can get, not put in a planning straitjacket from which it cannot escape. Future viability, growth and development are everything.

3090 The underpinning IDP thinking has been aspirational, as has already been outlined, and not based upon reality. It is, I believe, the clear understanding of this Assembly that the Committee for Economic Development are working hard with that industry at a strategic level. Unfortunately, because we are where we are, outcomes will not appear overnight.

3095 Deputy Soulsby has outlined some of the initiatives being worked up by them with industry, including maximising Aurigny, our national airline, working with Condor on ferry links and, importantly, investigating our ports and Airport infrastructures. I wholeheartedly support Economic Development in doing this and, as said, this is a big task.

3100 What has become clear to me in this debate is that the IDP cannot be in any way relied upon to become the main States of Guernsey strategic leader for this sector. This is clearly the remit and competence of Economic Development.

Proposition 3 asks for a States' strategic plan for tourism working with *Visit Guernsey* and the Chamber of Commerce. This strategy will become the right vehicle to assess the current stock of visitor accommodation necessary to support the future viability and growth of that industry.

3105 This strategy will inform the IDP under paragraph 7.6.11 of the draft IDP plan and will be the proper and relevant States' strategy to inform the IDP in relation to tourism and the assessment of accommodation stock.

I urge all Members to support this new Proposition.

Thank you, sir.

3110 **Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Sir, I am most happy to support this because we have already started the process so it is just confirmation of what we are doing.

3115 Our only input was to extend the date because there are certain areas which would affect the policy which are not available right now. We are waiting the outcome from the Condor Comprehensive Service Review, on what is going to happen with Alderney, infrastructure and other things.

3120 The fact that the previous Commerce & Employment had certain policies in place does not mean that we as a Committee accept all of their policies and, in fact, not so long ago three members of that Committee voted for the Soulsby amendment relating to change of use in hotels which, you could argue, flies in the face of previous policy; and so it should. But there is a message there. We are open to change. We are not being led by previous policies and we will produce the most relevant policy that is relevant now, and not previously.

3125 I urge Members to support it, because even if they do not we are going to do it anyhow, so there we go. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Bailiff: We turn to the President of the Development & Planning Authority, Deputy Gollop, to reply on the amendment.

3130 **Deputy Gollop:** There is not a lot that concerns us here, but I would make two points.

Deputy Kuttelwascher has sagaciously, from a position of experience now in this Chamber, pointed out that sometimes new committees, new bodies, inherit policies that have been laid there before. And, yes, it can take time to change but it is necessary to change them.

3135 I think perhaps the last States in some areas, not specifically this, was guilty of a certain delegation to officers of policy-shaping and perhaps were not totally on top of the situation in every respect. Here, I think it has been a bit unlucky on us poor souls at the DPA who have worked hard with our team on the Island Development Plan that we lost, for example, the Soulsby/Prow amendment, partly because we were obliged to put in a policy framework we inherited from the former States and the late Commerce & Employment Department.

3140 The only other point is Deputy Prow mentioned that the Economic Development Department are competent to do this. I hope that was not an inference that we are incompetent. But, no, we should not be micro-managing the hotel or tourism sector and it is up to us to support the industry together with Economic Development on this new workstream.

3145 **Deputy Bailiff:** I invite Deputy Soulsby, the proposer of amendment number 21, to reply to the debate.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, I do not really think I have much to reply to, so I am happy to go to the vote now.

3150

Deputy Bailiff: This is Amendment 21, Members, which is proposed by Deputy Soulsby, seconded by Deputy Prow. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Deputy Bailiff: I declare the amendment duly carried.

3155 Now, Members of the States, do you have in front of you Amendment 32? Because if you do then we might take Amendment 32 with the consequence that Amendment 19 can be discarded and recycled at your leisure, because it will not be pursued by Deputy Laurie Queripel.

Deputy Queripel.

Amendment 32.

To add a further Proposition as follows:

'3. To direct –

(a) the States Trading Supervisory Board in consultation with the Committee for Economic Development, by no later than 31st January, 2017 to identify and indicate to the Development & Planning Authority and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure a suitable area or areas of land consisting of at least 4 acres owned, or the occupation of which is controlled, by the States (such as the Belgrave Vinery site or part of that site) that could be used for light industrial use if suitable amendments were made to Guernsey's planning regime, and

(b) the Development & Planning Authority and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, by no later than 30th April, 2017, to submit proposals for consideration by the States which would enable, or potentially enable, the area or areas of land identified and indicated further to paragraph (a) of this Proposition to be used for planning purposes for light industrial use.'

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

3160 May I ask the Deputy Greffier to read out the wording of the amendment? It is just that it has slightly been changed and it will give Members a chance to absorb the slight change in the wording.

The Deputy Greffier read out the amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Laurie Queripel.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

3165 Mr Deputy Bailiff and, through you, sir, Assembly colleagues, there are very sound and good strategic and economic reasons to put in place the resources that this amendment is calling for to identify and set aside part of the States-owned land or controlled land for industrial use.

3170 Some Members might be thinking if this is such an important matter why has it taken so long to get to this point; why has this amendment only surfaced in the last few days? Sir, they are good and valid questions and my answer would only tell a small part of the story but it goes something like this.

3175 I have been saying for years, inside and outside of this Chamber as a Deputy, and prior to being elected to the States' that there is a policy, plan, strategy – call it what you want, let's say 'policy' for now – a policy vacuum when it comes to the construction sector and light and heavy industry. I have written and circulated papers, I have spoken to colleagues in offices and I have raised the subject through the media, sir, and I have not been a lone voice. Deputy Fallaize has made his concerns and views known; Deputy Mooney, who is unfortunately not with us today, has raised concerns about this and in fact has worked very hard on researching this issue, and we have exchanged information and worked very closely together. In fact we even walked the Belgrave
3180 Vinery site a few days ago to get a look at that particular site, although that may not be the site that is identified.

3185 Prior to that, going back over the years, former Deputy Graham Gill, and indeed our late colleague Deputy Dave Jones, and other voices too, sir, all raised concerns, all expressed the view that a policy strategy was required that incorporated the issue of premises and the need for the States to have some involvement. So over the years many sound, rational, coherent, reasoned arguments have been made but very little has happened.

3190 Some traction has been gained very recently. People in what you might call 'the right places' are beginning to listen. For example, I am very grateful that the President of the Policy & Resources Committee, Deputy St Pier, who once again, unfortunately, is not here today – he is on very important business, but he has taken an interest in this matter, the lack of a policy or a strategy. He has listened and, I believe, has accepted some of the points made and I know that he has been conversing with other colleagues on the topic. So there has belatedly been some recognition.

3195 But over the years, in my view, this is a sector that has been ill-served by the States. Both at political and officer level it has been undervalued, misunderstood, treated casually, almost dismissed. Its potential has not been recognised, or its importance to our community or our economy.

3200 The Fontaine Vinery situation has been in the news recently but this is a much bigger issue than that. This is not only about trying to find somewhere else for the Fontaine tenants, it is about the States needing to recognise the strategic and economic importance of this sector and the businesses that operate within it and finding meaningful ways to work with them and support them. Not only, sir, so that these businesses can just continue to trade but, with some certainty and some support, can actually consider expanding their businesses, growing their businesses and increasing their investment. And it is also about providing a starting point, an affordable base for
3205 new businesses within the sector. With the right support, I am absolutely convinced this is a growth area for our economy.

There is a view held by some, and I have already alluded to it, that this sector and these businesses should be left to their own devices, that their accommodation should be a matter for the commercial market, for the free market. Sir, that view ignores a number of issues and it also disregards the fact that the States works with and materially supports so many other sectors and industries and businesses across our economic spectrum. There are very good reasons for that, and I will come to those in just a moment.

What about the issues, the problems faced when it comes to industrial premises? I do not think I can put a figure or a number to the amount of space or land that has been lost over the years. Many sites have been granted change of use away from industrial use and crucially, sir, more than a few of them were in the affordable range and had tenants on them. As some examples, space will eventually be lost at Quayside, there are some industrial units there. It has already been lost in the Baubigny area, the Lowlands area and, of course, one of the most obvious examples is Leale's Yard. A number of the businesses that were located at Leale's Yard either could not find suitable premises, or premises that were within their price range and, as a result, some ceased to trade and their services and their skills, not to mention jobs, were lost to the Island.

More than one of those businesses offered specialist services in the area of fabrication, blasting, spraying, they used special techniques and they had particular plant and equipment. And other businesses within the construction industry and organisations, including the States, accessed and availed themselves of those services. The tragedy is that work can no longer be done here, it has to go off Island. That is a loss to the States, our community and our economy and that example could be applied or cited many times over.

