



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Friday, 18th June 2021**

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

**Volume 10, No. 13**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

*Published by Her Majesty's Greffier, The Royal Court House,  
St Peter Port, GY1 2NZ. © States of Guernsey, 2021*

**Present:**

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

**Law Officers**

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

**People's Deputies**

S. E. Aldwell	N. R. Inder
C. P. A. Blin	A. Kazantseva-Miller
A. H. Brouard	C. J. Le Tissier
Y. Burford	M. P. Leadbeater
T. L. Bury	D. J. Mahoney
A. Cameron	A. D. S. Matthews
D. de G. de Lisle	L. J. McKenna
H. L. de Sausmarez	C. P. Meerveld
A. C. Dudley-Owen	N. G. Moakes
J. F. Dyke	V. S. Oliver
S. P. Fairclough	C. N. K. Parkinson
S. J. Falla	R. G. Prow
P. T. R. Ferbrache	P. J. Roffey
A. Gabriel	A. W. Taylor
J. A. B. Gollop	L. S. Trott
S. P. Haskins	S. P. J. Vermeulen
M. A. J. Helyar	

**Representatives of the Island of Alderney**

Alderney Representative E. A. J. Snowdon

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

S. Ross, Esq. (States' Greffier)

**Absent at the Evocation**

Deputy G. A. St Pier (*indisposé*), Alderney Representative S. Roberts (*indisposé*);  
Deputies J. P. Le Tocq (*relevé à 9h 32*), R. C. Murray (*absent*);  
H. J. R. Soulsby (*relevée à 9h 46*), L. C. Queripel (*relevé à 10h 49*)

## Business transacted

Evocation .....	765
Convocation .....	765
<b>Billet d'État XIII .....</b>	<b>765</b>
12. Future Harbour Development – Debate continued .....	765
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.31 p.m. and resumed at 2.30 p.m.</i> .....	801
Future Harbour Development – Debate concluded – Propositions 5-7 (as amended) carried.....	802
14. Scrutiny Management Committee – Freedom of Information Review – Voting results: Proposition 1b carried .....	835
Procedural – Proposal to extend sitting – Not carried.....	835
15. Schedule for Future States' Business – Proposition carried.....	836
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.21 p.m.</i> .....	837

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m.*

[THE DEPUTY BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## **PRAYERS**

*The States' Greffier*

## **EVOCAATION**

## **CONVOCAATION**

# Billet d'État XIII

## **STATES' TRADING SUPERVISORY BOARD**

### **12. Future Harbour Development – Debate continued**

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq, do you wish to be relevéd?

5 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Thank you, madam.

**The States' Greffier:** Billet d'État XIII, the continuation of the debate.

10 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Thank you, madam. Good morning, Members. I want to commend Deputy Brouard for his speech yesterday because I was coming into this policy letter thinking that I absolutely had no interest in option 3 whatsoever and would never even consider it but I think Deputy Brouard and others, Deputy Prow, made quite a strong point, that it is important to consider  
15 a number of options.

It also, I think, again, showcases the quality of this policy paper and the way it has been presented to us in terms of really providing an array of options providing technical information supporting them so it does allow us to compare the different options and for Deputies, if they disagree with the preferred options, to go ahead and build a strong argument.

20 It also perhaps speaks to the quality of debating of several of the Deputies, many of the Deputies we have in the Assembly, that they could probably sell ice to the Eskimo if so required. So after yesterday's debate on amendment 6 regarding option 3, it left me in a little bit of a conundrum because I was lucky. I thought, I was quite convinced that actually options 5 and 6 were the right

25 direction of travel and so then I thought now it is getting a bit more complicated because, potentially, we have option 3 on the agenda.

Then I thought we need to go back to the basics. We need to go to the first principles of what we are trying to do with this policy paper and fundamentally this is about the future commercial port requirements, which will be set in stone for the next 50 to possibly 100 years. Underpinning those requirements is the Jacob Study, which is on page 18. It is a quite comprehensive study. I have  
30 an issue with one of those forecasts, which I bring through amendments later but the forecasts and the predictions in terms of the commercial activity of our harbours seem quite solid.

They are also based on Government policy that has been approved by the States of Deliberation, such as the Energy Policy, the Hydrocarbon Policy and predictions, so those forecasts really underpin the long-term thinking. They align with policies that have been established by this  
35 Assembly.

So when we, as Deputies, try to jump in and say, 'Well, actually the hydrocarbon requirements are going to potentially fall off the cliff,' that is not really quite true. I would like to think that after 10 years, our hydrocarbon requirements and demands will fall through the cliff, but that is not going to happen.

40 As the Energy Policy, Hydrocarbon Policy, and I am sure Deputy de Sausmarez might speak to that later, there is a plan of how that is going to happen. We are not going to suddenly transition, after 10 years, to electric, or not use diesel and fuel and aviation fuel and so on. It is just not going to happen.

So I think we have to take, really, those demand forecasts, as really the basis of this policy letter because they underpin the spatial requirements that are needed from a commercial port to deliver future-proofing port facilities for the next century. So the spatial requirements that you can see in the last column of table 2 underpin basically the commercial port requirements that we will require to operate our commercial port facilities and so this is the reason, I think, why we see that option 3 and options 5 and 6 were kind of designed on a higher level in that specific way.

50 I do not see any political conspiracy in trying to design an option bigger than another option, like some Deputies might think. It really, I think, arises from the forecast figures and the spatial requirements of those figures. Yes, perhaps there is an opportunity to do option 3 in a different way, slightly smaller way, but actually the spatial requirements are there underpinned by the demand forecast study.

55 Ultimately, if you come to the first principles of this policy, it is about where will the commercial activity of our Island go for the next 100 years and what option 3 fundamentally says is that they will go at the heart of our Town and I just cannot bring myself to think that this is a good idea. This is a decision I want to make today that our commercial activities will be locked into this very substantial development off the back of our beautiful Town for the next 100 years.

60 Deputy Brouard came up with some interesting ideas about doing a road outside of the 3(3) of option 3, to potentially mitigate some of the impacts. One of the criticisms, I believe, of the Island development so far is that we do not have a comprehensive infrastructure development plan, holistic across the Island.

The Island Development Plan in its last iteration tried to consolidate key industrial areas a little bit more, they are called the KIAs and so there are key industrial designated areas, one of which is around Longue Hougue South. That is where the commercial freight, the Ferryspeeds etc. they ultimately travel.

This is where, if you are importing sand, aggregates, everything else, this is where it is all concentrated. If we are going back to those very first principles, I just cannot see how I could accept  
70 an option which says let us start importing hazardous oil and fuel into St Peter Port, let us import sand and aggregates, let us build an industrial, commercial port at the heart of the jewel of our crown. I know there are challenges with other options, no option is perfect, but I just think if you go to those fundamental principles, I cannot see how I could envision an industrial harbour off the back of St Peter Port.

75 In terms of the marine economy, it is not about what happens in the harbour in terms of the water, the adjacent land you need to enable your commercial economy relating to whether it is importation relating to the blue economy, relating to energy, to potential production of hydrogen, etc., importation of aggregates, which we are likely to need to do in 40 years, you need adjacent land and potentially lots of it, depending on how your economy will evolve and by locking ourselves  
80 in option 3, we are highly limiting that available land for any future activity.

So I think that is extremely short-sighted and what it will likely mean is that at some point we will still need to build a commercial harbour somewhere else because just unfortunately we are not going to have the requirements of option 3 delivered to us.

85 It also basically leaves some commercial activity in St Sampson's. It will leave the NAABSA vessels for now and potential fuel importation, it will potentially leave some of the important of construction materials in St Sampson's. So St Sampson's will be left pretty much as is in terms of the opportunity for development.

90 In terms of the development of the leisure option, which I am keen on and I am bringing together with Deputy Haskins, hopefully a few amendments on that issue, there will still be a limitation in terms of what you can do in St Peter Port Harbour, especially given that St Sampson's will not be released for leisure. Just imagine the implications of the commercial traffic that will forever be locked into going around St Peter Port.

95 The other fundamental, effective fundamental principle of this policy paper, which was around de-conflicting the use and something I think Deputy Falla alluded to yesterday is that fundamentally I do not think this solves this problem. You will have little boats coming out of the same harbour mouth as big boats. You will have eight, nine-year-old sailors learning to sail, coming out of the harbour with more bigger boats.

100 So I really do not see how the de-confliction outside, there will still be an improvement, but it is not fully solved and there will be as much, more confliction on land because of all the traffic you are going to have there. This is going back to the basic principles of what we are trying to do. I think it really fails that test for me.

105 Deputy Brouard mentioned about the, I think it was called the optimism bias, the 66% cost. It is there but it is applicable to every other option. So every other option has the 66% bias. But in general this option is estimated to be at least 30% more expensive than the preferred option. So I do not think the argument that the optimism bias, if you take it out, it makes the whole project cheaper because every other option has the same basic situation.

110 So I do think there are challenges around 5 and 6. I would like to see more work done in trying to mitigate those challenges, but just going back to those basic principles I described about where you want to fix the location of the commercial port for the next 100 years, I just fundamentally cannot see how we could make a decision to lock this location into St Peter Port and I think on this basis I cannot in principle support this option and this amendment at this stage. Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Matthews.

115 **Deputy Matthews:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Bailiff. I am not a nautical person. I do not own a boat and my seafaring experience is mostly as a passenger on the Condor Sark boat or Travel Trident. But like all Islanders I am greatly affected by our harbour. It is how most of our goods arrive and it is fundamental to the experience of living on an Island.

120 This question of where should our commercial port be located is fundamental to how the States makes decisions. If you ask me where in Guernsey should ships dock, my answer would be St Peter Port. The clue is in the name. Not Longue Hogue. Those who I have asked with much more knowledge of the sea than I have tend to agree. Deputies Brouard and Prow have presented convincing reasons to locate the commercial port at St Peter Port.

125 I do have some concerns. It does cost £100 million more than the option put forward by STSB. But if a new port lasts 100 years then £1 million per year to have it in the right place seems reasonable. Like Deputy Inder, I wonder if these costs are really set in stone or just more provisional

estimates and, like Deputy Oliver, I wonder if the layout presented on page 24 could not be improved upon.

130 Like Deputy Haskins, I wonder if the potential income from the blue economy could be much greater and, like Deputy Dyke, I would like to know much more about the commercial case. Like Deputy Roffey, I do care about the visual impact, but I am not convinced a modern structure needs to be ugly. And unlike Deputy Ferbrache, I am not concerned that voting for this amendment knocks out the other options. The work on developing those are some costs but could be salvaged if needed.

135 With all these questions, I feel like we are like the mariners of old, in uncharted waters. But we cannot simply drift. We must set a course. I would set that course for St Peter Port. But we must be vigilant and nimble and prepared to change. I believe we should answer some of these questions quickly. That is to say without spending £4 million and taking four years.

140 The two answers I want most urgently are, firstly, what is the visual impact? Try as I might, I cannot visualise what the new harbour might look like based on the plans. I am sure there is more that can be done to help me and everyone else. If I can get a visual representation for a new kitchen, we should be able to do more for a new harbour. If the best design we can come up with resembles a concrete carbuncle, I will reluctantly admit we should change tack.

145 Secondly, what is the business case? If it does not make commercial sense, the idea will run aground. But with positive outcomes to these two questions, I believe St Peter Port is the right answer and that is why I will be supporting this amendment.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby, do you wish to be relevéd?

150 **Deputy Soulsby:** Yes please, madam.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

155 **Deputy Gollop:** Yes, I think Deputy Matthews has made a very cogent, concise and impressive speech there, because I agree with the flavour of all of it actually. In getting to this process, most of us States' Members, and I am very much a landlubber who never even sailed out in a bathroom tub really. I did go on the Model Yacht Pond once but I was sort of a walking, not footballer but a walking sailor. Never mind!

160 We heard from Deputy Kazantseva-Miller about the issues of young, inexperienced sailors perhaps mixing with the huge super tankers. Yes, that is a consideration. But of course it is in the nature of things that if we got back, and hopefully we will, probably Deputy Inder would agree with me here and Deputy Vermeulen, if we got back the cruise liner sector then when you have on your nice trips to Herm or, when you are happily sailing along on the briny sea on a sunny day, these little craft, amateur sailors enjoying their pastime, you are confronted with some of the largest ships in the world and that is challenging.

165 It will be challenging in the future because I would imagine the cruise liners will get even bigger and they will continue to be in the Russel and would prefer St Peter Port, I suspect, to Longue Hougue or St Sampson's because that is a jewel that is the centre of attention.

170 But we do have to look at the safety and look at all the permutations. To me, if one looks at the spirit of the last States and the work very respected for harbour pilots and marine aficionado and a lecturer too in the subject, Mr Barry Paint – and Deputy Inder did – there was clear interest not only from States' Members but from the maritime community in extending St Peter Port.

175 Of course I was impressed by Mr Stuart Falla, CBE's presentation. His message and the whole STSB message, because it is a group, collective effort, was very much that Guernsey politicians today, and we are the people who end up making the decision, ultimately, have to have some of the vision of their predecessors, of States of old.

I could of course add to that that in those days many of the leading States' Members were rectors and Jurats and indeed perhaps it was not a democratic Assembly in the way we would like to think.



180 Maybe that was a good thing in some respects, because they were less liable to be put off track by various siren voices.

But another difference between our era and theirs was there was less of a segmentation between being an officer at operational level and a politician at States' level and I believe there were some Jurats in the past and States' Members who were effectively supervisors and had businesses and other capabilities in the maritime field.

185 I mention that because actually the St Peter Port Harbour we know and love is actually an incremental development that not only was developed in the 1920s but was developed in the 1870s and even earlier than that. So we saw an evolution. Unlike some of our politicians from perhaps the more modern Treasury & Resources era that I lived through, where there was a penny pinching attitude of 'we must not spend more than we should, we have got no money left', in those days they thought big. Look at Elizabeth College. In the 1820s, only two pupils at the time, but what a huge building, like Downton Abbey. As we were told in the lecture, quite accurately, the harbour was built on a scale that we did not envisage.

190 Of course, one reason for that, that perhaps Deputy Inder might suggest, or other people with an interest in the subject, was that in the Victorian age, Guernsey had been a privateering economy. It had been key to defence against the Napoleons and so on. But there was a transition, when Guernsey was a world leader in shipping and construction of shipping as well, on all of the strands and so on, to one whereby I am afraid the north-east of England and Northern Ireland became more dominant in ship-building because we went from wood to steam and steel.

200 Now I mention that because technological change is a key element in this and one snag I think there has been with the existing portfolio that has been presented to us, is it has not altogether looked at the future-shock. I have heard people from the Chamber of Commerce and other people saying that actually, within 10 years, we may well see electric car ferries. We may well see pipelines. We may well see new forms of energy. We may well see more than a cable link-based society than today. We may even see the windmills or water mills that Deputy Lester Queripel referred to, who knows?

205 We therefore have to somehow not only think about what we need for today but also what we need for tomorrow. Looking at the aeronautical photography of Longue Hougue, it just does not feel right to commit ourselves to an area that not only is an attractive green part of the coast, not only with the weeds that Deputy Inder referred to but also, of course, the scaly cricket. But it is effectively an ecological area, with an impact on the surrounding community.

210 Now I actually agree with the vision that we have seen from Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and Deputy Haskins about moving quicker on the Bridge. I think that is right and I think maybe, if the Bridge, within a decade or sooner, could become a yacht marina, like many in Brittany or Normandy, not only will that be another Beaucette but on a bigger scale and improve the tourism soul of that part of the Island. But you know what it will also do? I think it will be a good place for young starter sailors.

215 So I do support that but I think today the most important decision is to actually support the work that Deputy Prow and Deputy Brouard have done because I think that we do at least need to put option three into the mix and voting for this amendment, I think, gives us a much stronger and more resilient future prospect than relying on Longue Hougue, which we know will not be sufficient for larger ferries for the future and I will point out here that I think in the future for Guernsey, we will not only be sailing to St Malo but to Cherbourg. I think we will need to sail more to Portsmouth, perhaps.

220 We would need to have greater resilience and capacity for a greater volume of faster transportation. Conventional ferries might become a lot faster and better. We need to plan for that future and, to me, extending St Peter Port, which is still the hub of our economy and our population to a degree, and also our society and our offer to tourism, makes more sense. I do not feel option 5 is anything more than more of a huge engineering extension. It does not really develop economic capacity. So for all those reasons, I think option 3 is the best one of the options I have seen and it should be definitely looked at, at the next stage, so I am so supportive of the amendment.

230

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

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you, madam. I cannot support this amendment for several reasons; several quite big reasons. I think Deputy Falla gave a very concise but very effective speech yesterday when he asked a simple question, does this address the issues that have been identified that we are trying to improve here, and I think the answer is no, not nearly enough. There might be some potential workarounds, some potential mitigation, but I think Deputy Kazantseva-Miller this morning went into more detail about the constraints of St Peter Port in terms of that long-term vision and I do agree with her very much that binding the commercial and industrial activity for so long into the future, in the very heart of Town, our beautiful Town, just is not sensible, either from a pragmatic point of view or an aesthetic point of view.

Aesthetics is really another one of my very serious concerns about this amendment. Deputy Matthews talked about the visualisation. Actually I was at the Chamber of Commerce last night, for a very lovely evening, and it had all the visualisations up on the board. I do not know if everyone has had an opportunity to look at those visualisations. I know the STSB has also provided some fly-throughs and things like that.

The aesthetic impact of this option is really very considerable. Deputy Brouard, in a very good opening speech – I have to say I was a little bit surprised when I saw Deputy Brouard’s name on this amendment for this very reason because I think, for reasons that are to be applauded, I always associate Deputy Brouard as being something of a guardian of aesthetic value and Guernsey’s aesthetic cultural heritage – so I was very surprised to see his name associated with this particular option.

But I do not think we can underestimate the very significant aesthetic impact that this will have. It is not a good parallel to use the creation of the QEII Marina. When we look at what is envisaged in these plans, even if you scale it down a bit, there is so much more actual development, so much hard infrastructure being proposed and that hard infrastructure will not just be a few walls, it will be significant amounts of land created, buildings on that, so I think we have got ferry terminals, we have got container storage. It is going to look like an industrial port and one of the most significant impacts, it will look like an industrial port and it will look like a large industrial port because that is what it is designed to be.

But another one of the factors is of course the breakwater and the breakwater is a very significant structure in its own right. It is tall, it is very long and it is very wide. There is no way that people are just going to not see this on the approach in St Peter Port. Now Deputy Matthews talked about the name St Peter Port – the clue is in the name – of course it still will be a port under other options. It will just be more of a leisure port. So I think we can retain the aesthetic characteristics, whilst moving forward more pragmatic solutions to the commercial aspects by relocating them, which does bring into scope new northern harbour.

Deputy Inder was hoping to hear from E&I and I cannot speak on behalf of the Committee but I can speak around the issue of sustainability and environmental impact and I would say Deputy McKenna gave a rousing speech yesterday about the need to embrace sustainability and renewable energy and things and I wholeheartedly agree, but I would not say there is anything unique about this option. Sustainability should be at the heart of any option that we progress. But there is nothing unique about this option that enables a more sustainable, stronger blue economy.

In fact, I would argue, that with the blue economy in mind, it is a much stronger proposition to separate the commercial activity from the leisure activity in a way that this option does not give us scope to do.

In terms of environmental impact there is more to an environmental impact consideration than sea grass, but I am glad Deputy Inder raised the sea grass issue because there is significantly more eel grass east of the QEII Marina than there is at Longue Hougue, that would then need to be mitigated. So that is a serious consideration.

I would say, I am not going to give a full speech about the relative environmental impact, but if we are focussing on sea grass, like eel grass, then I think that is an important consideration and it

also leads me to something else that I think is, for me personally, interesting about the STSB's proposal, which is the potential to change the design and reduce further the environmental impact of any work at Longue Hougue, potentially. I think that is an exciting area to explore.

So, actually, it could help improve the environmental impacts. You are always going to have an environmental impact. If you build in the sea or build on land there is always going to be an environmental impact. They are really important and I think as much as we can do to minimise and mitigate the better, but I do think there is more potential through the STSB's proposals, or recommendations, and I think there is far more risk associated with this particular option in that respect.

As Deputy Kazantseva-Miller also said, I am amazed at how little attention the issue of cost has been. This is a very significantly more expensive option and Deputy Inder warned at the start of this debate on this amendment that costs do seem to have a habit of inflating. Well, if we are going skyward from this starting point, then really we need to be braced for a very significant bill indeed.

So, I think the economic risk is too great. The environmental impact risk is too great. I do not think it goes far enough to address the original problems. I think, in fact, it exacerbates, potentially, existing problems. I think the aesthetic impact is too severe, and I do not think it gives us enough potential to explore fully the blue economy aspects of a future harbour development and, for those reasons, although I think it has been a very helpful debate, I cannot support this particular amendment.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle.

**Deputy de Lisle:** Thank you, madam. Longue Hougue decentralises growth, which is not good for the competitive future of Guernsey. Investment in Town is part and parcel of the successful future of the Island for competitive reasons, *vis-à-vis* other competing centres and jurisdictions around us.

It is important not to decentralise growth activity into the future, particularly as we have got a situation where the future is very undecided globally. Now Jersey has capitalised on the growth pole model in economic terms, in terms of investing in its central growth pole, St Helier, and stimulating growth and development as a result and competing very successfully with the likes of Guernsey, St Peter Port and other neighbouring jurisdictions. It has seen growth as a result.

What we want to see is some growth in the future and in order to do that, we have got to invest in our growth pole and decentralisation of growth, and that has been one of the problems in Guernsey for some time, neglecting the centre and distributing housing and economic activity all over the Island.

So I think this is a fundamental and that really is something – I will not be giving way, you have had your turn – and the fact is that Guernsey has undermined, really, its strength and its potential, by dispersing so much activity outside of its centre. So that point is one of favour with respect to this activity here, which is concentrating on further development of St Peter Port.

The one problem in my mind is the huge amount of money – £460 million is a lot of money, which is being earmarked for this particular development. It is a pity it cannot be done on a smaller scale, in terms of providing some development, which is needed on a smaller scale, such as the interest in the Pool, you know, for a few more yachts to tie-up and so on and so forth. That surely can be done within the existing budgetary ability of the harbours area, without going into these very complicated schemes.

It is the same as other things can be done as well, without these huge capital expenditures, which really do not make any sense at the current time, when the States is running a deficit and everybody is having a hard time.

So, anything we can do to invest in the Town is something that we should be looking toward, particularly given the current difficulties that the Town is having, both in retail and in hospitality and in many other areas. So certainly not Longue Hougue, certainly some investment in Town is required but really the negative to this scheme is the huge capital investment, which is far too much, given

335 the current situation that we find ourselves in. The uncertainty that we are blessed with, with the  
virus and the difficulties in the economy. So I think that I will not be supporting this thrust because  
of the large amount of expenditure and I do not think that this Island, at the current time, can afford  
it.

340 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** I rise briefly just to address three matters and the first is an observation, it is a  
fact that I have used before and I want to use it again today and that is that the QEII Marina project  
is without doubt Guernsey's most successful infrastructure project ever. It repaid in 12 years, which  
345 for infrastructure projects of that type, is unheard of. It is a phenomenal repayment rate.

That is because rock armouring a leisure facility is a cheaper option than all of the other options  
for in the marine environment and that should be obvious to all. But successful it was. Also of course  
the leisure market, the blue economy, is growing, it is growing rapidly and has a direct correlation  
between Guernsey's economic success, its growing wealth and that sector.

350 The second point I would like to make is with regards funding. I think the issue is an important  
one but it is made even more relevant by comments made by my very good friend, Al Brouard,  
Deputy Brouard, when he was proposing the amendment. He warned us about PFI projects, private  
finance initiatives, in the knowledge that with the information we have in front of us at the moment  
the cost of his preferred option is very materially greater.

355 What he did not tell us was how he would fund it and I would be delighted, even though he is  
not currently involved in the Treasury function as he was in the last term, I would like to know what  
his preferred option would be.

Deputy de Sausmarez picked up on comments made by Deputy Inder, who told us to ignore  
these numbers, they were nonsense, but then in the same breath explained that whatever the figure  
360 is, it will go up. In fact, he told us it would go up by two-thirds, although the arithmetical example  
he gave showed a 50% increase. But leaving that one-eighth aside, the point is that he is right,  
marine projects nearly always end up costing more and we were very fortunate with the QEII project.

365 My last point is this. There are only, really, three ways of financing this. You either allow private  
investors, through something like a private finance initiative. Or you borrow on the capital markets,  
or you save before you spend. Now saving before we spend on this occasion was extremely unlikely.  
Deputy Brouard does not like PFIs. So that leaves the capital markets and this is where we have a  
real dilemma because the world markets are, quite understandably, particularly the sterling markets,  
pricing in a substantial inflationary problem, which is going to make the cost of borrowing  
increasingly expensive.

370 The right time to be doing this is now and it certainly should not be done, any form of borrowing  
of this type for infrastructure, should not be done through a revolving credit facility, because that  
leaves the rate open-ended. You can use certain products to cap that but it is a very inefficient and,  
in my view, wholly irresponsible way of funding long-term infrastructure investment, whatever form  
that takes.

375 So my primary question is to ask Deputy Brouard how he would seek to fund this quite  
extraordinary sum of money. Because if he cannot answer that then clearly this is not a meaningful  
alternative but rather a wrecking motion. It is a way of seeing nothing done and that has been the  
primary failure of the last two or three States, this inability to be bold and brave, this inability to  
invest properly at the appropriate time and the States' inability to see the long-term picture.