When I spoke to the Environment Department, as they were during the last term, I was told that an ample provision of industrial premises were available to the businesses that work within this industry. But, upon closer inspection of the list, I could see that most of them would not be suitable for the kind of businesses this amendment typically has in mind – smaller operations, a few employees, some machinery, often quite dirty work being carried out; but mostly requiring a small area, or even just an open compound for storage and also, crucially, they were not in the affordable bracket – and I will come to that in a minute. This list was full of quite large warehouses, many vacated because of the loss of Low Value Consignment Relief (LVCR), with rents beginning at £16,000 or £20,000, going up to £60,000 or £80,000. So unsuitable, sir, not only from a requirement point of view, certainly in most cases not affordable.

It has to be appreciated that these types of businesses in the main are not particularly high value in the standalone sense, but they make a significant investment. Not only providing jobs and also apprenticeship schemes and training positions but in purchasing plant, equipment, vehicles and so on. And it is the value that they add that is important; their use of local merchants and suppliers, getting machinery and vehicles serviced and maintained. They really do help to oil the wheels of the economy. They play their part in the money-go-round and in some instances, bringing new money into the Island through the export of products or the provision of specialist skills.

This is a sector that does well but could do even better with the right support. And the biggest problem is in the area of acquiring suitable and affordable premises. Now, there has been some acknowledgement from the States in the use of Fontaine Vinery, for example, that there is a requirement for this kind of provision provided by the States. But even that is indicative of the States' attitude towards this sector and these businesses. Permissions to carry on using the site have had to be renewed many times over and now we have, at the 11th hour, States' Property Services – making their best efforts, I am sure – scrambling around trying to find homes for some of the businesses currently tenanted on the Fontaine Vinery site. All a bit hotchpotch, sir; make it up as we go along. It hardly provides certainty or demonstrates that the States values these businesses.

The use of some privately owned vinery sites, as we have been discussing this afternoon and yesterday, is being envisaged, but even that on its own is not good enough. A couple of questions: how long will the owners of these vinery sites allow them to be used? Where is the

certainty that the rents will remain affordable? There is a compelling case for some States' involvement, some States' provision in a properly structured, organised way for strong strategic and economic reasons.

Sir, in regard to income and revenue for the States, the rents of these units or these compounds on States' land would only be the tip of the iceberg. I have already spoken about the services and jobs that these businesses provide, so tax and contributions being paid; and, on top of that, there is a significant, perhaps we could call it, enriching of the skills base via apprenticeships and training schemes. And the skills base is a very important element.

A lot of work has gone on, I am sure it is going on at Economic Development now, but in my time at C&E, before I fell from grace, (*Laughter*) the skills base was a really important thing to C&E. There was a whole strategy built around it. So there are all these things that these kinds of businesses contribute to our community and to our economy. So once again, not only are there the rents and the taxes and the contributions paid but the added value that these businesses add to our community and to our economy, and the services that they provide.

When I was at C&E, during the last term, there was some work done on something called the 'multiplier effect' and it was concluded that for every £1 spent on Island that £1 gained between £5 and £10 as it circulated around the economy. So these businesses are very good at helping not only to circulate money but, as I have said at times, bringing new money into the Island.

Just a moment ago I mentioned the various ways that the States provided material support to other sectors and other businesses and other industries. And the reason for that is the return on the investment, the wider benefits realised for the Island in all senses – strategically, economically, socially, environmentally, the revenues to the Exchequer etc. And I will just give a few examples of that. Guernsey Finance, provided with premises and funded via the States of Guernsey and of course via the taxpayer; the digital greenhouse; the budget allocated to promote tourism. Even cruise liners, the infrastructure and facilities put in place at the Harbour to accommodate the cruise liners. Even down to things such as coastal cafés and kiosks all, I think, mostly owned or exclusively owned by the States and leased to private businesses to operate.

And once again, back to the finance industry. All the expertise, legal and otherwise, used to create products via legislation that our industry can offer to the marketplace. And one could even extend that line of thinking to something like the bus service, operated by a private company but the infrastructure, facilities, vehicles, etc. provided and funded by the States and the taxpayer. And there are many other examples, I am sure, that other Members could cite, but all done for very well evidenced and beneficial reasons. Providing the kind of resources that this amendment is calling for would not be setting a precedent; far from it, it would be following a very particular States' trend.

There is mention of the Belgrave Vinery site in this amendment but there could be other suitable areas of land under States' ownership that could be put forward by the States' Trading Supervisory Board. I, and others – Deputy Mooney, for example – have walked the Belgrave site at least three times, and I walked it with Deputy Mooney just the other day. That site is in our minds, because it is a familiar one to us and it seems like an obvious option. I would urge Members if they have not paid a visit to the site that they do so.

It is a vast area of land and, with the right approach, could tick all the boxes. There could be a significant housing complex in one part, the conservation area could actually be extended and open land could be retained, and a well-screened industrial zone could be established, because artificial mounds have been created over time. That would be a good and efficient use of a land resource. The Island Development Plan says quite often, sir, that we need to make good and efficient use of the land resource and that really would be a good one if it could be used for those three things. I am particularly thinking about the industrial complex but, as I say, it could be that the States' Trading Supervisory Board thinks that there is a better place for it.

Sir, I do not want Members who have not visited the site to get the impression that it is a pristine, open land area – it is not. A lot of activity has taken place there over time. As I said, there have been artificial mounds created, there is evidence of storage crates there, hard surfaced gated

areas have been created and used over time, concrete paths, built structures, certainly sheds, etc.; and, of course, it is adjacent to the pumping facility, the Guernsey Water Pumping Facility so it should be a candidate at least. It is not, as I say, a pristine area of open land there are signs of all sorts of activity that have taken place there over the time. But, as I say, that is the place I have got in mind but I am quite open to any other suggestions or options being brought forward.

Finally, sir, for now, I just want to thank Deputy Fallaize for seconding this amendment. His support and assistance has been invaluable in putting it together. Also, I would like to thank Her Majesty's Comptroller because he has been incredibly helpful in regard to this amendment; and as I say, once again, Deputy Mooney, I am sure in some way representing the interests of Economic Development has been incredibly helpful too. So it has been a team effort in many ways.

I really would like to see this matter progressed. I think it is way past time not only that we took upon ourselves this piece of work, but actually put together a strategy, because there are so many strategies for so many different sectors and we need a strategy for this industry. The construction industry employs over 3,000 people and it is really important from an economic and strategic point of view, but specifically I think we need to tackle this issue first.

So I call upon Members to support the amendment, sir.

Thank you.

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

Deputy Fallaize: Yes, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Yerby.

Deputy Yerby: Sir, whatever our differences in other areas of policy, during the last States' term I have watched and like and admired Deputy Queripel as an ambassador for small and local businesses, especially for light and heavy industry. This is a good proposition which I will fully support.

Both this amendment, and Deputy Merrett's earlier words on glasshouses, as Deputy Queripel has already said, point to the need for an economic strategy for light and heavy industry. I am standing therefore simply to invite Deputy Kuttelwascher to do as he did before, and to stand and assure me that it is okay, the Committee are already on it, and before long we will see an economic strategy brought back to the States.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, sir.

As the President of the Committee that will be largely landed with the task of fulfilling this resolution, if it is carried, I would first of all like to say that it would have been more helpful frankly, if the proposer and seconder of this resolution had perhaps talked to the States' Trading Supervisory Board before bringing propositions to the Assembly, and perhaps we could have clarified some of the issues with them before they got this far.

I think probably the place to start is to tell the Assembly what the States' Trading Supervisory Board is doing about property and how this piece of work might fit in with that. It will be a high priority of the States' Trading Supervisory Board to produce a strategic asset management plan, or something of that name, to make best use of the States-owned property portfolio. Our aspirational timetable for completion of this work is the third quarter of 2017, but we recognise that the work will require perhaps extensive discussions with other committees. We also recognise that the term 'strategic asset management plan' has an unhappy history in this Assembly and that the last States failed to agree a plan of that name. We may therefore ultimately choose a different name, but the document will serve the purpose which I think the last States was hoping to achieve

but somehow managed to not agree. The failure of the last Assembly to agree this vital piece of strategy does, however, illustrate the complexity of the task.

3365 Turning to the specific proposals, Deputy Laurie Queripel has mentioned the Belgrave Vinery site as a potential candidate but I would draw Members' attention to page 245, Annex II, of the Island Development Plan which is headed, 'Sites Allocated as Housing Sites' and the first name on the list under 'Site name' is Belgrave Vinery. So in the plans that we are being invited to approve at this States' meeting the Belgrave Vinery is identified as a housing site. It was, of course, a housing target area in the old plan and that concept is now disappearing. But as I understand it, 3370 and it was a very large site, do not ask me how many vergées it was, but I think it was about 40 acres, and most of that site as I understand it in the new plan is what the planners call a 'green lung'.