380 So I am not sure how helpful that has been even to myself, madam, but I say it because, unusually  
for me, I mean Deputy Brouard made the point that he is in a very envious position. He knows which  
way he is going to vote. I am finding it harder as time goes on, because I am a man of the sea. I  
love the sea, always have since I was a child and I spent years at sea, in aggregate. But the idea of  
Longue Hougue South being a tidal option is the one that challenges me as much as anyone else.

385 But at the end of the day, one has got to be realistic. If you cannot have the best –  
Are you asking me to give way? Yes, I give way.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Just to assist Deputy Trott, the problem with the Longue Hougue South idea/concept is not that the harbour dries out. It would be dredged to 7.5 m. It would always be full of water. The problem is that on certain states of tide, it is possible that the current outside the harbour mouth would be too strong for commercial shipping to use it. We do not absolutely know that.

**Deputy Trott:** Thank you for that. A welcome interjection and the harbourmaster did make very clear in the presentation that I attended, that a great deal more modelling was necessary. So, madam, I am undecided. It is a dilemma, but at the end of the day, these numbers that we are talking about, they are not door numbers.  
I give way to Deputy Inder.

**Deputy Inder:** Deputy Trott, thank you for that because you have much more knowledge of financing projects than I do and I accept that, but might he agree with me as somebody who had significant interest in the original requête, that the current scheme looks an awful lot larger than the original requête and, with the right team in place, that cost could be significantly reduced and still maintain the benefits to St Peter Port, with the right team in place, conducting the right scheme and, if Deputy Brouard could give him that assurance and say a different scheme could be in place, would that help him towards his vote?

**Deputy Trott:** But that is not what we are being asked today. This amendment is asking us to send a very strong signal to the STSB and the Policy & Resources Committee that this is the option we favour and this is a pretty grandiose and extremely expensive option. We have not got the luxury of saying, 'Do you know what, we have only got £150 million to spend so can you come up with something for that amount of money?' The issue is far larger than that. That is not going to be a sufficient sum. Of that, I think we can be almost certain.

So it is essential that we make a decision, we move forward, but clearly the costs of these projects are absolutely enormous and the manner in which they are funded is extremely significant. So that is my primary question to Deputy Brouard. Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Moakes.

**Deputy Moakes:** Thank you. I just want to summarise some of the things that people have been saying because there have been a lot of really good points made. I do not agree with this amendment and I think the reasons for that are, as people have already said, aesthetically it is a bad idea. It is one of our biggest assets on the Island. As you approach the Island by sea, you see the Harbour and you see the Castle and it is a spectacular view. If you do anything to build out from there, I think it will spoil that. Frankly, I think also for residents looking out to sea, it will probably have a similar effect and take away some of these amazing views that we have.

From a practicality and safety perspective, I always think if you mix leisure and commercial shipping it can be a great problem. We have cruise ships, we have cargo ships, we have leisure boats. Not everybody with a leisure boat is a skilled sailor and if you mix it all up, there is always the possibility of there being an accident. So, part of the reason STSB put some of the Propositions that it did was specifically for that purpose, to split out some of these boats to reduce that risk.

I think that mixing people and cargo on land together is also a risk. If you have got people walking up and down piers and then great big lorries driving up and down, full of aggregate and goodness knows what, that is never a great thing. I think also, if you centralise everything in St Peter Port, you are actually creating more and more traffic on what are already quite busy roads. So, I think that would be an awful problem as well.

From an environmental perspective, the noise of some of these cargo ships being unloaded, right where we are hoping to bring tourists to or right where we are on the harbour, having a sandwich with our family, would be awful. As I said, the traffic will be terrible and I suspect if you

440 are unloading bulk cargo ships of aggregates and things, there is going to be an awful lot of dust. So add that to the mix of the noise and everything else and actually one of our greatest assets would potentially become a liability, where people would not want to go. As fabulous as the presentations that were made about this particular amendment were, I do not agree with it for all the reasons I have just given. Thank you.

445 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Taylor.

**Deputy Taylor:** Thank you, madam. Just raising a little point. I do not particularly support this amendment but I support it more than the original Propositions, so I am inclined to vote for it. I just want to raise that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller has talked about the confliction between school children on their little sailing boats going out through the harbour. I feel there is quite a simple solution to that –

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Point of correction, madam.

455 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Sorry, madam, I just wanted to correct that that was not the only confliction I was talking about. I was talking about all the conflictions between commercial, leisure, young sailors and everything.

460

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, that is not really a point of correction, that is going beyond. You are just trying to re-explain what you said. Deputy Taylor.

**Deputy Taylor:** I absolutely take on, but I do need a little bit longer to keep talking. There is reference to the confliction of small sailing boats with children coming and probably the easiest solution or way around that is to repair Havelet Slipway. (**Severall Members:** Hear, hear.) That does not quite cost £300 million.

470 Also on the topic of confliction, this is one that came up in the STSB presentation, talking about the option and getting rid of confliction because the mix of leisure craft with commercial craft and all this going on. You have only got to look at the schedule for Condor Ferries and look at the ports that they sail into. Portsmouth is one. Everyone has been to Portsmouth. Portsmouth has lots of marinas. There are lots of sailing boats that come in, leisure sailing boats, in and out of Portsmouth, in and amongst some very large, commercial craft.

475 Poole, much the same. I even recall, coming into Poole, you have got the speed limit on the approach, it takes forever. But the benefit is you can stand on the back of Condor and you can watch the jet skiers doing little somersaults over the waves. A bit of fun. Of course then, Jersey is also there, and I believe Jersey, the rowing club, is right on the onside of the harbour so it has to sail out through the piers and past Condor's berth. So this issue of actual confliction here, I do not see that being a huge issue between the two options, option 5 and option 3. That same confliction is still going to be there because we will still have a large amount of commercial traffic going through St Peter Port. Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Haskins.

485 **Deputy Haskins:** Thank you, madam. I think going on from Deputy Taylor, STSB showed us a slide that said we have got Condor, we have got cruise ships, we have got Trident, we have got the leisure boaters and it is all in St Peter Port. When I questioned with this option, and it actually relates to option 3 as well, what changes? Nothing.

490 So I am stood here wondering what the purpose, what the need is to change. Is it that we need to reduce our reliance on NAABSA vessels, the ones that bring fuel up to St Sampson's? Is that what

we are trying to solve, because they are going to be more expensive and harder to come by? This is a very big bill. If you can buy a NAABSA vessel that can negate that, that security of supply, for £20 million –

I give way.

495

**Deputy Inder:** Thank you for giving way Deputy Haskins. I am glad you brought up the point of NAABSA vessels and parcel ships and we will get to that in five. But there is an ability to build NAABSA vessels, parcel ships taking fuels into three different holds, for around \$17 million.

500

**Deputy Haskins:** Thank you, Deputy Inder, for that.

So then my final question is, is it an economic opportunity that we are looking for by, essentially, creating a blank canvas in St Peter Port Harbour so that we can improve the public realm, then yes that would be great but what are the costs? We have to maintain with 5, and maybe not with this option, Option 3, with option 5 at St Sampson's we have to maintain still, St Peter Port we have to maintain but then we also have to maintain Longue Hougue South.

505

With this particular option, I think Deputy de Sausmarez made a very valid point and I think we can almost link the massive wall that we are going to build underwater to, it is a bone of contention, which is a rather large spend on maintenance, is the Alderney Breakwater, and we are going to do that to ourselves? It just does not make sense to me. So I am afraid, for all of these reasons, I cannot see that real necessity and this particular amendment does not go far enough to take out the commercial operations to give that blank canvas, so I am afraid I cannot support it.

510

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I am going to ask Deputy Roffey to reply, as the President of STSB.

515

**Deputy Roffey:** Thank you, madam. I am going to start off with a few general remarks, before dealing with some of the specific issues that have been raised during this debate, and then return to general issues at the end. The first thing I have to say is to refer Members back to my opening speech on this whole item in the Billet. I said that it was not for the STSB to tell the States what to do, rather that it was the other way around. STSB is not primarily a policy making body. It helps to inform policy through its expert advice and it is often responsible for then implementing the policy but it is more of a doing committee than a policy committee.

520

So I said that whatever the States decide today, we will faithfully take forward, and we will. But that does not stop us feeling that this amendment takes us in a very poor direction indeed. That judgement is subjective and it is this Chamber that is the decision-making body.

525

The second thing to say, I think, is that a new commercial port east of the existing St Peter Port Harbour is almost certainly operationally feasible. There is very little doubt about that, although as with all of the options, detailed work will need to be carried out before we can be 100% sure. I am sorry if Deputy Queripel finds that detailed work too expensive, but it just is with these sorts of things.

530

It is not just the Wallingford modelling. That has been brought up quite a few times. It is also the sub-seabed surveys that would be needed with any option. These are hideously expensive and frankly I doubt – although I welcome the offer – I doubt that Deputy Inder will be able to save us a quid or two by going out in his own boat to do them. But, of course, he is welcome to tender!

535

I will explain why I think this amendment is a big mistake shortly, but I want to pick up a few individual points and questions first, starting with Deputy Inder. I can assure him, madam, that there was absolutely no political bias in either the options selection or the options appraisal. Indeed, no politicians were involved in either process. Nor did politicians choose to make one scheme look more attractive and another less attractive so to further our own agendas because we were not involved in that process either. Indeed, I have to say I rather resent the allegation that we would allow ourselves to become involved in what amounts to misleading this Assembly.

540

Madam Bailiff – sorry, promoting you, one day maybe! – Madam Deputy Bailiff, yesterday I was taken to task by some Members for showing too much passion and if my adrenaline levels were

rather too much for some people's liking then obviously I apologise, but frankly that is small beer compared to hinting that colleagues are practising either deceit or deception.

545 Deputy Inder also expressed scepticism over the cost estimates in this Billet. Well, he was right to do so, but for all of the wrong reasons. I have no doubt that those estimates, which are just estimates, will have to be revised. Maybe they will be revised upwards, although as others have pointed out we have contained a 66% optimism bias, specifically to try to avoid that being the case.

550 What I struggled with was his apparent belief that the figures quoted were hopelessly low for all of the options that he did not like but then he did not seem to extend that logic to the one contained in this amendment, which he preferred. I can tell him that none of these figures were produced by 'States quantity surveyors'. Rather, they were produced by Jacobs, who are drawing both on their experience of port construction and of working in Guernsey.

555 Now, we have heard about the environmental impact of a new port at Longue Hougue, but as Deputy de Sausmarez pointed out, there is every reason to believe that these will be just as bad, if not worse, outside St Peter Port, not to mention the impact on maritime archaeology. There are a wealth of historical wrecks just outside our current harbour, which would either be lost or would have to be removed, at great expense, which is not contained in the current option.

560 Now, a couple of people mentioned that the new Longue Hougue Harbour would dry out at low tide and my Vice President has tackled that when Deputy Trott asked him to give way. Please let me double down on what he said and dispel that myth. It will not dry out. It will not be tidal in that sense. The reference to tidal restrictions refers solely, as you said, to the strong currents making it difficult to navigate into that port for about an hour or so either side of low spring tides.

565 Having said that, since the publication of the Billet, we have been contacted by both a universally respected former harbourmaster and a former chief pilot, both of whom suggest that those tidal issues could be largely mitigated by changing the design of the new port and the orientation of the quays within it.

570 We also felt that might well prove to be the case, which was why we were so keen to move to the next stage of design work and the detailed modelling that is going to be required in order to answer those sorts of questions. It is also why we were really happy to keep option 6 on the table, because if those tidal issues can be removed, or even mitigated significantly by the detailed design work then the prize that option 6 offers is massive and I would say to the Deputies that say this does not conflict St Peter Port as much as they would like, so why are we doing it; option 6, which will be examined in depth, will do exactly that.

575 In fact, given the time of day, and we have still got lots of amendments to go, I am going to try and save the States some time by saying that I do not think there is any need for Deputy St Pier and Deputy Helyar to lay amendment 1. We have said in the Billet that if option 5 goes forward, we will take a strong look at whether option 6 is achievable. It is not increasing the work much because the two ports look incredibly similar and I will give that promise today. So I would invite Deputy Helyar or whoever is going to lay it not to do so, because that will be done anyway. But whether he takes that advice is up to him of course.

580 It was also suggested yesterday we do not know the depth of the approaches to the new proposed Longue Hougue Harbour. We do and we have done since the survey in 2014. Frankly, to listen to some people yesterday, one could have been forgiven for thinking that the option of putting a new deep water port at Longue Hougue was being put forward by a bunch of clowns who knew nothing whatsoever about the sea. Not that it was the preferred option of an expert panel, including the harbourmaster and the ports team. Not that it had been looked at by people with expertise in harbour construction. Not that the local pilots had been fully consulted and involved at every step of the process.

590 Madam, in many ways, the committee of the STSB is just a conduit here. We do not pretend that we are the experts but I have to say neither are the Members of this Assembly. But you would not have thought so from yesterday's debate. Deputies were seemingly so much more knowledgeable on all things nautical and port-related than those whose professional lives revolve around these issues.



595 Now, could we build a smaller harbour east of St Peter Port? That was the question from several  
Deputies, I think, including Deputy Dyke and Deputy Oliver. Yes, we could. That was referred to in  
the policy letter and it was explained in depth in the appendix of the Jacobs Report. But there are  
very significant drawbacks. It may surprise some people but there is not deep water immediately to  
600 the east of the current harbour, rather there are rocky reefs outside our current north arm, which is  
probably exactly why the current north arm is still in the position it is because they have made use  
of those existing stone reefs to actually construct it upon.

So, a great deal of blasting would be required, really heavy blasting, to use the water immediately  
to the east of the current harbour. Now not only does that involve a lot of cost, which means that  
actually you will end up with a much smaller harbour with roughly the same price tag, but it also  
605 involves a regular risk, not least to the existing harbour walls. So the very sensible decision was  
taken to leave those reefs in place, just outside the existing harbour, and to put the new deep water  
berth beyond them, where deep water already is. That gives you a better harbour at a similar cost,  
with much lower risk.

Coming to some of the specifics in Deputy Brouard's speech –

610

**Deputy Taylor:** Point of correction, madam.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy Taylor.

615 **Deputy Taylor:** I may be wrong here but I do not know if Deputy Roffey is being a bit misleading  
there because he is referring to making the water deeper outside of St Peter Port, using the  
terminology of blasting, but it sounds much simpler to simply dredge at Longue Hougue. I confess  
I am only looking at Google Maps, but it looks like there are rocks at Longue Hougue and I do not  
think you can dredge rocks, so it would require blasting as well. So it makes it a little bit more even.

620

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

**Deputy Roffey:** I was trying to compare the two options for the harbour outside of St Peter  
Port. We have never tried to hide the fact that some amount of blasting would be required at  
625 Longue Hougue. But the reason why a smaller harbour outside of St Peter Port is perhaps counter-  
intuitively not cheaper than a larger harbour is because of the amount of blasting that would have  
to take place.

Although I would say to Deputy Taylor, let us do the sub-sea surveys, do not rely on Google  
Maps on his phone, because really we do not know the extent of the blasting yet at Longue Hougue.  
630 All of the expert advice is it is likely to be considerably less than what would be required for the  
smaller harbour outside St Peter Port. Of course, it will be in a place where it would have less impact  
on the surrounding infrastructure.

Now Deputy Brouard quite rightly said that we could use the void space under option 3, the  
white bit on the map that is being shown there, for either a sail training lagoon at high tide, or  
635 potentially for generating hydroelectric power. Indeed, we made these points ourselves at all of the  
presentations.

However, he also went on to claim that it could be used as a marina. Sadly, that is not just  
practical. For exactly the same reasons as a smaller harbour outside St Peter Port is not practical.  
The space is relatively shallow and full of rock. Of course, if we impounded the water there, then the  
640 boats would float, but that would add to the cost considerably because the type of construction  
that is being put in now is not the sort that would be required if there was a marina behind it.

But more to the point those berths would not be popular, because they would be so tightly  
constricted and the marina gates would only be open for relatively short periods around high tide.  
I discussed this at length with the harbour team last night. I assure you the harbourmaster will grab  
645 any opportunity for additional marina moorings but they were quite clear at the ports team that  
this was just not a practical option.

It shows the dangers, I think, of being offered poorly researched options on the floor of this Assembly, which seem so attractive. I will give way, but Deputy Brouard will have chance to speak straight after me and can answer anything I say.

650

**Deputy Brouard:** It is just to say that myself and Deputy Prow saw the harbourmaster and it was him who suggested it could be used for a marina. Obviously, things have changed since Monday till Thursday.

655

**Deputy Roffey:** Maybe so. I was not present at that meeting. All I can say is that I had a meeting at length – and yes of course it could be used as a marina, but at considerable cost and it would be so tidal, it is also the opposite of the Pool Marina, where premium berth rates would be available because it is available at all tides, this would be a very tidal marina indeed and it is not sensible. There are other low hanging fruits around St Peter Port to put marina facilities before you actually even consider doing this.

660

Deputy Brouard, also, was not correct, when he suggested that our scoring matrix was inaccurate, for two reasons. Firstly the table that he referred to is not, repeat *not*, the one that was used to score the options. Rather the options were scored against a set of criteria which we very widely consulted on. Anybody that saw not the final presentations but the presentations in the lead up to them, we have laid out what we thought the scoring criteria would be, we asked do you have any feedback, we want to know what you think we should be scoring it against. It was a massive consultation exercise and those were the criteria that were scored against.

665

The table that he refers to was a simple technical appraisal of the operational strengths or weaknesses of all options. He said, why did it give a partial tick for freedom from tidal constraints. Well, because that was marking, that was ticking and crossing, against the clear option of a new harbour east of St Peter Port, and leaving the bulk cargos at St Sampson's. It was partial in its freedom from tidal constraints because St Sampson's would have continued to be tidal. It is tidal.

670

Exactly the same is true of the issue of large bulk cargo vessels. The ships coming into St Sampson's, which was the option being looked at, would continue to be size-limited. So the table is completely correct for the options that it was appraising.

675

Now I know that Deputy Brouard does not want to do that. He wants to move all the bulk cargos into St Peter Port, which is an entirely different kettle of fish and I will get onto that concept shortly. But first of all, Members, not only would option 3 be much more expensive – and I do not accept that £100 million extra is a mere bagatelle – but I do find it really weird how some Members say that £360 million is unthinkable. 'Why have we even got it on the floor of the Assembly today – mind you, I think I will vote for an amendment that would cost £460 million instead, that is just fine and dandy!'

680

By the way, I should say each option has been costed consistently and in line with best practice as advised. So please do not let Deputy Brouard persuade you to tinker with the costs by removing the prudent optimism bias. That would be moving away from best prudent practice. So, £100 million more. But what would be worse, in some ways, would be the lost opportunities under this amendment.

685

Either way, you lose opportunities. Either St Sampson's not transformed. Either the bulk, dirty, heavy shipping continues to go into St Sampson's, it is not turned over to leisure and we lose that once in a lifetime opportunity to do something for the north of the Island that they have been waiting for, for the last 50 years.

690

Or all of that heavy traffic goes through St Peter Port instead. What a complete shocker that would be. I cannot believe that some Members are quite happily sleepwalking into that scenario. Hydrocarbons are going to be with us for several decades. There is going to be a long tail. There will be dwindling quantities, but there will be significant amounts of hydrocarbons coming into Guernsey for some years.

695

Now Deputy Brouard has an answer to that, too. He wants a new sub-surface oil pipeline from the Town up to the fuel farms in the north. Well, if that is the solution, just forget the extra

700 £100 million on top of options 5 or 6, we are really talking about megabucks to do that. I have not funded it, I have not priced it yet, it has not been priced, but on top of the £100 million extra he wants to spend there is another very big price tag involved in doing that.

In reality, I do not think that is going to happen. In reality it is going to iso-tanks, full of fuel trundling along what is already our busiest road. Likewise, with our sand, likewise with our aggregate and likewise with all of our other bulk cargos. And on the subject of aggregate, I think there could be an enormous amount more aggregate coming into this Island during the lifetime of this project.

710 Deputy Brouard is right, we are talking about 100 years, hopefully a lot longer, when we build this. Now, Les Vardes Quarry is nearly exhausted. I have no idea of the latest thinking about whether or not at the end of that we import aggregates or we allow Ronez to mine Chouet headland. But even if it is the latter, that quarry's projected life is a fraction of the life of this project and when that runs out, there is nowhere else accessible for the mining of stone in Guernsey.

715 So we are going to be seeing, in the lifetime of this project, a massive amount of aggregate being imported to Guernsey. I do not want to see it in St Sampson's. I do not want the impact on St Sampson's that that would do. I certainly do not want to see it in St Peter Port, coming through our absolute jewel in our crown, our capital, our biggest tourist asset – truck after truck full of aggregate actually coming through.

Longue Hougue, well we do not really ... the fact it will still have to disperse, it will still have to go somewhere it will be far from ideal but of the three options that is by far the best. St Peter Port is by far the worst.

720 Of course, it is not just the bulk imports, it is the bulk exports as well. We have to get rid of stuff. Scrap metal goes out on a regular basis. It goes out, maybe those of you that spend a lot of time down St Sampson's do not realise it goes out through St Sampson's. This amendment, if we are not going to use St Sampson's for bulk exports as well as bulk imports, that will be being exported through St Peter Port. Through the middle of the jewel in Guernsey's crown.

725 Yes, I accept that on the surface, quite a bit of prime real estate will be freed up under option 3, but I ask Members just how prime would it actually be, in the middle of an ongoing industrial zone, with heavy cargos coming and going. It will not be prime real estate. We will not be getting the economic opportunities that this Island expects that even today the Chamber of Commerce are emailing us saying they are watching this debate, they really want to see those opportunities unlocked.

730 We would be turning what should be our greatest asset, in St Peter Port, into for the next 100 years, an industrial one. Of course, not to mention all of that heavy traffic coming off the harbour, going around the roundabout and going along the front or in other directions. To me that is a nightmare scenario.

735 Of course all that heavy traffic would not just be in one direction. Equally, load upon load of inert waste would need to be brought to the site over quite a few years during the construction period. What a way to abuse St Peter Port. What a way to degrade our chief asset.

740 As I said, madam, in my opening speech, every other community that I know lucky enough to have a characterful, stone-built harbour as we do, and I think there are very few as spectacular as St Peter Port, have taken the sensible decision of taking all of the heavy, dirty, commercial shipping out of it. They have turned it into a centrepiece for both locals and tourists alike.

This amendment would do absolutely the opposite. It would import all of those activities into our most beautiful harbour in St Peter Port. Yes, it would free up St Sampson's so I am grateful for that, but do we just transfer all of that into St Peter Port? That is utter madness, frankly.

745 That brings me finally onto the issue of appearance and the new harbour under option 3. Now Deputy Brouard does not think that the new harbour under option 3 would change the appearance very much. Who does he think he is kidding? Of course, I accept the views provided by our Town's natural topography, the buildings marching up the Town, up the hillside behind, that will stay the same. That will stay the same so if you are doing that all the time you are probably okay.

750 But what frames that picture when you are coming into St Peter Port? It is our beautiful Victorian harbour and that would disappear behind a utilitarian industrial harbour, which would be there for the next 100 years. Maybe that is thinkable for Members of this Assembly, I find it quite extraordinary.

755 Now Deputy Matthews said he does not really know what it is going to look like. I am not sure what we could do more. We have emailed out the fly-throughs, we spent quite a bit of money – I am sorry about that – but we thought people had the right to know what was going to be looked on, so we had the computer-generated fly-throughs, we made them widely available, they are available at all of the drop-ins, we have re-mailed them out to Members. I am not sure what else he expects us to do. Put up sight poles maybe.

760 Unfortunately, Deputy de Sausmarez is quite right, the breakwater does have to be massive and the reason is that while, yes, there is a deep water immediately east of St Peter Port, once you start getting out into the Russel, it becomes deep quite quickly, which means that the height of the protective breakwater from the seabed up to high spring tide and then a bit more is very high indeed.

765 I am not a civil engineer but I am told if you build it very high you have to build it very wide, which turns it into a really big structure, and that is going to be so imposing on St Peter Port Harbour it will change the appearance of it, for the worse, forever.

I do not know, I am not as cynical as Deputy Trott. Well, generally not as cynical as Deputy Trott. But in this particular case I am not as cynical as Deputy Trott in thinking that this amendment is here to wreck the proposals going forward at all. But what I do predict is if we pass this today and we are sent away to look at this, the public reaction is going to be absolutely massive. We are People's Deputies, the public reaction to doing this to St Peter Port, if you thought that Belle Greve Bay was sacrosanct – and it is in my mind, I have to say – then you have not seen nothing yet.

770 Yes, those of you that want to do nothing, you can do it really by voting for this, but I would rather you were honest and actually got to the proposals 1 to 4 at the end and actually voted against them because that is what you wanted to do because that will be the straight-forward way of doing it. This is a truly awful prospect we are being sold today. Do not do it.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Queripel, do you wish to be relevéd?

780 **Deputy Queripel:** Yes please, madam.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you. Deputy McKenna, you have already spoken in this debate. Deputy Brouard, it is your turn to reply.

785 **Deputy Brouard:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Bailiff. I always thought it was going to be bruising at the end and of course it usually is. Thank you very much, Deputy Roffey, for that. I am going to basically shoot myself in the foot and I am going to shoot myself in the foot fairly early on in this and I will start off with going through some of the comments from Deputy Roffey.

790 My offer, or my suggestion, to you is this: vote in our preference of option 3 now but, and I think quite a few people have mentioned it to me and I will pick it up in some of the speeches as well, there is an undercurrent that maybe, when we start to look at the option, whichever one it is, rather than looking at just one option, we go for a head-to-head between St Peter Port and Longue Hougue and have those two.

795 You started off with 17 or 18 different options but they were narrowed down to seven different combinations and now the final sort of play off, as it were, should perhaps be where we can get that information to see how much dredging needs to happen at Longue Hougue; to see whether it really is practical; to see what the design would look like for St Peter Port.