3375 It is supposed to now be a green space that divides St Peter Port from St Sampson's, and only the relatively small area which one might call the dry part of the site is now a housing site. So on the face of it I do not think the Belgrave Vinery site will be suitable, assuming the States approve this plan. And, of course, we do not know what further amendments might flow in the rest of this meeting but, as it stands, this is a housing site or at least it is supposed to be.

3380 Now, of course, the States does own a lot of land and in the course of the next nine or ten months we are going to be going through the whole portfolio, checking off every single piece of land, deciding whether the States needs it, what the best use of the land is, whether it would be better deployed in the private sector, or whatever; but it is a very large task. The target date of the third quarter of 2017 is pretty ambitious. As I said earlier, in many cases this will involve negotiations with other Committees about relocating them and probably quite a lot of Members of this Chamber will be involved in those discussions where we have to sit down with them and 3385 say, 'Well, can we move you?'

Now, in the context of all that, having said that, I do accept the challenge and we will try by 31st January 2017, alongside the major piece of work which we are doing, to identify four or more acres that could be used for light industry. And I hope I am able to report back within the deadline that the proposition has set out.

3390 What I would caution, Members, at this point is ... well, first of all it is unlikely to be Belgrave Vinery if we come up with a site or sites. Secondly, it is not likely to be free. Turning a site into an area suitable for the use of light industry will probably involve some money. Deputy Laurie Queripel invites us to consider that kind of investment in the context of the wider economic benefit to the Island, the multiplier effect he spoke about, and I am actually quite receptive to 3395 those sorts of arguments. But it is a big ask to expect my committee to put together that business case for sites we have not yet even identified, to bring back to the Assembly and say we think it might cost x hundred thousand pounds, or whatever, to put this land into suitable shape for use by light industry, or even to build sheds on it, and to build a business case that will convince you all that this should go into the next round of capital prioritisation, or whatever has to happen to 3400 make that possible.

3405 So I think it is not going to be easy. It would be easier, perhaps, to build that business case in the wider context of a strategic asset management plan where I might be able to come to the Assembly and say, 'Look, we are freeing up all this land here and there, and we are going to sell off these pieces and that is going to produce £3 million or £4 million, or whatever'; and we would propose that some of that money gets reinvested into developing sites suitable for light industry or whatever. But I am certainly not, by the end of January, going to be in a position to bring you that wider picture.

3410 So we are looking at one little piece of a much bigger task in isolation and frankly, therefore, without the funding mechanisms that might eventually emerge from the full study, it is mildly unsatisfactory and let's put it no stronger than that. But I do accept the challenge. We will do our best to come up with some areas.

So I am not going to resist the propositions and I hope if we do not quite hit the deadline the Assembly will be tolerant and indulgent, but we will do our best.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen to be followed by Deputy Tindall.

3415

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

No matter the timelines, and I think that I would be lenient on those given the enormity of the work that Deputy Charles Parkinson seems to have set out just now.

I would like to give my support to this amendment. As Deputy Queripel has stated these small businesses are *very* important to our economy and our community and if we are serious about diversifying our economy, which I am, after so many years concentrating on the big ticket areas such as finance and professional services to name a few, we must start to show our support for these light industrial businesses in a practical and meaningful way.

I see this amendment as providing this support and therefore will be supporting it, and urge Members please to do so.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Tindall to be followed by Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

Whilst this is an additional proposition, sir, the Development Planning Authority still oppose it. I did have a long speech prepared but, considering the time, I have reduced it substantially and propose only to summarise our view.

We oppose because the draft plan already makes provision for industrial sites, both in centres and out of centres on glasshouse sites throughout the Island. We also know that, although some have problems with affordability, there is an oversupply of industry and storage land which will decline further over the next 10 years. The issue is affordability rather than land supply, and I also look forward to hearing the confirmation from Deputy Kuttelwascher as requested by Deputy Yerby.

But unfortunately the timeframe is our main concern. The Development & Planning Authority deadline is highly unlikely to be achievable as, once land is identified, this would need to go through a public enquiry as there has been no consultation on such sites. We therefore oppose this amendment.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize, to be followed by Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

I think the Authority is being quite daft in opposing this amendment because what is required here, from them, is that by 30th April 2017 they submit proposals for the consideration of the States which would enable, or potentially enable, areas to be used for planning purposes for light industrial use.

If it is necessary for further work to be carried out after that report has been brought to the States, then it can be carried out. Effectively, at that point, the Development & Planning Authority would have to come to the States and say, 'If you wish to have these areas of land that have been identified used for these purposes, these are the steps that we will have to take to get there'. The amendment is not saying that by 30th April 2017 the Development & Planning Authority has to come to the States with proposals which would allow businesses to move in on 1st May. So I really do not think that the grounds on which the Authority are saying that they will oppose this amendment stand up.

Deputy Parkinson would have preferred discussions, or consultation, with the States Trading Supervisory Board; he makes a fair point, although he has to remember that he has only been in office a very short period of time and I was advised – as the seconder of the amendment – that there had been discussion with States Property Services, admittedly before Deputy Parkinson was elected, and the Trading Supervisory Board is responsible for Property Services. So I was advised that those discussions had taken place. I know that discussions certainly did take place, because I

was involved in them to some extent, with Deputy St Pier in the period when he was in effect standing in for what was then the unconstituted States Trading Supervisory Board. So there have been exchanges, and there were exchanges involving Deputy Ferbrache on this issue, as the President of the Committee for Economic Development. So there have been exchanges there has been discussion in the run-up to this amendment.

Deputy Parkinson is concerned about the timeline and I accept that, but the timeline is largely driven by his committee, because the States Trading Supervisory Board, through States Property Services has advised businesses which are operating at Fontaine Vinery that they will be removed, as I understand it, by the end of March 2017. Now that is the prime driver for the urgency here. I am sure the States would be indulgent and patient if this work takes the Trading Supervisory Board rather longer than is set out in the amendment, but I would say in return for that could Deputy Parkinson, through his committee, please ensure that businesses are not driven off Fontaine Vinery before this report is laid before the States by his committee? There needs to be a *quid pro quo* here and so if it needs to take longer, well that is reasonable because the work has to be done thoroughly and properly. But please do not drive these businesses off this land which is under the control of the States in the meantime. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) So I think the timeline is very much in the hands of the States Trading Supervisory Board.

The case for the amendment is quite self-evident and Deputy Tindall says land is available. But the problem is that the businesses of this type are going to be removed from the Fontaine Vinery site, because everybody agrees it is not suitable. The very fact that they have been there for so much longer than was initially intended, effectively having to be assisted by the States, demonstrates that there is a need for land to be allocated for these types of businesses. If there was no need, the arrangements at the Fontaine Vinery would not exist and they would not have existed for so long.

So I think the amendment stands for that reason and, as I say, I think the timeline is very largely in the hands of Deputy Parkinson's committee.

I hope the States will approve the amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel, to be followed by Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Thank you, sir.

Speaking as a member of the DPA, as well as a person who ran his own successful business within the construction industry for almost 30 years, it makes perfect sense to me to support this amendment.

Small businesses are absolutely essential to our economy and we need to support them as much as we possibly can. I know of two businesses in the industry that have gone out of business in the last three years because they could not find suitable premises to operate from. Twelve people lost their jobs because of that; three of them reluctantly signed on as unemployed, and therefore cost the community. Plus, of course, those three people were totally demoralised because they loved their jobs and they wanted to carry on working.

They did not want to be unemployed. In fact one of them became so depressed that she asked her doctor for some anti-depressants, and she may still be on them for all I know because as we know, sir, anti-depressants are addictive and they are very difficult to get off once you are on them. So there is always a cost to the community by not supporting small, local businesses.

In other words, it really is a case of support local or it is goodbye local. And I get the feeling, and I am glad to say, this Assembly wants to be more proactive than previous Assemblies. (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.) And I am not criticising the previous Assembly's lack of proactivity, because previous Assemblies were very much hindered – particularly the previous Assembly – by all sorts of things that held us back; but I get the feeling this Assembly is going to drive through those obstacles and here is a chance to do just that.

By supporting this amendment we are not being asked to agree to builders' yards being set up on every one of the 250 disused vineries in the Island, we are simply asking for a report to be compiled and presented to the States for debate. And why would we not support that intention?

3520 Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

3525 I am sympathetic to the need for small businesses to have sites and I think it is wrong to say the previous States have not accepted that. That is why Fontaine Vinery was allocated for that purpose, because they accepted the need for it. It was allocated somewhat controversially and the States were heavily criticised by neighbours, which is why we have to be very careful, because it is very easy to say that businesses need it, but people have to live next to whatever sites we put forward.