800 So my suggestion is, after this vote is taken, hopefully you will pass this one as the preferred, I would not be averse for someone to come up with a further amendment that basically puts this

option 3 versus options 5 and 6, which are almost identical. That is my shooting myself in the foot bit to start with.

805 I would just like to also thank the States' Greffier for very kindly producing the map, which we have got now in front of us on our desks because I think I will be referring to part of that as we go through. Just picking some of the thoughts from Deputy Roffey first. Marine archaeology, I appreciate there will be some and hopefully we may well discover some more wrecks and interesting artefacts there and then we can decide what we are going to do with them. They are there, I cannot take them away. I do not know what archaeology there might be at Longue Hougue, I have got no idea. Probably because our ancestors used St Peter Port as a harbour and Longue Hougue as a beach.

810 I am a little bit concerned that Deputy Roffey was castigating me for bringing forward option 3 but it was one of the proposals that the committee themselves thought was a feasible option. So I am a little bit miffed that I have such a sort of bad press for bringing forward one of the options that the actual committee considered and it is a reasonably viable option. The idea of a smaller harbour east of St Peter Port, again that would be something that, perhaps if you are doing a head to head between the different options, may well be a forward.

815 The size of the marina in the white area, if you look at the white area east of the QEII on that page 24, it is a substantial area. Maybe that could be a marina at a cheaper price because you have got less access. Maybe a marina for smaller boats that have lower draft. All these things are things that perhaps would need to be considered.

820 You also have, which I did not manage to speak about when I was introducing it because we do not have the map, there is also a white area slightly to the south, as it were, of the big white area, which is also another impounded area. You might think that looks a bit small but when I put my tracing paper over the top of that, that area, which is also an impounded water area, is the same size as the Victoria Marina. That is the marina outside Woolworth's in my language. Other people might know other establishments that are along there! But it is the main bit along the front, anyway, the old harbour. That area there, that white area that is south of the big white area, a massive area, could be again for leisure, for boating, for marina.

825 Deputy Roffey spoke about the lost opportunities, St Sampson's not being transformed. Well, in my vision St Sampson's will be transformed. It will not be happening now but it would be happening when we have the demise of the tanker ships in 10 or 15 years' time when that happens. That is when I would see St Sampson's perhaps be turned over to leisure.

830 But there are a few people, as well, here, which is not a criticism, but there are some people who are very conscious of these costs. If you want not to do it then all you need to do is solve the tanker ship issue and the bringing in of fuel oil, because you can do that with iso-containers, through St Peter Port on a ro-ro and you can keep St Sampson's open for aggregate and bring aggregate in. That is all a lot cheaper than building Longue Hougue or this large extension to St Peter Port Harbour.

835 So those of you who have got concerns about the cost, which is a valid thing to have, please do not go for either option, because then you would continue using St Sampson's. That is cheaper than trying to build Longue Hougue. I will come onto the traffic issues, which Deputy Roffey mentioned about, further on. Again, I will come back to the view, etc. a little bit later.

840 Deputy Inder, thank you very much for your support and highlighting the concerns that we have with going for option 5. He mentioned figures will be wrong and highlighted the changes that we have had in the harbour that we were an exporting Island, from the point of view of goods; we are now an importing Island from the point of view of goods.

845 He also makes a very good point, even if option 3, which hopefully you will vote for in a minute, is approved, this will not be the final design. There is a lot of water that needs to come up and down the beach before we are going to end up with this particular design. That is why I think I have more confidence that when the next level happens, a lot of the issues can be ironed out to see how things can be done.

Deputy Prow, I thank him for his support. Also, you are looking now at two sites. You would have obviously a harbourmaster for the new marina, you have got two new places to then look after because you are still looking after St Peter Port. You have also then, now, looking after freight etc.  
855 on a new Longue Hougue port possibly.

Now, one of the issues that has come up several times is about traffic and de-conflicting and the use of the port. Somebody else, I cannot remember who it was, one of the newer Deputies, said, 'Let us be a bit ambitious. Let us do something a bit different.' Well if you look at the map and the white area and the hatched area of the new port, we are containing all of our industrial park in one  
860 part of St Peter Port. It will not be conflicting with the harbour, with Castle Cornet, it will not be conflicting with the Model Yacht Pond. It does not conflict with the Pool or the Albert Marina or the Victoria Marina. We are putting it in one block.

One way to get access out of that area is you could just drive down the White Rock as you do now. But if you are a little bit innovative, why don't you build a bridge over the entrance to the QEII?  
865 For many hours of the day, I was having a discussion with Deputy Trott, we reckon that out of every tide, about 12 hours' worth of tide, for five hours you cannot get out of the marina.

I will give way to Deputy Oliver.

**Deputy Oliver:** If you put a bridge over the QEII how are you going to get the yachts out with tall masts?  
870

**Deputy Brouard:** For someone with an engineering background, I would have thought that would be obvious. The bridge will either swing or lift up and down. I come from the west, we have thought of these things! (*Laughter*) Just a thought. You could then move all the heavy traffic off that  
875 area, across to La Salerie and then along the coast from there.

Do not forget, you are not creating a *panacea* with Longue Hougue. You have just decided with Longue Hougue, if you go ahead with that amendment, you are going to bring in all the sand and aggregate the wrong side of the bridge, because the yards that process and make concrete blocks are on north side. Where do you bring the sand and aggregates in at the moment? North side. What  
880 are you proposing to do? You are bringing them now a mile and a half south side. So all the sand and all the aggregate is going to be trundling across the bridge anyway. So please, this is what we said at the very beginning, there are going to be conflicts. You do not necessarily solve one problem by doing one thing –

I give way to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.  
885

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Deputy Brouard, do you think a solution for a swinging bridge across St Sampson's might be a solution in this case?

**Deputy Brouard:** It is a bigger bridge and it would cost more but to be fair it has been thought about. People may laugh, but people have thought about building a bridge across St Sampson's  
890 Harbour and a new road across to take the heavy traffic. It is definitely not new. I am just trying to point out you cannot have your cake and eat it. You cannot say, 'Oh I am really concerned about traffic, oh dear,' but then you are now just going to increase that problem with Longue Hougue. So you do not necessarily completely solve each of these conflicts.

Another part, I will do it now, is the breakwater. Now, again, on the map, the breakwater looks very wide because they are showing the width of the stone underneath but of course there is quite a bit of width on the existing arm out to the light. It does not necessarily mean, in this design it looks as though there is a sort of walkway along the top, but it does not necessarily mean we need to have a breakwater with a walkway along the top, it can just be a breakwater that stops the swell  
900 and the waves coming in.

Again, I am not sure how that has been costed in, whether it is with a walkway on the top or not. But certainly from the drawing it looks like a pretty solid concrete structure on the top. Again, I am

not an engineer, this is where the next stage comes in. Maybe a breakwater without concrete construction on the top, which just gives that rock armour protection to the harbour mouth.

905 Deputy Parkinson mentioned about the bias issue and how it has been tainted. I appreciate what he has said. Thanks to Deputy Aldwell for her support and Deputy McKenna, thank you very much. I was picking up already on Deputy Oliver's point, just a second ago, about the breakwater and the size and how it can be.

910 Deputy Ferbrache said, and this is why I was shooting myself in the foot at the beginning, I think he mentioned along the lines that maybe if you vote for the original Propositions, there will still be a little bit of a look at what could happen around St Peter Port. I am not so sure about that because I think by voting for option 5, I think his point was that you keep alive option 3, but I am not too sure that is true because, by the same token, by voting for option 3, you would also then keep alive option 5, so this comes back to my suggestion that perhaps the two options need to go head to head.

915 Deputy Falla raised the conflicts and the commercial activity. The commercial activity would be contained in a fairly neat block and I do appreciate there will be some concern as to how you access St Peter Port. Of course, if you are moving the main ferry port to Longue Hougue, you are going to have traffic, as I mentioned, coming up and down the banks, you are going to have 920 conflicts there as well. Again, none of these things is a *panacea*.

Deputy Dyke mentioned about it could be slimmed down or perhaps could be less expensive. Yes, this is I think the point that Deputy Inder also made, that there are other options and other shapes available for an east arm extension and I think that would be the part that happens in the next iteration.

925 Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, yes, I think I have picked up most of your points about playing option 3 against options 5 and 6. In my thoughts we would leave St Sampson's as it is for the next 10 years, especially while we are importing quite a lot of material and especially to do the harbour development itself.

930 Deputy Matthews was concerned about the layout and the income from the blue economy and I think, yes, very important that the harbour looks to all aspects to raise funds because clearly the amount of funding that the harbour gets in is not sufficient for it to be able to do its own maintenance. For an operation that is meant to be commercial, that is a real struggle point, because otherwise you are returning to General Revenue for what is really a commercial operation that should be covered.

935 I think, again, there would be the opportunity on the next level to start to hone the design to see how the harbour looked. But if you stand along the front, opposite Woolworth's, you do not see that far. You do not see to the other side of the walls. It is a fairly one line, there are some cranes you can see, but you do not see much more. It is the same looking the other way. When you are coming back from Herm on the ferry, you see a darkish wall from the harbour, with the signal station, 940 I think it is called, at the end, you see a dark wall that runs along and then dips in a bit for the QEII Marina. You do not see anything else. You see the cranes, then on top.

The view would not be much different with option 3. It is exactly the same thing. You would have a wall of so many metres, just as it is now, and then there will be cranes behind it. I think that picks up one of the points that Deputy Lindsay de Sausmarez was making. I have been very concerned 945 about spoiling St Peter Port, so I would be the last one that would go in and try and spoil St Peter Port.

950 Deputy Gollop, thank you for your comments and the mention of the conflicts and, of course, St Peter Port, improvements in things are usually done by very small increments. I was listening to a programme about racing bikes and how it was not a radical design that made the fastest bike, it was the bike that had little tiny increments. They changed the pedal, they changed this, they changed that. We have got a harbour that works. This is the next increment in that. You are taking, in my view, a substantial risk by suddenly moving our harbour to Longue Hougue.

I think Deputy de Sausmarez was mentioning also about St Sampson's and adding back to St Sampson's. If you go round St Sampson's now, today, what do you see? Do you see large gravel

955 sandpits, large heaps of coal and dust? You do not. The importation on the south side is by the ships, the oil tankers, which go aground. On the north side is where the aggregate and the cement comes in. It does not look a horrendously ugly industrial area. It is a harbour. The sand is shipped into the hopper, the lorries go underneath and they drive to the yard, a few yards away.

960 You will be doing exactly the same on Longue Hougue but you will be having a bigger drive all through St Sampson's and you will have a slightly longer drive –

I will give way to Deputy de Sausmarez.

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** I thank Deputy Brouard for giving way. Would he accept that actually there is the potential to move the operation on site for those activities, all into the one at Longue Hougue with any new land created there to condense those industrial activities onto the one site?

**Deputy Brouard:** Yes, that is another whole question. So if you are thinking then you are going to be moving one of the commercial operators who are making blocks and making concrete and you are going to be moving them from north side to this new industrial zone then, yes.

970 I will give way to Deputy Leadbeater.

**Deputy Leadbeater:** I thank Deputy Brouard for giving way. I just wanted to point out that it is not only Ronez on north side that processes aggregate and makes concrete blocks, we have also got Annandale out at Cobo. So aggregate and sand, etc., goes out west as well as just the north side.

**Deputy Brouard:** Thank you for that. So we have to be very careful which items we want to conflict with because there are trade-offs between all of these things. Most of the area in the east of St Peter Port will be basically flat land, used for lorry park and storage, just as it is there today. So in theory there are no extra items that are coming in. All the area that we have got now in the main harbour and the White Rock is moving eastwards into the new area.

980 I take Deputy de Lisle's point about not decentralising growth and also that highlights the needs for the extra marina in the Pool. Deputy Trott, I do not know why he is asking me this question because usually when he asks a question he always knows the answer, so I am a little bit confused there. We are not today – I appreciate £460 million is more than £360 million, but how are you going to fund £360 million? We have still got that conundrum, so I am not going to go into funding.

985 That then plays back into what Deputy Dyke was saying earlier. We really need to look at the costs. If we are really serious that we are not going to be spending anything like this money then you are going to keep St Sampson's going and you are going to solve the hydrocarbons with iso-containers. That is probably the far cheapest. You can hear the price of a new NAABSA ship. If people want to do nothing that option is there, you have got £35 million, which you would have to spend on maintenance.

990 Deputy Moakes, yes, I take his point about the aesthetics but I do not think that particular look will be that bad at all. Deputy Taylor, thank you again, mentioned the confliction and some of the mitigating ways of solving those problems. Deputy Haskins, again, looking for the reasons for change and what are the drivers and that goes back to the heart of it. If the driver is how we bring in fuel, well then the cheapest way is we carry on doing what we are doing now, and then we switch to iso-containers. That is it. But if we are wanting to go for a larger harbour, then you start to spend big money and then you have these decisions, whether you go for Longue Hougue or not.

1000 I am sensing I am getting near the end of my speech and also I am sensing I am losing your patience, which is always a bad sign! I think Deputy Inder summed it up really at the beginning, we are trying to find out where the big ships go, what the size of the quay is. Do we need a breakwater?

I have just got one bit to finish with. I think it is fair to say, I had a message from Deputy Paint last night. I cannot use all the words because it is in seafaring terms! (*Laughter*) But he said:

1005



I can tell you that no self-respecting seafarer would even try to navigate a vessel through the twists and turns of any channel approaching the proposed new port –

– this is Longue Hougue –

– anywhere near low water on a neap tide, let alone a spring tide, unless he or she –

– I have added that in –

– was suicidal or a mad person.

1010 So that is from a professional pilot who has spent years working, not out of some port on some  
continent somewhere else, but right here, navigating ships in and out of St Sampson's, right next  
to Longue Hougue. So I think I would rather trust Deputy Paint, as a pilot, than some computerised  
tank simulation. But as I said yesterday, do you feel lucky? Do you believe in £360 million on a port  
at Longue Hougue or are you happier with the safer bet, by extending what we know? Thank you.  
1015 Please vote for the amendment. Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you. Are there any requests for a recorded vote? Yes. States' Greffier  
when you are ready. This is in relation to amendment 6, just in case anybody ...

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Amendment 6*

*Not carried – Pour 12, Contre 23, Ne vote pas 3, Absent 2*

**POUR**

Deputy Matthews  
Deputy McKenna  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Taylor  
Deputy Vermeulen  
Deputy Aldwell  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Le Tissier

**CONTRE**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Mahoney  
Deputy Moakes  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Queripel  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy St Pier \*  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Blin  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Bury  
Deputy Cameron  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Fairclough  
Deputy Falla  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Gabriel  
Deputy Haskins  
Deputy Helyar  
Deputy Kazantseva-  
Miller

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Leadbeater  
Alderney Rep.  
Snowdon  
Deputy Dyke

**ABSENT**

Deputy Murray  
Alderney Rep. Roberts

\* denotes Member who voted by proxy

1020

**The Deputy Bailiff:** There voted 12 Pour, 23 Contre, there were three abstentions and two  
absences. I therefore declare the amendment defeated.

We will now go to amendment 1. Deputy Helyar, are you still wishing to lay this amendment?

1025 **Deputy Helyar:** Madam Deputy Bailiff, I have been able to contact Deputy St Pier, in the interim since Deputy Roffey gave his undertaking to look into option 6 as well as option 5, and we are content to withdraw on that basis.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

1030

[Amendment 2](#)

*After Proposition 4, insert the following proposition:-*

*"5. To direct the States' Trading Supervisory Board to submit by the end of December 2022 a Policy Letter together with suitable Propositions, which provide for a scheme to develop within St Peter Port Harbour a 'Pool Marina' with associated marina facilities and which includes costings and a delivery plan.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Amendment 2, Deputy Inder, do you still wish to lay this amendment? Do you wish the amendment to be read?

**Deputy Inder:** Yes please, madam.

1035

*The States' Greffier read out the amendment.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

1040 **Deputy Inder:** Thank you, madam. I think it has been made aware that under, I think it is now Proposition 5 and 6, some of this has been taken into account but in the debate yesterday there was a sort of distance between whether STSB would be prepared to do something because they had not been given direction.

1045 So it is perfectly possible that while the governance board is being set up, they are given direction today to carry on with some of the work, so when this governance board especially is formally prepared, hopefully, with some grace for STSB because they did previously yesterday agree that they would support this amendment, there is no reason that this work could not be started effectively tomorrow or Monday and then passed over to a governance board as and when it is properly formed. But I do not want to lose, particularly, even though I have some faith the governance board will be able to act quickly, if I can gain on it I will gain on it and today is the day for gaining on it.

1050 So yesterday STSB did agree that they would support the amendment. In fact they have attached an amendment to it should this be successful. I will spare you the speech for what was amendment 8 yesterday because most of you were the ones who were still in the room. Just to go over some of the ground, we have an opportunity here, this policy letter was all about expense, whether we like it or not, and we have here an opportunity to look at revenue.

1055 Under our previous Revive and Thrive policy letter, just to tie in what we have done from the last States, what we did here, under the Revive and Thrive policy letter we spoke about working in partnership to recover our economic prosperity, build on our inclusive community and capitalise on our many strengths to make Guernsey a safe haven based on sustaining health of our community, well here is the opportunity today.

1060 Paragraph 3.1 in the same document:

Economic modelling based on several scenarios demonstrates that without fiscal stimulus the economy recovery will take up to a decade.

We can start the fiscal stimulus today with a real project. Paragraph 3.2:

Although it is likely that much of the lost revenue will be restored by 2021, activity resumed, receipts in 2021 could remain the same, some £30 million to £40 million short of the 2019 level.

1065 If we do nothing that will translate into a fall in taxes received by the States. That is a gap in public finances of roughly £400 million over that 10-year period. Well since then new information says it is not looking great, so here is an opportunity again today, to stimulate the economy and of course Guernsey Together, recovery is a collaboration and effort between Government, public services and businesses.

1070 It is mentioned in the explanatory note for the amendment that there are other funding opportunities beyond that in the States, identifying growth opportunities and resilience in new sectors and addressing growth in existing sectors. Well, again, here is the opportunity today for us to put our money where our ... certainly, our words, our vote, rather, where our words are.

1075 So in short, it falls into the blue economy, support from the GMTA, support from the TPA, support from STSB, so there is no reason this should take any longer than a fairly simple vote for the Assembly and in preparation for the governance board and at the governance board, we are instructing STSB to carry on with the work that they claim they have already started and hopefully when that governance board stands up, hand that work to it. Thank you.

1080 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Vermeulen, do you formally second this?

**Deputy Vermeulen:** I do.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

1085 **Deputy Vermeulen:** Madam, I am very pleased to be seconding this amendment. Boating in our waters is at the heart of Guernsey's heritage and an all-state-of-the-tide Pool Marina is very much needed. As Deputy Inder pointed out just before, this amendment has been supported by Guernsey's marine community, basically, and local boaters.

1090 I cannot remember an amendment in recent times that has been quite so well supported locally. It is also a project which will not only fulfil demand but will be self-funding and revenue-generating in time and I think the latter, being a very important point in our current climate. We need action and to rebuild our economy, making it sustainable for the future. By supporting investigation into this project, it could be built within three years.

1095 Deputy Inder and I were keen to see plans for a Pool Marina prioritised, because as much as I support the harbour redevelopment, it is a much longer initiative and providing no firm commitment over the Pool Marina. Prioritising a Pool Marina complements these plans, it complements them whilst generating income and making Guernsey open for business.

1100 Madam, the support for this amendment will not only benefit the boating community but will have a significant knock-on effect for retail and tourism, estimated to be around £5 million. In a post-COVID world, demand for boaters has been significant and there are so many opportunities for Guernsey as a boating destination of choice but we will not be without the enhanced marina facilities. This is just the beginning of an exciting journey for Guernsey and I would urge the Assembly, madam, to support our amendment. Thank you.

1105 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

1110 **Deputy Roffey:** I am hoping I can cut this short. We made clear that we supported this amendment prior to the States' debate opening. We said that we felt it was unnecessary because we have told each and every stakeholder at every presentation that this is exactly what we intended to do anyway and I have to say I slightly resent the 'supposedly' work that was being done, barb that was actually offered to staff this morning, but I can assure Members that is absolutely what we intend to do.

If it was unnecessary then it is probably doubly unnecessary now because actually yesterday we inserted exactly this Proposition into the proposals. So we still do not resist it but it is now doubly

1115 unnecessary. The only other thing I would have to say is that, originally when this was put, we circulated to Members –

I give way to Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Soulsby:** I thank Deputy Roffey for giving way because I am actually quite confused at the moment. As Deputy Roffey has just said, we approved amendment 9 yesterday, at least I think I did, and we have got in a new 6(b), a timeline setting out steps to develop the Seafront Masterplan with marina facilities by 2022 and we have got this amendment now which inserts after Proposition 4 a new number 5, which I presume now will be a Proposition 7. So we have got two things saying the same thing in here, so at some point somebody is going to have to delete something somewhere but it does not make any sense as it stands if we support this.

**Deputy Roffey:** Deputy Soulsby is quite right. As I explained yesterday, the new technology for this Pool Marina is very clever and innovative but it does not allow two marinas, unfortunately, to be built in the same area in the Pool, which is effectively what we are being asked to do today. So as I say, I think this was decided.

The only thing I have to say is that we did circulate to Members, in advance, an amendment that we intended to lay, if this was successful, to make sure that we have the money to take this project forward. Because while the actual project itself would be self-funding, we would have to borrow money and that would be paid back from the revenue stream. Obviously, we need to actually get it to the starting blocks. Normally, that would come out of the Ports Holding Account. There is absolutely nothing in this Ports Holding Account, we are living on debt and we were going to lay an amendment asking P&R or asking the States to instruct P&R to allow us to use the overdraft we are living on at the moment to do that.

But to save time, I spoke with Deputy Helyar yesterday and he gave me the assurance that that seed money to work up the plans will be available so we will not need to lay that amendment. So I think we are at risk of spending time arguing about something that absolutely nobody disagrees with so I suggest we go *aux voix*.

**Deputy Inder:** I am just wondering, if it really helps, and it is really for Deputy Vermeulen to agree, I wonder if we withdraw the amendment and carry on to –

**The Deputy Bailiff:** The main difference, in relation to the amendment, is about who is doing what because in your amendment it is directing the States' Trading Supervisory Board to do something, whereas in the amendment approved yesterday, amendment 9, it is directing the Policy & Resources Committee. So I suppose one needs to ask oneself ...

**Deputy Inder:** May I ask a question then, with your guidance? I am always one for speeding things up. Potentially if this goes through, this directs STSB to carry on doing some of the work, as I tried to explain in my opening speech, if I withdraw this they are not under direction to do any work. So my thinking is that they could carry on the work, which I thought hopefully Deputy Roffey could have picked up, rather than the 'supposed' comment. I know it seems a bit, I do not know what the word is actually, but if we withdraw it now or it is defeated, that stops the STSB doing any such work until such time that this new board is set up. So I am actually trying to speed things up, which I am quite sure Deputy Roffey, I cannot see any reason he would disagree with that.

**Deputy Roffey:** We have no reason to want to slow things up. Sorry, madam, in an attempt to cut this short. The only thing that would slow it up would be not having the funds available to actually do the investigation. We have been told that will happen. I am not sure about it is STSB will do the work under one and P&R under the other. Under proposal 9, P&R are charged with coming back with a plan and a scheme to allow the Seafront Enhancement to be worked up in a way that would include a Pool Marina.

1170 Now, I look to P&R. I presume that in any such plan it would be the STSB and the ports team that would be charged with actually – I cannot see it would be anybody else – designing and moving forward the ports. So either way that is what would happen. If it helps, I am happy to say that STSB is very happy to move this forward with as much despatch as possible. As I explained, it is not simple. There needs to be surveys, there needs to be a seabed survey, there needs to be a refraction and reflection survey. There needs to be confidence about the technology.

1175 That work is waiting to be done, if it is funded we will move forward as quickly as we possibly can, whether or not this amendment is passed. So I do not have a problem with this amendment being passed, it is just a problem for the Law Officers going and redrafting things I think to make sense out of the proposals then.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Inder, do you wish to withdraw the amendment?

1180 **Deputy Inder:** No, madam, I do not. I am carrying on.

**Deputy Trott:** I wish to speak ... have you called me?

1185 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I have not but I will! (*Laughter*) Deputy Trott, would you like to speak?

**Deputy Trott:** That is very kind of you, if you do not mind, madam? I want to speak because of the explanatory note and I want to ask a question, which leads onto the challenge that I gave Deputy Brouard earlier, with regard to private finance. The explanatory note speculates, nothing more, that the cost of this project could be £15 million – £20 million. Now I have absolutely no doubt in my mind that the business case will stack up. I think it will stack up in spades and I gave the reasons why based on the QEII Marina. I think in many respects this is a far simpler engineering project and the demand will be more sufficient. Where the price-point is, is clearly a matter for another day.

1195 But that is not my challenge. My challenge is that we are told in the explanatory note that there are two sources of funds: private capital or the States' bond. Now my understanding is that the Policy & Resources Committee have advised that if we utilise everything that is currently in the Capital Reserve, if we utilise the residual balance, which is about half of the original bond offer, we will still need to borrow a further £200 million. Is this project part of that £200 million? Indeed.

1200 This is an example, as Deputy Brouard said earlier, that I was fairly certain I knew the answer. So, that £200 million has just become £220 million, if it comes from the bond. But if it comes from private finance then clearly it is still debt, but not through that particular procurement route. So I will do this every single time now, to assist my friends on the Treasury Department, because there is a stack. So let us be clear, I fully support this. I think the business case will be absolutely unequivocal. But if it comes from the bond money, it is now an additional £220 million potentially. Thank you.

1205 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Queripel.