3530 It is important to note that this amendment goes a lot further than Fontaine Vinery. Fontaine Vinery is open yards, this talks about light industry. They are not the same, so please do not think we are just putting something in to replace. Light industry, I take as buildings, so this is not necessarily replacing Fontaine Vinery it is going a lot further.

3535 But I go back to the previous States as well. In the Strategic Land Use Plan and, as I have said before, I sat on that group and we heard the message very loudly that there was a need for this, that is why there is specifically policy SLP4, limited provision we made within the development plans for small-scale business development outside the main and local centres that respects the scale and character of the surroundings. So there was a very clear direction in the Strategic Land Use Plan to set something up and, in the meantime, the previous States set up the Fontaine Vinery.

3540 Then if you actually look at the Island Development Plan there is policy OC3 which, again, is specifically for offices, industry and storage and distribution outside the centres. So the system has worked perfectly, the Strategic Land Use Plan specified a high level policy and the Environment Department and the Development & Planning Authority have come up with a specific policy. And it does cover what we spoke about before, OC7 Redundant Glasshouse Sites, and it also mentions a specific location, it says:

... it is located at the allocated site at La Villiaze, Forest, and it is in accordance with the approved development framework.

3550 So there is a specific site. If you look at the Island Development Plan there is a site there which is coloured purple with slashes across it specifically for that purpose so we have a policy which is put there.

I mentioned yesterday about that report on approach to agriculture and redundant vineries, and they have looked at the redundant vineries and they saw that 30 would be basically within OC3. Those vineries are 47.85 acres, and if you want to talk in vergées that is 118 vergées, of potential land for that. Now, not all of them will come forward, but if we want those sites to come forward and we want there to be a marketplace for it, if the States start intervening in it then we will destroy that market because the States will be providing it.

3560 There is a far bigger possible pool of land to satisfy this demand than the four acres that is spoken about in this amendment. I think that is the right way forward. I think we have a plan and I do not think at this stage it is necessary for the States to intervene. I think that we have a temporary solution at Fontaine Vinery and, as I understood, it is being extended beyond the dates that Deputy Fallaize spoke about. We will have the uplift in value of the vinery site, which I mentioned and Deputy Merrett referred to, sir, in her speech. And I think that they will deliver what we need to a far greater extent than the States will.

3565 I think we have to be extremely careful, because if we intervene and provide land at a lower price than the market we favour some businesses. I think we have to have specific criteria. If this

was saying that we were going to look at start-up businesses and we were going to provide it, I would perhaps look upon it differently because you could offer some discounts for the start-up and they can then move on into the commercial sector.

But I think we have to be careful as a government, what we are going to do? I think what we should be doing as a government, is providing the policies and I think the policies provide the land suitable to satisfy the demand. I do not see the need for the States to intervene other than continue with Fontaine Vinery, extend it for a period of time, which I understood is going to happen, until this policy comes up, and see if it does deliver. I think it will deliver because owners of those vineries will see the uplift in value.

I showed that just an open yard site will give the uplift in value from about £30,000 to nearer £80,000, so there is a considerable uplift which will more than pay for the clearance of the glass. That policy is being softened with the further amendment from Deputy Queripel which allows some of the glasshouses to stay up and possibly be used for other purposes. So I think we have a vehicle which will satisfy the need, and we do not need this amendment.

Although I am very sympathetic to the need for local businesses I do not see the purpose of this at this time. I think we can, as a government, spend better time doing other work.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache to be followed by Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Ferbrache: Thank you, sir.

Can I say the two best speeches – and I know it is not a contest of who has made the two best speeches – made in this debate so far are the one that has just been made and the one by Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Dorey makes many, many good points and Deputy Parkinson, at one time I thought 'Why can we support this?' Because there will be hideous problems if we support it. But when I heard the wise words of Deputy Parkinson say he is not going to oppose it, he believes that the deadlines might be too tight, he has made that point very clear, but he will come back with something in a reasonable period of time. I fully accept that, because he is a person who does what he says and he has only been in office for a short time.

But when I hear words, and I was going to save it for another day, but I am going to mention part of it today. When we came into office as the Economic Development Committee we were not obviously fully constituted until 18th May. We looked through, we had our induction process, we were told what work had been done, and what I am going to say is not a criticism of any civil servant at all, in fact just the opposite. I was impressed by the work of the officers who generally had worked for Commerce & Employment before and then had transferred to us with the transfer of government.

But what surprised me was that ... and I fully support it even though I do not understand it, and that is why Deputy Dudley-Owen is leading our committee in that direction. So much effort by the previous committee that we replaced, had been put into Fintech and Finance. So much effort. I value that, it is worth it, and it was considerable, and it was good.

When we went up as five people on 18th May, my colleagues had just been elected on that day, we went up and we met the Construction Industry Forum. They said that was the first time they had seen a politician for years. We found that in relation to tourism, we found that in relation to so many matters that there had been this overwhelming desire to go out and get the great big businesses from afar – which I favour – but we neglected our local industries. We neglected our local businesses.

I heard what Deputy Laurie Queripel said, much of it was sense, but he was on the Commerce & Employment Department for a period of time – (*Laughter*) I apologise, I did not see you.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, Deputy Ferbrache, for giving way.

I think yesterday – or was it the day before? – he was reprimanding Deputy Lester Queripel for getting very excited and carried away. I think you are being a bit ungenerous to the Commerce & Employment Department of the previous term. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) A lot of work was done, hence the Tourism Strategy that you were talking about today, that was worked up with the tourist industry at the time, and that was the strategy that went forward. And the same, a lot of work was done with small businesses and the Construction Forum, so perhaps a little thought on the words would be much appreciated.

Deputy Ferbrache: I do not retract one syllable of what I have said, because I am telling you what the five of us were told when we went to see the Construction Industry Forum on 18th May, that is what we were told by the numerous people that were in that room.

And when I say that no work was done, I found very little evidence of any practical work being done and any practical policies, and I did not see any policy that was going to help light industry going forward. I did not see any policy that was going to help the construction industry going forward. I did not see any policy of any real practical substance that was going to help the tourist industry forward. (*Interjections*)

So if I offend Deputy Brouard, who I think may have been on that committee, and if I offend Deputy Laurie Queripel, who I think was on that committee for a time, well, then I offend them. It is not the intent. (*Laughter*) I am stating what I believe was accurate from the information. And I have been President of this Committee now for the last five months or so, and I and all four of my colleagues have worked diligently really covering ground that, frankly, should have been covered before. But we are where we are.

Deputy Dorey is right when he says it goes beyond Fontaine Vinery, completely correct, but Fontaine Vinery is a practical problem and, whether it is February, March or it could be extended to April or May, it is a practical problem for the businesses that are there. They do not want to be there but they have got nowhere else to go, they would much rather have somewhere they could put down their roots for the next five or 10 years (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) rather than think, 'We have only got another six months', or whatever it may be.

One of the officers at Commerce & Employment, now an officer at Economic Development, worked diligently a long time ago trying to sort out Fontaine Vinery. He spent a lot of time on it and, as Deputy Fallaize says, he, I and Deputy Laurie Queripel, have exchanged various emails over this topic for the last month or two. And Deputy Mooney – who is not here today, he is away on other business – has spent hours and hours and hours, he has not only physically walked the various sites that might be available, he has spoken to the people at Fontaine Vinery, he has spoken in the wider context to people because we are trying to achieve a practical solution.

It is very interesting to hear, because if I had spoken before Deputy Parkinson, I was going to say what is the president of his board going to say, and he said it and he said it very well. I am going to ask – and I see there are only two members of Policy & Resources, if I am right, in the room at the moment – one of them, if they wish, to speak on this matter and say what Policy & Resources are doing in connection with it because Deputy Laurie Queripel praised Deputy St Pier in his speech. What are they going to do to help assist in connection with this very real problem?

Can I say there has been a lot of work done, and I will not go over all of it, but the States Property Services have identified nine prospective sites of 10,000m² in private ownership. Now, those are predominantly derelict – whatever that word might mean, and I accept Deputy Oliver saying it is a dangerous word to define – glasshouses sites, which would well offer alternative accommodation, particularly to the current open storage facilities at Fontaine Vinery. Those sites have been whittled down by Property Services and they are confident that what they call the 'theoretical demand' – whether it is theoretical or real – the demand for four acres or so could be so satisfied. It is Deputy Dorey's point that he made a few minutes ago.

Now, there are a number of businesses which require land for heavy industrial uses so Economic Development has written to Deputy Parkinson's board, they have written to Deputy Brehaut's board and they have written to Deputy Gollop's authority. As I understand it, and this is

not meant as a criticism, the only response we have had so far, or confirmation for support, is from Deputy Parkinson's board. That is not to say we are not going to get it from the others, but we just have not heard any material detail yet so that is not meant as a criticism in any way. I do not want to criticise anybody because I do not want somebody else standing up saying I have offended them.