1210 **Deputy Queripel:** Thank you, madam. In the words of Simply Red, money is too tight to mention. It is because it is too tight to mention it is absolutely vital we separate wants from needs. Now this is a want. We cannot have everything we want. But it is crucial that we get what we need and we have some really big ticket items coming up soon for debate and how many of them wants and how many of the needs? We only have a finite amount of money available to us and we need to spend it wisely.

1215 The general thrust of this amendment is to spend an incredible amount of taxpayers' money on developing the harbour and, as I say, that to me is a want, it is not a need. In opposing this amendment, I just want to spend a moment focussing on those big ticket items. They include extending the Airport runway – up to £100 million; putting a direct cable for France to import

electricity – another £100 million. The estimated cost of developing our harbours, as we know, is £360 million, plus of course the £4 million to just draw up the reports.

1220 The money that will be needed to reconfigure our schools, and I am sure one of my colleagues will correct me if I am wrong, I think that is somewhere around £30 million. I could be wrong there. I have lost track of that one. We need to modernise the Hospital, at an estimated cost of £132 million.

1225 On top of that, we will continue to be asked to give millions of pounds to Aurigny, on top of the £100 million we have given to them in the past nine years. So there is a possibility we will be asked to recapitalise them again. The last time the States did that it cost the taxpayer, I believe I am right in saying, £25 million.

1230 Now out of those six, only two are needs. The remaining four are wants. We need to modernise our Hospital and we need to reconfigure our schools. We do not need to pursue the other four. There are other ways of going about dealing with those four. All we need to do at our harbours is repair them, something the States has got a very poor record of doing on all States-owned property, maintenance and repairs. It has been woeful historically.

1235 But the request for that money can come in a separate policy letter. If this is all about the blue economy and diversifying our economy, there are other ways we can do that, several other ways we can do that and we will not be taking a risk and a gamble that they pay off. Where is the evidence that this is going to pay off? There is no evidence.

1240 There is no evidence in this amendment and there will not be any evidence in the report that results from this amendment succeeding. All we will hear during the debate is opinion and all the report is going to contain under costings is estimates. There will not be any evidence. There will not be any evidence that spending between £15 million and £20 million is going to pay off.

Just in case my colleagues are wondering which ways I am thinking of diversifying the economy, we should be all over medicinal cannabis. There is millions to be made there. And we should bring in a territorial tax. There is millions to be made there.

1245 So it is on the basis that there is no evidence and also on the basis that many of us say we need to be fully informed to enable us to make a decision and we have not been fully informed. We will not be fully informed during debate and we have not been fully informed in this amendment that we are contemplating now, despite what colleagues may say to the contrary. So madam, in closing, I urge colleagues to reject this amendment and I ask for a recorded vote when we go to the vote please, thank you.

1250 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Roffey. Deputy Ferbrache.

1255 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Deputy Queripel makes lots of good points about costs, very wisely, very astutely and he actually said something that many people would be saying, albeit he is saying it on their behalf. So I commend him for that. But I think he is wrong in his conclusion. Because as Deputy Trott said, the history shows that a marina facility of this nature would be repaid in a relatively short period of time and it would also give a boost, even before it is built. People will think Guernsey is really going forward, it is doing something.

1260 So, I am very much in favour of it but I am not going to vote for this amendment because it is completely unnecessary, because it is covered already, as has been explained and the Deputy Bailiff made the point, P&R in one and STSB in the other, but that is not the reality of it and Deputy Roffey has covered that. So what is the point of us debating and voting for an amendment that is really completely unnecessary?

1265 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy de Lisle.

**Deputy de Lisle:** Can I ask for a little clarification because is this not something that is already ongoing? If you look east, down from the Crown Pier, there is already a fledgling marina within the Pool, with people actually embarking and being checked for the virus on the south arm of the Crown

1270 Pier. I just wonder whether this is not part of the combination one, with respect to ongoing change and investment within the £35 million that was designated for combination one and I am asking to what extent, actually, that this is something that is already ongoing that the port has in hand? Thank you.

1275 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gabriel.

**Deputy Gabriel:** Thank you, madam. I rise briefly and Deputy Queripel inspired me to rise. I was not going to speak because I do support this amendment and I had heard all the arguments I need to vote for it. But primarily he was on about wants and needs and we need to rebuild our economy.  
1280 We need revenue. A marina will do that. The current leisure configuration we have got for our marinas does not attract larger vessels and, equally, larger mooring fees.

Deputy Trott and Deputy Ferbrache had already picked up on the payback that the QEII, or the North Beach Marina as it was then in 1984, got paid back in a relatively short period of time for a large amount of capital expense. I believe that this, what STSB are offering, will do that and I think  
1285 that we should trust STSB to do that. Let us not forget that the Ports Holding Account, very few years ago, was very healthy, based on our marina activity, primarily, it is my understanding.

I only ask STSB that, while I trust them, not to use Guernsey as a test bed and not to use perhaps new technology which is maybe not relevant for a small port like Guernsey. I thank STSB and I thank Deputy Inder and Deputy Vermeulen for laying this amendment and I will be supporting it.

1290 **The Deputy Bailiff:** If nobody else wishes to speak, I will ask Deputy Inder if he wishes to reply.

**Deputy Inder:** Thank you. Again, obviously, thank you for Deputy Vermeulen for supporting and the general support from the Assembly for economic activity. We know where we have been. We  
1295 know where we are today. We do not necessarily know where we will be in the future but this is the opportunity.

I have explained two or three times why I think this amendment should be laid today because it allows STSB to lay their other amendment, irrespective of the quirky nature of amendment 9, how that got its way into the current set of Propositions. So without further ado, I think I need to answer  
1300 Deputy Trott's direct question and he is right. I made mention of it not being a part of a capital prioritisation, and I understood, again with his far greater expertise and Deputy Helyar's far greater expertise, in matters of corporate finance, that there was an ability, when this was written, before we have that information, the bond was accessible for matters where revenue could be generated.

So at the point of writing, of this going to press, that was the information I had in front of me.  
1305 Deputy Trott will also, hopefully, have remembered, that we got an email from Mr Ravenscroft, who happens to lead the Guernsey Investment Fund and he had basically, open-armed, said effectively on this project alone, 'come and talk to us'. That was his message.

I was hoping it to come out of the bond. It may not be the case but there is now another option. Some form of private capital and as I hope we move towards some form of commercialisation for  
1310 the port, all things will fall into place. I am just not going to persuade Deputy Queripel in any way, shape or form.

To answer Deputy de Lisle's pontoon – pontoon? Question! – pontoon is a game you play on Friday night, is it not? I think he is talking about the visitor pontoons themselves for the embarkation of visiting vessels, which of course in any future marina would have to be taken into consideration.  
1315 But that is not the start of the greater marina. They are just literally overnight lay-off pontoons and disembark application pontoons and they are very much temporary measures. So without further ado, a recorded vote please, madam, and let us see what happens today . Thank you, Deputy Vermeulen, and general support from all parties.

1320 **The Deputy Bailiff:** States' Greffier, in relation to amendment 2, would you call the recorded vote please?

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Amendment 2*

*Carried – Pour 26, Contre 6, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 6*

**POUR**

Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Matthews  
Deputy McKenna  
Deputy Moakes  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Taylor  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Vermeulen  
Deputy Aldwell  
Deputy Blin  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Bury  
Deputy Cameron  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Fairclough  
Deputy Gabriel  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Haskins  
Deputy Helyar  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller  
Deputy Le Tissier

**CONTRE**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Queripel  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Ferbrache

**NE VOTE PAS**

Alderney Rep.  
Snowdon  
Deputy St Pier \*

**ABSENT**

Deputy Mahoney  
Deputy Murray  
Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Dyke  
Deputy Falla

\* denotes Member who voted by proxy

**The Deputy Bailiff:** There voted Pour 26, Contre 6, there were 2 abstentions and 6 absentees. I declare the amendment passed.

1325

[Amendment 3](#)

*After Proposition 2, insert the following:*

*"2A. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee, through its seafront regeneration sub-committee, in consultation with the Committee for Economic Development, the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, the marine industry and other relevant stakeholders, to undertake a detailed analysis of economic opportunities from developing an enhanced Blue Economy offering across the Guernsey Seafront Enhancement Area, including but not limited to leisure marinas, super yachts, over-wintering, marine service industry, marine tourism and other commercial opportunities and use the findings to develop proposals for such an enhanced Blue Economy offering to be submitted in the form of a Policy Letter and suitable Propositions for the States for approval by the end of December 2022."*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Amendment 3. Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, do you still wish to lay this amendment?

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Yes, madam. May I have the amendment read please?

1330

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes of course. States' Greffier.

*The States' Greffier read out the amendment.*



**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

1335 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Thank you, madam. I just wanted to ask whether you need a seconder or it comes after me?

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I am sorry, yes. Deputy Haskins, do you still wish to second this?

1340 **Deputy Haskins:** Yes, I do.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

1345 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Thank you very much. Thank you, Members. I think throughout the debate of the last two days, we have heard the central concern that we feel the current policy letter does not address fully really the economic opportunity of looking at our harbours and seafront enhancement.

1350 I think this amendment very much tries to address that as the next step that we need to undertake in parallel to developing more detailed proposals, for the actual options of the harbours. So this amendment came before the amendments around the seafront, the regeneration and development board, but I think they still very much apply and I will explain why.

1355 As I mentioned earlier in debate, the Future Harbours policy letter is underpinned by the demand forecast for the Future Harbours requirements, which were conducted by Jacobs and we have the table, table 2 on page 18, that I also refer to. So as I mentioned before, this table is quite important because it underpins the demand forecasts for the different categories of users and it also then translates that into the spatial requirements that Future Harbours will need to meet that demand.

1360 I think overall we have focussed on talking about the commercial demand requirements and while I will accept that became very much the cornerstone and what was driving the considerations and the option development and stuff like that, the original direction from the States in 2019 was the following:

To direct STSB to carry out detailed analysis of the Future Harbour requirements.

1365 It was not just about the commercial part, it was about the future requirements and hence if you look at the Jacobs demand study, it does not just look at the commercial requirements. It has non-commercial requirements as well. In specifics, what I would consider the non-commercial requirements are around visiting yachts, local yachts, super yachts, cruise, fishing and charter vessels, basically.

1370 Where I have a real problem with this current policy letter is around the line forecasting demand for local yachts. Currently, if you look at the local yachts, first of all it is based on an historic trend in current demand, which has been pretty much flat. But the reason it has been flat is because we have limited capacity of the harbours. We have exceeded the capacity of the harbours, you just cannot have more demand. We cannot meet the demand.

1375 So the demand forecast study is based on flat demand of local yachting for the last many years but it is because it has been constrained by the existing harbour facilities. So the Jacobs demand study gives us what could be the best case scenario, the high demand forecast by 2050, and the low. And the higher level forecasts 2,110 potential moorings berthed by 2050, which is an increase of just 343 berths, which represents a 19% increase in demand as the best case scenario for local yachts.

1380 Having spoken with the marine industry, and that was referred to at the previous amendment Deputies Inder and Vermeulen led, we all know that there is more demand right now that cannot be met by the industry. I ask the question to the marine industry whether they agree with those demand forecasts and they said, 'No, we completely do not agree with those demand forecasts.'

In addition, these demand forecasts do not include whatsoever any of the potential additional opportunity that creating additional marinas for new markets such as over-wintering for UK or other international boat owners, could present. So this is only looking at the maximum opportunity with local demand, which is seen to increase by only 19% by 2050 and fails to look completely at additional opportunities of creating marinas and other marine opportunities.

Then, so I mentioned how this demand forecast then translates into the spatial requirements that were developed as part of all of those options that we have seen in the policy paper and so all the options that we have seen and the combinations of options basically are designed to cater for that demand only. In fact, they can cater for slightly higher demand, about 500 berths, and I have been engaged with the ports team trying to get to the bottom of what is really the absolute maximum number of increased capacity we can get from the existing options as they are from a combination of those existing options and I tried very hard and the maximum I got was 500. This does not include potential extension of Havelet Bay. So it is 500.

Five hundred additional berths would represent just a 30% increase in capacity. Again, if we are thinking about building out our future harbours, future ports, for the next 50-100 years and the absolute maximum capacity that we think we can deliver is 30%, I just think this is not really future-proofing ourselves and this is exactly the kind of projects that will pay for themselves in spades, as Deputy Trott mentioned about the QEII Marina.

If you look at many harbours, new harbours, marinas being built in Brittany and Normandy. I will just give a few examples. Saint Cast in Brittany, 825 new berths built in 2009. Roscoff in Brittany, 622-berth marina built in 2016 and the list really goes on. So our neighbours have already built much bigger capacity than the absolute maximum capacity we are going to be building in the future.

So, while I recognise that really the cornerstone has been where our industrial port goes and the spatial requirements from it, I am really not happy with the forecast of the demand that has been done here in terms of local yachts and not taking into consideration the potential additional opportunity, which I think has the problem of potentially restricting, in terms of the spatial configurations what we will be able to do with our marinas in the future.