But we emphasise our commitment to working with businesses both at Fontaine Vinery and elsewhere and, as I say, I repeat the commendable work done by one of our officers in particular and by our colleague Deputy Mooney. In fact they have met with tenants in relation to that vinery up to and including the end of September, to understand how they view Property Service's proposals and they are continuing to work closely with them.

With every good intention there is a consequence and Deputy Parkinson has already, frankly, alluded to that. What the (a) of the Amendment 32 says, is that the various committees – that is, the States Trading Supervisory Board, in consultation with the Committee for Economic Development – by no later than the end of January, identify and indicate to the Planning Authority and to the Environment Committee suitable areas of land consisting of at least four acres.

Let's say they can come up with six acres – I am plucking that figure from the air, because it says *at least* four acres, but let's say they have got six acres that could be suitable. What is the cost going to be of clearing the sites or doing the work necessary, putting the infrastructure in? Who is going to pay for that? What are the rents going to be? And what is going to happen if you have got six acres? I am just using that figure for pure theory, I do not know whether there are four acres. Let's say you have got six acres but you have got a demand for 26. What are you going to do? How are you going to price it?

What you would normally do in the commercial sector is think, 'I have got a restaurant for sale, there are 25 people interested in that. My goodness me – I can get £2 million where I thought I could get £200,000!' So are the States going to say, because we are the States we have got to reflect it, we have got to give it at a discounted rate? Those are issues that will be addressed in the next three to six months. I am not discounting them; I am just saying these are very, very difficult issues and there are no easy answers.

So let us not go away today having patted ourselves on the back saying we have done something for this industry, which I thoroughly agree with Deputy Laurie Queripel we need to do. It needs support, whether that support is in the form that Deputy Dorey has so well expressed or otherwise. But there are no easy answers; there will be no easy solutions. There will be no free solutions.

We have got to continue to do what we are doing and we have got to give as much support as we can to people. But equally, and it is a phrase I have used in another context, the States is not your money, you have got to go out and look for yourself. You are grown-ups and you have got to develop your businesses yourself and help yourself. The States is there to give what assistance it can. It is not there, especially in these particular economic times, to solve all your problems.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Sir, I do have to say I worry about some of the headlines that might go out following today's debate and partly for the reasons that I think Deputy Ferbrache was starting to allude to at the end.

It is not mentioned in the amendment, which I believe we are going to pass, and I intend to vote in favour of, but listening to Deputy Laurie Queripel I think the media might be thinking affordable, cheap facilities for light industry are on the way thanks to the States. I am not sure that is actually going to be the case, even if this amendment goes all the way through.

Land has a value. Deputy Parkinson has said the preparation of that land for this use would have a cost. We would have to look to get a commercial return and that may not make it affordable in some people's eyes, particularly if they are in a fairly low-profit industry.

3720 I thought I heard Deputy Laurie Queripel saying we can subsidise it as a States because it is no different to giving a grant to Visit Guernsey to advertise the Island for that industry, or giving a grant to Guernsey Finance to advertise for the finance sector. It is *completely* different! Both of those are trying to promote the whole of their industries. Here, if we give subsidised, cheap rents we will have individual companies with a subsidised rent competing head-on with competitors in other parts of the Island paying a commercial rent. How on earth can we justify distorting the market to that degree?

3725 So I am all in favour of us making sure land is available and I think really that is what this amendment is saying, land is available for people to rent if they are able to pay the going rate. But I do not think we should be sending out the message, 'Don't worry if you are a really marginal company because we are going to do something fit for you, as the States'. It would be lovely to be Mr Benevolent like that, but I do not think it is fair on the taxpayer and it certainly is not fair on the competitors who will be elsewhere in the Island trying to compete head-on with the people on the site.

3735 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Stephens.

Deputy Stephens: Thank you, sir.

I rise partly to make response to Deputy Ferbrache's query. But before I do, we began the day with some literary allusions and I think we are now getting into Agatha Christie, 'And then there was one'. But you are right, there are only two members of P&R here at the moment.

3740 I think I have to say that one of the important considerations that will come up with the Policy & Resources plan, are the proposals of the need to ensure a healthy economy and we recognise that to do this we have to support businesses and put in place the right conditions for them to flourish. So going forward if there is any support we could give to Deputy Ferbrache and his Committee then we would be only too pleased to do so.

3745 One thing that does occur to me is that perhaps when we get to the end of this debate and we begin to think about putting the lid on the box of this round of consideration of planning, it might be time just to be sure that the Strategic Land Use Plan is absolutely appropriate for our needs. I know that it is E&I's responsibility to compile that and make sure that it is appropriate, but P&R can also contribute to that activity by making sure that it is aligned with the P&R plan.

3750 So there is another opportunity for collaborative working. But I do assure Members that P&R will act in any way they can to co-ordinate a good result from this debate.

Thank you, sir.

3755 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you.

It is nothing personal, Deputy Ferbrache, this microphone is closer, that is all it is, I can assure you!

3760 I just wanted to remind Members that at the Fontaine Vinery – and, by the way, I am supportive of this amendment and I say that from the outset – the tenants were given three years and they needed another three years so they were given three years. They asked for another three years and they were given three years. I think they have now asked for another 12 months and it looks like they probably will get the period that possibly has been alluded to already.

3765 Now, they want to be a tenant of the States because the States are a good, responsible landlord. And the States, at the moment, is charging a reasonable rent, so I understand why that relationship works. But one of the most frustrating expressions because it is over-used was ... and I think Deputy Graham Gill coined it at the time, when he spoke about 'Fred in the shed'. Well, it sounded like there was somebody in a shed wrapping Christmas presents! It is almost like you wanted one, you have done your landscape and 'I know what I forgot to do, I didn't get a "Fred in the Shed"'. It was such a friendly concept when actually they were not very friendly businesses,

they were very dirty businesses, they were noisy businesses, they brought with them a lot of traffic, a lot of vans and lorries and heavy plant.

If you remember, that was in the context of some years' ago if you wanted a skip you paid £80 or actually £100 to £140 for a skip. The skip disappeared from your property and where did it go? It went to a vinery, it was tipped upside down, it was set alight and all the metal was taken from it.

Who wanted to live next door to a vinery that should not have been used for that purpose, but was being used for that purpose? Yet Members were out there saying, 'Give these people somewhere where they can do that'. Now, who would you have as a tenant and who wouldn't you? What about the plumber, the electrician, the carpenter, the roofer, the signwriter, the marine engineer, the commercial flooring company, the shopfitters? Where do you begin and end? I am not too clear whether we know the type of people that we want to assist here. I think once you open the door ajar, then you are giving a signal that the States is going to do something for you and you will create a demand.

If we do have somewhere and presuming there is a shed, it will need hard-standing, drainage, three-phase electricity and that all comes at some considerable expense – not to the States, but to the taxpayer. So what are the criteria then? Who has this great facility subsidised by the taxpayer? I want to know if we are going to have that arrangement and I would need to ask them, are they good employers? Do they pay above the minimum wage? Do they pay their insurance? Do they pay their taxes, do they pay their bills? Will they pay their rent? The minute you become a landlord, the minute you own a large built structure with tenants you already have quite a burden of admin, and that would take some management too.

Now, despite that downbeat view I still believe this is something worth looking into, but I am more drawn to the arguments made by Deputy Dorey here this afternoon, sir.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, sir.

I do not know whether I am flattered or not, but it is rarely I am asked not by just one but two Members of this Assembly to speak on something that I am not a party to! But there we go.

In relation to Deputy Tindall's comment, the first thing I would like to say is that we have all listened to her views of the DPA on all the amendments so far, and this is the one I have found most disappointing. To me, it is another example of the bureaucratic process helping to kick a can down the street because it will not provide a solution. And that is what we need.

And why do we need it? Because the matter is *urgent*.

I was on the States Property Sub-Committee in the last term and this issue came up a couple of years before the end. All sorts of things were done and I will not go into it, but the problem was not solved.

As for Deputy Yerby, all I have to say is that I think some people have got an inflated view of what powers on our Committee we actually have. Most of our powers are nothing more than making recommendations and that is it! If you look at our budget it is miniscule.

One thing I can say is in one of our fairly frequent coffee mornings or afternoons where we meet just politically, we were all of the view that nobody should be evicted from the Fontaine Vinery until they had premises to go to. That is the criterion because how do you put all this equipment out on the street?

Now, there is a solution and Deputy Ferbrache brought it up earlier in relation to parking. If we want to reduce parking spaces at Frossard House, we could set aside two-thirds of the spaces to park commercial plant and vehicles. I know that is not going to happen but it makes the point that some of these businesses require nothing more than a parking space for stuff – and there are a lot of them. I met one recently who operates out of a large van and does not know what to do with it at night. He usually gets parked at Ville au Roi. And that is all that is required and sometimes the infrastructure can be quite minimal.

3825 There is also mention of the Belgrave Vinery site. What is interesting, and what was mentioned, is that part of it is, as it were, not a bog. The bog part could be very suitable for some of these businesses; and I do not know if you know but there is a big crusher down there at the moment and it has crushed vast quantities of rubble which could actually be laid over the site and bring it above the water table! The solution is almost there, so it may not be quite as expensive as we think.

3830 All I have to say is that it is an urgent matter, it has to be solved and we have been kicking this can down the road for years and years and years. Identifying sites all over the Island which could be used is not good enough, because what happens then is you go to the sites and they do not want to do it. The owners do not want to do it, or some of the owners have a view of rents which nobody could afford. So just identifying sites is not good enough.

3835 That is why I think the use of States' sites is here and rents are already being collected. I am not sure that they are particularly low and in fact the service provided for those rents is nothing more than providing the land, really. I have been down to Fontaine Vinery to look at granite and talk to a scaffolder. It is not exactly a site for light industry. Quite often it is nothing more than somewhere to store materials out in the open.

3840 So I would urge Members to support this purely because it is urgent; and secondly, because we can find a solution. If there is one thing I would like this Assembly to do, it is actually provide solutions. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) No more kicking things down the road.

So please, support this amendment.

3845 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

I will support this amendment but it is almost going full circle because we had this about seven year ago, when we heard a great cry about there was a need for land and people were needing to move out of Fontaine Vinery – in fact I think it was even before they started with Fontaine Vinery.

3850 So with this amendment here, you could change the name from Economic Development to Commerce & Employment because they were directed to do it last time and the Planning Authority you could put in place for the Environment Department. I was in the Environment Department at the time, seven or eight years ago, and we had this where there was not enough land for people to operate at a reasonable rent and the States were directed to go and have a look at that. It will probably be the same staff who will be doing it in the Environment Department because many of them are still there and I see them regularly.

3860 They have produced a list of many sites that were available, mother warehouses or indeed sites that were available. And they produced that and they gave that back to Commerce & Employment and they said, 'Please give that list to those who are telling you there is nowhere. These are the premises that are available'.

And you have only got to do your own research on the internet, go on the estate agent sites which actually do commercial properties. I only looked about three weeks ago and there is still a whole list of sites that are available. The difference being that they are commercial rents.

3865 I have a huge amount of sympathy for many of these that are on Longue Hougue, because some of them have been operating at not even a peppercorn rent. They were operating from sheds, some were operating from Leale's Yard which did not even have the facilities there – they were using generators. And they had successful, local small businesses. So to come out of there and then to suddenly find that they had to compete with others that would have been operating in the same field as some of them, that have been paying commercial rents, obviously it was a huge shock to them and that is why some of them went to Fontaine Vinery and struggled for quite some time. Others did not even feel that was the appropriate thing to do and they closed their business down.

3870

So, yes, I am supporting this. But I really believe there are still sites out there, there are commercial rents, and it is very difficult getting that balance of local businesses that are small, local businesses which have operated for so long. And some of them are dirty or noisy businesses.

The prime answer for it could be in the hands of the Environment. Get rid of those terrible derelict houses at Vale Avenue, pull them down and let scaffolding and businesses like that operate from that site with a high hedge in front. Who wants to build housing right alongside the power station when it has just cost the States a considerable amount of money purchasing seven properties? That site is not going to be the appropriate site for development for housing at all. Would you want to build alongside the power station when you know the difficulties that are there? And whether we use the cable or not, they are still going to have use those generators to make sure they are well maintained and run so they can be put on when appropriate.

So we do have sites, we have common-sense sites. Do we want to look at that mess continually along Vale Avenue, because it is supposed to be listed? I think there needs to be some serious discussions at Environment where they could actually help out a lot quicker by common sense approval of demolishing those buildings at Vale Avenue. Have them there, it is perfect by St Sampson's. Dirty goods can come off the boats at St Sampson's, straight there, right by the Power Station to Vale Avenue. Not much traffic having to go through all the roads right across the Island.

So there is one solution for you. And I do hope that it will not take too long because as I say, most of it is probably there on the book, so you have just got to update it with some of the properties that are available still, even from a few years' ago.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Point of correction, sir.

Planning matters would now be in the hands of the DPA, not the Environment. Thank you.

Deputy Lowe: I appreciate that, Deputy Brehaut, I still class them all as ... *[Inaudible]* *(Laughter)*

The Deputy Bailiff: I invite Deputy Gollop, the President of the Development & Planning Authority, to respond to this amendment.

Deputy Gollop: Yes, starting with the last speech.

Few people have worked harder than Deputy Lowe in dealing with difficult neighbours, such as the Electricity Board. She mentioned the dirty neighbour issue and some people might accuse me of being a dirty neighbour. *(Laughter)* So it is all in the mind of the public.

I think we are all a bit tired and these amendments are very complicated, and even this one has gone through umpteen drafts and different proposers and seconders, and everything else. I was fascinated and entertained by Deputy Parkinson's speech because he gave a very long list of significant reasons to be extremely cautious with this and then said he was just mildly unsatisfactory, which was a wonderful understatement.

And I think that would really sum up the DPA's perspective. This amendment is unwanted, at various levels, because it is a distraction from the main line of the plan in the future. It also has issues within it. For example, I can actually support the current version; it was not the initial version, because the initial version was entirely focused on Belgrave Vinery. Now, as you know, a lot of that site is allocated for an area of housing development. Another part of it is a buffer zone, a green lung, very near to the ancient monument of Ivy Castle, Chateau de Marais. And it is, of course, a site of special scientific interest, an area of biodiversity.

Maybe, with hindsight, I regret that we could have defined the boundaries of the site, because there has been a radical change from the previous UAP in that respect. But we do also need to conserve the ecology of the area and separate the centres. So to support an amendment that was

about Belgrave would not have been appropriate and it would have sent us on a wild goose chase.

This amendment *might* come up with the goods at Belgrave Vinery because it is very flexible, actually and basically it identifies and indicates:

to the Development & Planning Authority and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure a suitable area or areas of land consisting of at least 4 acres ...

3930 – yes, I know people do not want to hear about acres –

... owned, or the occupation of which is controlled, by the States ... that could be used for light industrial use if suitable amendments were made to Guernsey's planning regime, and the Development & Planning Authority and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, by no later than 30th April, 2017,

– they will all be very busy –

to submit proposals for consideration by the State which would enable, or potentially enable, the ... Proposition to be used ...

3935 Now, that is a big 'if' as Deputy Parkinson pointed out, because there are questions, as Deputy Roffey and Deputy Ferbrache have already identified like, do you subsidise the rents or do you keep it at market levels? I assume implicitly it is at or near market levels. The amendment does not talk about subsidised rents, I think that is a side issue. But I did say to Deputy Mooney that I am sympathetic, personally, to the States particularly through P&R and Economic Development, at maybe acquiring a site and leasing it to parties that satisfy criteria.

3940 Another way of doing it, of course, and a cheaper way probably, is utilising our own land asset, which is what this amendment calls for. But that does not necessarily imply special pleadings for one trader over another. But one has to also take on board official advice that we at the DPA have had, which is that there can be misunderstandings, litigation, even judicial review and cost to the taxpayer if parties are given understandings, lettings, or leases that are unclear and politically motivated, perhaps, that then you get the inevitable, 'Oh, we want another three years; we want another year; we are not going to move; we can't move'.

3945 I am still more in the camp wanting action, wanting activity, wanting problem-solving here, as Deputy Laurie Queripel has eloquently said, but I do not think that we can run into this blindly. There are trading issues that I know did block before the States' Asset Management Plan, and I was one of those who probably killed it. But it was very undemocratic at the time and I think you have to be extremely careful about reallocating States' land in an official kind of way.

3950 So, yes, I support the principle, and on balance I will personally support the amendment, but do not be surprised if there is a delay in the report and do not be surprised if the answers that you receive after an open-minded process has gone on, is not what everybody in the Assembly would like to hear.

3955 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I turn to the proposer of Amendment 32, Deputy Laurie Queripel, to reply to the debate on his amendment.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

3960 I was hoping to be quite brief in my response and if I knew the Assembly was going to support the amendment I would be quite brief, so perhaps we can have a show of hands for it before I speak? (**Several Members:** Pour!)

I am not quite sure! It was not enough!

3965 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, do let Deputy Laurie Queripel decide how he is going to pursue his reply.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: I will quickly go through a few things, sir.

Deputy Gollop said we need to be cautious and careful about things like this and I think he is giving his support, he gave a bit of a mixed message but I think he has given his support. And I understand, I think he is sympathetic towards this issue. But I think basically what he is saying is that this is a complicated matter and it might be something that is inconvenient. But just because it is inconvenient does not mean it is not right. So I really think that Members should be thinking beyond the complexity and beyond the difficulty and thinking about what is right, ultimately, for this business sector, for the economy and for the Island. I think it is right that we go down this road.

He mentioned the Belgrave Vinery and he spoke about its historic significance and the various things that are down there. But I wonder if it is the concrete that is down there that is of historic significance or the fences that are there, or the packing sheds that are there because, as I said, when I opened on this amendment it is not a pristine area, there is lots of evidence that there has been artificial activity and industrial activity and commercial activity there. So it really is not the significant historic, pristine area that Deputy Gollop perhaps might be giving the impression that it is.

But I think he is right that it is a complex issue. There will not be any easy answers or easy solutions and he is right to say – and I think Deputy Brehaut said this as well – there needs to be some criteria and some mechanism, some gateway, so that we know the businesses that access these areas are the right businesses to do so.

And we will not be blindly going into this, that is why this amendment calls for a report. It does not just say we should allocate this piece of land without their being some very serious consideration first in regard to the pluses and minuses and the pros and the cons of it. So I think that covers most of the things that Deputy Gollop alluded to.

I will just jump around and go to Deputy Ferbrache next. He was right in saying that despite the fact that we had the Construction Industry Forum, during all the time I was at Commerce & Employment and of course once I left it still existed and Deputy Kuttelwascher, I think, chaired that group. Deputy De Lisle and I were members of the group and I walked away extremely frustrated. I have to say that it was a great talking shop but very little action emanated from all the talk that took place. I still got the impression that it was a token offering on behalf of Commerce & Employment and there was not a great will to get the sleeves rolled up and look for proper solutions, despite the requests by Deputy Kuttelwascher, Deputy De Lisle and myself. There was really very little that came out of it that we could say would be of benefit to the industry. We pushed for many things to be done and very little came through.

Deputy Ferbrache is right, there has been a lot of focus – and I am not saying that focus should not be there on Fintech and Finance and the digital greenhouse, and things like that. All these things are done for a good reason because we know that there is a very good chance that it would be a good outcome for the Island economically and in other ways. But that is the same argument for this and if we put this infrastructure in place I firmly believe there will be a good outcome for the Island strategically and economically. Also, I would just remind Economic Development of part of their mandate which is to be responsible for the promotion and the development of all sectors of business – construction and manufacturing are specifically named, sir, as examples. So I think we need to give equal attention to construction and manufacturing, as much attention as we give to Fintech and Finance and digital issues as well.

Deputy Ferbrache was right, there is not and never has been a policy or a strategy with regard to the construction industry and these types of businesses, and we have really missed a trick there. I actually think that we have not made the best of these businesses in this sector, we have not helped them to realise their potential because of the lack of States' support. Deputy Ferbrache mentioned Deputy Mooney and I mentioned him in my opening remarks, and he has been extremely helpful on this, and he is very enthusiastic about this.

Deputy Mooney, because of his business background, if anybody knows how to set up a site for this kind of activity and to do the groundwork it is Deputy Mooney and, despite the slightly downward comments on the part of some Members on how it might be really expensive to put

4020 the infrastructure in place and prepare the site, Deputy Mooney who as I say is a bit of an expert
in this area, he thinks it can be done for very little and he has already given me examples of how it
can be done. I think Deputy Kuttelwascher referred to the stone crushing that is taking place
down there and actually the hard standing area that already exists on Fontaine Vinery. And if it
was going to be Belgrave, and I am not saying it will be, these things could be shifted across and
4025 we could be up and running in no time at all, because nothing fancy is needed.

Something else Deputy Ferbrache referred to was that there has been very little meaningful
activity with regard to working with the sector. Actually we had a meeting at Les Cotils a while
ago, when industry representatives were invited to come and convey their concerns and put
forward their views. It was a great evening, sir, but I do not think really the points that were made
4030 were taken on board and hence we are here at the moment.

I think Deputy Ferbrache is going to support this and I thank him for that, and he is right to try
and strike the balance and show once again where the pluses and minuses might be. But I think
we have got to look beyond that and I think we have got to look at the higher level strategic
issues here and realise what good can come out of this. And I think it was Deputy Ferbrache who
4035 spoke about the multiplier and things like that and, as I said, that work has been done at
Commerce & Employment. And we are not only talking about these businesses being involved in
the multiplier effect and helping to circulate money and add value to it, but we are also talking
about perhaps the money they can bring into the Island.

Deputy Roffey said he was going to support it – I hope he has not changed his mind. He gave
4040 a sober warning and I don't think he had a glass of wine at lunchtime but it was a sober warning!
(*Laughter*) Oh, he did have a glass of wine at lunchtime? He holds it well! (*Interjection*)

A Member: Be careful with data protection! (*Laughter*)

4045 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** But once again he tapped into this common theme that this will not
be an easy matter, there could be complexities and I fully appreciate that. I think the setting up is
a fairly easy matter, as I have said, but perhaps all the logistics and the administration and the
other issues would be quite complex. But that does not mean we should not go ahead with this it
is only, after all, calling for a report and some recommendations. I was not being flippant about
4050 this issue, I know that it is not an easy issue to address.

I thank Deputy Stephens for her words on behalf of, I presume, Policy & Resources. I think they
were very supportive words and, as I say, Deputy St Pier in the past has spoken to me on these
issues and he is sympathetic, too.

Deputy Lowe was sympathetic and, as she said, we have been here before many times over the
4055 years, and yet we have gone around in ever-decreasing circles it seems to me. It is time that we at
least tried to make some progress in this area and I thank her for her words of support. And
actually she mentioned the land near to Guernsey Electricity and that would be perhaps a good
candidate. But also another trading organisation that comes under the auspices of the States
Trading Supervisory Board is Guernsey Water. And I am just putting forward suggestions here, I
4060 am not saying any of these pieces of land should be the pieces of land, but they have areas of
land too.

And something that came up at the meeting at Les Cotils was very interesting. There was some
great frustration put forward by the traders that came there because Guernsey Water do not use
local companies often when they have work done, such as putting up fences and infrastructure
work. They bring in non-local companies and they allow those companies to park their vehicles
4065 and their plant on their land! That just seems slightly unfair with regard to local businesses,
because no local businesses are allowed to park their vehicles and their plant on Guernsey Water
land, but these businesses that come in from the UK are allowed to do so. That seems to give
them a bit of an unfair advantage.

4070 And once again, we have been talking about subsidising businesses, isn't that a way of
subsidising a non-local business when you allow them to park on your land and yet local

Guernsey companies cannot take advantage of that. So that is something perhaps that the States Trading Supervisory Board can look at.

4075 Deputy Brehaut, once again, sounded a word of caution but he was, I think, supportive and I thank him for that. And I think he is right, we do need criteria. He spoke about what the tenant mix would be and I think we have already got a good idea what the tenant mix would be because the Fontaine vinery is quite typical of the tenant mix that would perhaps be able to access this kind of site or facility. I assume all the businesses at the Fontaine are good employers because it is a site that belongs to the State and it is overseen and administered by the State. So I would have
4080 thought that would have been checked, so I am sure they all pay their taxes and their contributions and pay a decent wage, etc.

Deputy Dudley-Owen, I thank her for her support and very good words, talking about the need to look as the time goes on for greater economic diversity and how important to the economy these businesses are – very good.

4085 I thank Deputy Fallaize for his support and his words. And, actually, if the States Trading Supervisory Board did not meet their deadline or if Development & Planning did not meet their deadline it would not be the end of the world. They would not be the only States' Committees that had not been able to meet States' Resolutions and I think Deputy Fallaize and I would quite understand if they could not quite meet their timeline and their deadlines. We appreciate there is
4090 a lot of work to do.

I thank Deputy Yerby for her support as well, she made some very good comments.

Sir, I am going to leave it there and I thank all who have spoken in support. Those who have given sober warnings and spoken words of caution, I understand that, but all those things can be looked at and sorted out as this workstream progresses if the States approve it today.

4095 Thank you, sir, and I ask Members to support the amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States, we move to Amendment 32 proposed by Deputy Laurie Queripel and seconded by Deputy Fallaize.

Yes, Deputy Lester Queripel?

4100

Deputy Lester Queripel: I would like a recorded vote, please, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States, is it your wish to sit beyond 5.30 p.m. now for the purposes of a recorded vote? Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

4105 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Okay, we will proceed to the recorded vote, and sit to deal with that and the necessary sweep-up.

Deputy Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you very much; the two Alderney Representatives having left us earlier this afternoon.

4110 Now, while the votes are being tallied up, Members of the States, that amendment has been carried.

4115 Because it has gone half past five we are now into the position where this debate on Article 3, the Draft Island Development Plan is forced to be adjourned to 2nd November 2016 at 9.30 a.m. to be slotted in in its appropriate place and the two items of business that are left to be dealt with today, Articles 4 and 5, will be deferred to that meeting in accordance with the Rules.

We have one amendment left to go on this matter, amendment number 18. But we do, before closing this meeting, have to deal with the schedule for future States' business which is

Proposition 2016/47. So I will be adjourning the meeting until 2nd November unless any Member wishes to propose a different adjournment process?

4120 Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I have not consulted my Committee or anyone else, but it was the practice in the last States to sometimes debate on the Tuesday as well as the Wednesday, Thursday and Friday; and I say that because we have a Budget and another major Employment Social Security report and I just fear we will run out of time again.

The Deputy Bailiff: Unless you are proposing a motion to adjourn to a different time, or you are proposing a motion that the States should continue to sit this evening, if there is no such motion then that is the way that the Rules operate.

Amendment 32

Carried – Pour 30, Contre 2, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 7

POUR

Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint
Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Yerby
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Kuttelwascher
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld

CONTRE

Deputy Dorey
Deputy Langlois

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Smithies
Deputy Le Tocq
Alderney Rep. Jean
Alderney Rep. McKinley
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy St Pier

4130

The Deputy Bailiff: Now, the voting on Amendment 32, Members of the States, was as follows: there voted *Pour* 30, *Contre* 2, and for that reason the amendment is declared carried.

Deputy Lowe.

4135

Deputy Lowe: Mr Deputy Bailiff, sir, I am quite happy to put it to the States so somebody can put something on the floor to give them an opportunity if they wish to continue debating this.

I think the next amendment is a pretty simple one, it is only a technical one, really. But of course there is still general debate and it depends how many people want to speak in general debate. If there are lots of us well, obviously, forwarding to November would be the ideal

4140 opportunity. If there are not many of us who want to speak in general debate then I suggest we perhaps continue on until we finish this evening?

So I am just putting that to all of you if you wanted something on the table to say we continue this evening without a break, I am happy to propose that.

4145 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Will it assist if Members who wish to speak on, first of all, Amendment 18 were to rise in their places to give an indication? Clearly, the proposer and the seconder and the President would be speaking. If nobody else was minded to speak on that one then that is that one.

And in general debate?

4150 It is a matter for you, Deputy Lowe, with those indications as to whether you want to propose something other than adjourning to 9.30 a.m. on 2nd November.

Deputy Lowe: I am happy to propose that we continue, but if Members want to throw that out I have no problem with it being 2nd November. It is down to the Members to take a vote on it.

4155

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

4160 **Deputy Brouard:** Sir, I am also conscious that it has been quite a busy three days for everybody and I think it would be very useful to take stock. We are also missing today, through States business, some of our senior politicians and I think it would be very useful for them to have their say in general debate on one of the most important plans that we have got before us for the next 10 years, sir.

4165 So I would urge Members to perhaps suspend for tonight. We have got the layover days, that is what they were designed for, that is what SAC put forward and I recommend to the States we go on that basis.

I also have a flight to catch but that has nothing to do with it! *(Laughter)*

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

4170

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

4175 Could I suggest perhaps that – and I am not saying this because it is my amendment – but whether we just clear the amendment, because then all the amendments will have been done. The Development & Planning Authority will know that all the amendments had been done, and they can then take the period until 2nd November to reflect on this deferral business which is provided for in the Rules?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

4180 **Deputy Tindall:** Just to say, I think you referred to it, but there is another proposition that is coming through which is, as you mentioned, a sweep-up proposition and, to be honest, to actually read through that will take about 15 minutes. I have seen it myself.

So from my perspective as the general debate will be delayed, I just thought I would point that out.

4185

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

4190 **Deputy Roffey:** In support of Deputy Lowe's proposal, I really worry that if we take stock as has been suggested we could end up with another 10 amendments. **(A Member: Yes!)** So for that reason alone I would like to crack on and finish.

The Deputy Bailiff: Okay. Well, because this is in my gift, let me propose now in accordance with the proviso to Rule 6(2) that the States continue sitting to deal with Amendment 18, and then we will take stock again.

Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

4195 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I am going to declare that carried.
I invite, therefore, Deputy Fallaize to move Amendment 18.

Amendment 18

To add two further propositions as follows:

'3. To amend section 9(4) of the Land Planning and Development (Plans) Ordinance, 2007 (and any related relevant legislation) in order that the Development & Planning Authority shall, in the future, have sole responsibility for laying before the States proposals relating to any Development Plan or draft Development Plan and associated documentation, which was the intention of the States' Review Committee but was not carried into effect by that Committee's propositions.

4. To direct the preparation of such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the above decision.'

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

Given the hour and the very simple nature of this amendment, I need only say that this ought to have been dealt with at the time of the reforms of the machinery of Government.

4200 If the States approve it then legislation will be prepared which ensures that the Land Planning and Development (Plans) Ordinance of 2007 will be consistent with the mandates of the Development & Planning Authority and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, in the sense that the Development & Planning Authority will have responsibility both for preparing and presenting to the States' development plans, and the Committee for the Environment &
4205 Infrastructure will have responsibility for advising on compliance with the Strategic Land Use Plan and environmental policy generally.

I believe this amendment has the support of the Presidents of both the Development & Planning Authority and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, and I hope Members can support it.

4210

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

Deputy Dorey: Yes, I formally second it; and just to say, as a member of the new Committee, it was quite clear from our July 2015 report that is what we proposed.

4215

The Deputy Bailiff: Is there any debate on this amendment?

Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I did support it, but after the last three days I would prefer Deputy Brehaut had the responsibility. *(Laughter and interjections)*

4220

The Deputy Bailiff: If there is no further debate on this amendment, I doubt there is any need to reply to that, Deputy Fallaize. I will put it to the vote.

Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour

4225 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I declare that amendment duly carried.

Now, Members of the States, Proposition 1 has been amended 11 times on my reckoning. There have been seven additional propositions added, variously numbered 3 and one numbered 4. They need to be renumbered and there needs to be a composite amendment going forward, on which you can all engage on general debate.

4230 In those circumstances, unless any Member is minded to actually move a motion to either continue sitting now or alternatively to sit on an alternate day, then I will turn to Proposition P2016/47, deal with that and close this meeting.

Deputy Yerby.

4235 **Deputy Yerby:** Sir, is it possible to request clarification on Deputy Roffey's point? Will it be possible for further amendments to come forward between now and the next debate?

The Deputy Bailiff: Until there is a vote taken on the final propositions as amended, any proposition can be amended. So, yes, there could be more amendments.

4240

Deputy Yerby: In that case, sir, I lay a motion to continue debate now.

The Deputy Bailiff: Okay. Deputy Yerby is suggesting that I put to you that debate continue now – I will do so – to a conclusion. We might take a recess before actually moving on, but that will be the motion. Those in favour; those against?

4245

Some Members voted Pour; some Members voted Contre.

The Deputy Bailiff: I am going to declare that lost.

It is open to anyone when a Proposition or motion has been put to ask for a recorded vote, but I am not going to do it on this occasion. Does anyone want a recorded vote? No.

**Schedule for Future States' Business –
Proposition carried *nem. con.***

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 Meetings of 1st and 2nd November 2016 and subsequent States' Meetings, they are of opinion to approve the Schedule.

The Deputy Bailiff: We will turn to Proposition P. 2016/47. Deputy Greffier.

4250

The Deputy Greffier: Schedule for Future States' Business.

The Deputy Bailiff: Is there any debate on this matter? Are there any amendments?

No. In that case I put to the vote that the Schedule for Future States' Business be approved in the schedule that you have got in this original Proposition. Those in favour; those against?

4255

Members voted Pour.

The Deputy Bailiff: I declare that duly carried.

Before we leave, can I just thank all Members for their patience with the changed order from time to time, as we have been trying to manage a number of amendments. Can I particularly echo what has been said by a number of Members, and commend the newest Member of the States,

4260 Her Majesty's Comptroller, for his assistance throughout, (**Members:** Hear, hear.) because he, I know, has been shouldering the majority – (*Applause*) He is available for the next 30 amendments, so ... (*Laughter*)

Can I also say to Her Majesty's Comptroller, the meetings are not usually like this! (*Laughter*) There will be a simple meeting coming up in future, at which you can enjoy yourself a little bit more.

4265 Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Can I, sir, thank you as well, before we actually close today, because it has been an extremely difficult meeting, with lots of amendments coming and going and changing, and the way you have tried to keep us in order has been difficult at times. I congratulate and thank you for looking after us and steering us in the right direction.

Members: Hear, hear. (*Applause*)

4275 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you all very much.
We will now close this meeting with the Grace, please. Deputy Greffier.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.47 p.m.