From what I understand there was very limited consultation that took place with the marine industry. It amounted to a one-hour presentation just before COVID appeared last year. There were no individual follow-ups with the marine industry following that. I was disappointed, unfortunately, to hear it was quite a limited consultation even though I appreciate that the COVID pandemic disrupted the situation.

So, very much, this amendment is about making more explicit what we would like the States to do as a next step, in parallel to developing the technical next steps in terms of options 5 and 6 if we approve today. It is enhancing the current Proposition 2, which makes reference to section 11.14. So it is really about placing front and centre the need to really look at the big picture of what I kind of call the blue economy presents to us.

Just to jump into the section 11.14, what the STSB has asked for is that we approve that:

Further work and investigative studies will be required to progress this Programme to develop more detailed proposals. These will include, but are not limited to, hydrographic modelling, site investigations, outline design, economic analysis, marine or coastal surveys, opportunities for early stage environmental offsetting and further stakeholder consultation. These costs and those pertaining to the establishment of a small Programme Office shall be treated as a pipeline project in the capital portfolio, with associated costs subject to approval by the Policy & Resources Committee. The costs of this further work will be developed with the Policy & Resources Committee but are currently estimated not to exceed £4 million ...

So there is a mention about the need for further economic analysis. There is a mention for more work to be done and we have also approved and it is already, we have heard the commitment to approve the work to undertake the set-up of the development corporation. But what is important is that through this amendment, what I am proposing today, is not in competition with either what we have approved with regard to commercial harbours or the regeneration board.

Actually it is that underpinning, big picture thinking we need to put together as a Government in terms of the blue economy. So the development and regeneration board is not going to be just about the blue economy. It is about the whole seafront. It will be looking at many areas of the seafront, which have nothing to do with what might be called the blue economy.

1430 It might look at residential development, it might look at commercial development – hotels and so on. But what we are missing right now is that bigger picture, Economic Development-type thinking, what is the opportunity with the blue economy. Hence I am bringing through this amendment today the need to work as a States in a very co-ordinated approach, through different committees such as Economic Development, such as Environment & Infrastructure, Policy & Resources and STSB to undertake this piece of work.

1435 The deadline for that I have currently aligned with December 2022, because I think that piece of work can help inform for further stages of developing our harbours. Some of the key implications, I think, from this piece of work will be that if we do see a real opportunity and we know from many business cases elsewhere, from QEII Marina, we have just discussed the Pool Marina, that these types of projects pay for themselves in no time. They are true economic enablers.

1440 If we agree that that is where we see the real opportunity for further diversification enhancing our marine industry, it will potentially shift how, perhaps, big our harbours might be, what might go in our harbours and look at other sites such as St Sampson's Harbour extension, which I am bringing through amendment 4 later on.

1445 So I think it is very important to have that work done, which will really help the work of the regeneration board, which will further inform the harbours development, as have been captured but just not in enough detail for me to be confident that this piece of work will be done. So this is very much about placing front and centre the desire that I think I have heard from pretty much all Members that the hand and glove have to go together, it is really looking at that opportunity and making sure we do it through working together but, really critically, through engaging with the marine industry, which have been loudly and clearly screaming for better blue economy offering, for more berths for more opportunities. That is really the call from them.

1450 So this is an amendment that specifies the work that I believe we need to undertake as an Assembly in parallel to the work STSB specifically will be doing in harbours and that will also then feed into what a regeneration board, development board will be tasked with developing. So I look forward to the debate on this amendment. Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

1460 **Deputy Inder:** Madam, again Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and Deputy Haskins have come up with a very good amendment, they completely understand the industry. I believe Deputy Haskins is ocean-master, not yacht master, ocean master, he is probably the most qualified person in the States for leisure sailing and he actually beats Deputy Trott, no? (*Interjection*) No, we have got two ocean masters. Well they beat Deputy Helyar because I think he is only a yacht master, so there you go.

1465 Deputy Kazantseva-Miller quite clearly understands the necessity for developing the harbour and it is great that she has come round to that. The only question I have got to ask and this is really calling to procedure, because I support absolutely the intent here and all the work that has gone into, but I am just not entirely sure and it is probably ... oh, there is no one from Policy & Resources here. Or very few, anyway. Deputy Le Tocq, sorry!

1470 Now we have got amendment 9 shoved into the final Propositions 'to establish a Development and Regeneration Board', which we have not entirely got the whole of the KPIs and SLAs involved, so we have decided to go on a more commercialised path, could I ask possibly Deputy Le Tocq, even though this is slightly disconnected from amendment 9, which has now become a substantive Proposition, even though it seems somewhat disconnected, would he accept, through the intent of the amendment to include Members of E&I, EcoDev and an expanded skillset, which I think the

answer to part of that question is obviously certainly yes, otherwise it would not be a development and regeneration board ...?

1480 But I think what Deputy Kazantseva-Miller is saying is will E&I and EcoDev get some kind of inclusion in this regeneration board in setting the terms. What I do not want to do is I do not want to lose the intent but it is not necessarily connected to amendment 9, which is now substantive. I hope that makes some sense.

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

1485

**Deputy Le Tocq:** I will try and respond to that. I can only speak for myself, my colleagues are not here and I have not consulted them but it seems to sort of make sense to do that, although I have to say I am losing the will to live in this debate. I really do think these are the sorts of things that we should not be trying to design on the floor of this Assembly.

1490

We have got into the situation where a lot of this is making sense but is almost in committee. This States said early on that we wanted to be collegiate and to consult and work with all the Members and all the various mandates that Deputy Inder has mentioned would fall under that and I think it would be incumbent upon us as P&R to certainly consult and get the views of those committees. They may not agree among themselves, let alone between the different committees, but we would not try and force that upon them. So if that helps in any way, that is as much as I can say, I think, at the moment.

1495

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

1500

**Deputy Gollop:** I kind of disagree, I think, with some elements of what Deputy Le Tocq has just said because the thing is an overly collegiate environment means some of us never get to know what is going on, really, if we are not on the committees. There is a real problem with our system of governance, becoming greater and more apparent with every passing month and it was not helped by the reorganisation of 2016, either.

1505

Because I am President of something very impressive, Madam Deputy President, the States of Guernsey Transport Licensing Authority, and I get numerous people asking me, 'What are you doing about buses, or taxis or ferries?' None of that is within my mandate. We do not have a ministry of transport.

1510

We really have a very strange kind of mixture here. To me, the blue economy and all the benefits that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and other Deputies have spoken on, from Deputy Brouard to Deputy Inder and Deputy Haskins, is intrinsically part of a ministry or Principal Committee of Economic Development, Commerce & Employment. It is about generating more money for the Island. It is about stimulating everything from hospitality to retail to light industry, to high net worth individuals spending more time here.

1515

Yet we have transferred a lot of this, although he is arguably perhaps our most able politician or one of our most able politicians, it is under Deputy Roffey's mandate and he would be the first to admit – and did yesterday – that it is a Trading Board mandate. It was not intended to be a policy development committee, nor was it meant to be a political committee, because it started its life with only two politicians; now it has three. It had a different format really. It was focussed on commercialisation and being a conduit.

1520

So we have got problems here somehow and Policy & Resources have become involved with this and the environment is important in this too. We know there is potential out there for leisure marinas, super yachts over-wintering, the marine service industry, marine tourism. But it does need to have the input of Economic Development politicians and officers. Also people maybe from other – even competitive – jurisdictions and also people who know what they are talking about when it comes to making money and developing these opportunities, not just civil engineers and structural builders and quantity surveyors.

1525

1530 These amendments are important and I also will support but will not need to speak on the Bridge one because the Bridge is a gem that could be a really competitive port, to really outline the competition in southern England, other Islands, northern France, many other places. The Bridge has charm, history, it is even mentioned, St Sampson's is a key element of one of the great Victor Hugo's most important novels and yet nobody goes there, especially tourists.

1535 Even the charity shops have been closing in St Sampson's. That is depressing. Never mind. We need a rebirth and the blue economy will work in St Sampson's, where there are still elements of the blue economy already, and St Peter Port, so let us get on with this. I do not think there is anything controversial not to support.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey.

1540 **Deputy Roffey:** Thank you, sir. Deputy Ferbrache said yesterday he was I think slightly bemused that STSB were supporting some amendments, proposed others and were neutral on others. This was one of the ones we were neutral on. We were neutral on it not because we, as three individual politicians, are neutral or do not care about the blue economy but I will wind Members back to what we thought we were doing with this policy letter, which was to set in place a keystone to decide  
1545 what we wanted to do with our commercial ports and, okay, not a final decision, because that work needs to be done, get a steer so we know roughly where we are going and then the next stage, full speed ahead once we have done that was to work up the regeneration possibilities, the blue economy possibilities.

1550 We did not feel that we were the people that were going to lead on that. So that is why we are neutral because we thought more it was for P&R to respond to this amendment than for us. Of course, where those blue economy opportunities relate to harbours, we will be involved in what actively could be done and could not be done. But that is I suppose why we were neutral on this. We felt it was really, as Deputy Gollop said, more in Economic Development's mandate than it was in ours.

1555 I do have to take up a couple of points that she made, though. I was not on STSB when this whole project started but my understanding was there was indeed very significant stakeholder engagement to try and work out the demand forecast. I would also point out that STSB, and I thought we might get criticised at some of the presentations – nobody did – we took the very upper end of those demand forecasts in order to plan.

1560 How much demand there may be beyond the domestic market for people to moor craft of some considerable size and base them here and commute into the Island to use them, because they do not have to cross the Channel all the time, I think it is an open-ended question. I think Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's attitude is build it and they will come. We do not take the opposite view but we are slightly more cautious than that because money is limited and we have to make sure that the  
1565 business case actually stacks up and a business case based on hope is sometimes slightly difficult. But we are certainly open to a lot more marina development.

1570 She talked about numbers, that the maximum would be an extra 30%, an extra 500 or 600 moorings. That is true but what it does, the present schemes, if they go ahead – and I think that is the big question there that she needs to be worried about – if they go ahead then it will produce up to 500-600 berths, but it will also allow inside that mix a lot more large berths that would generate a lot more money for the Island.

1575 Now, she thinks that is too unambitious. Maybe she is right. I do not know. I am looking forward to the next tranche of work, which will be led by other committees and they will be the ones making up those business cases. What I would say, though, is that even that 30% increase, and it would start off with the Pool Marina, there is also, I am sorry for anybody who wants to re-erect polo competitions, but it would probably then move next to the Careening Hard and then, if the States have the vision to actually move forward on our commercial ports, obviously St Sampson's Harbour would be turned into a leisure facility and that is where those would go.

1580 If there is demand beyond that, then of course more work needs to be done on other sites and  
of course we have said Havelet Bay is a possibility. It would be controversial, very controversial, but  
it is a possibility. And there are other possibilities. But what I would ask is let us get on with this next  
stage, which will create several hundred extra berths without asking us to look at too many, stretch  
resources too thin at this stage.

1585 But as I say I think really the key to the blue economy and side effects of the commercial ports  
decision is actually getting a commercial ports decision and the body language I am reading is we  
could, if we are not careful, walk away from here having voted against 1-4. If you do that and yet  
you still say that you are in favour of the blue economy, then frankly you are facing both ways at  
the same time. You really are, because so many of these opportunities, actually not the Pool Marina  
necessarily, do depend on getting a decision on the actual thing that we are here to debate today.

1590 So STSB really do not mind how you vote on this. We assumed anyway that the next phase,  
which would not be under our control, although will feed into the bits where we have a relevance,  
was going to do this anyway. We assume we are going to do it. I guess the Deputy just wants to  
make absolutely sure that that is there in black and white to make sure that happens and I have no  
objection to that.

1595 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Haskins.

**Deputy Haskins:** Thank you, madam. Seeing as Deputy Roffey is ambivalent in this I would hope  
that everyone would support it. Seeing as though Deputy Le Tocq and I suspect many of the rest of  
1600 you are losing the will to live I am going to try and be as quick as possible. Deputy Gollop makes a  
very valid point and I agree with him.

I believe the concern is that other Committees have not been involved enough in the way that  
they want to be, whether it is Economic Development, we are really trying to focus on the economic  
opportunity just so that we can make sure that we are actually joining up that strategic direction of  
1605 commercial, if we are going to take it out, all of the other opportunities that we can have, which is  
the reason for this amendment.

I wanted to elaborate on something that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller said, which was that the  
Jacobs Report said that there is a 0.7% rise in local yachts and she already alluded to this, that if you  
have a glass of water and it is full, it is full – it cannot get more full. We have a two-year waiting list  
1610 for our local boats. I think build it and they will come might actually ring a little bit truer in that  
regard.

When you are looking at visitor yachts, I think the forecast in here from the 2008-19 was a 2.3%  
reduction but globally we are looking at a compound annual growth rate of over 4% so I would  
then go and challenge why is it that we did see that decline and I would suggest that that is because  
1615 our facilities are not as good as they should be.

I think we all know that; everyone would agree with me. But what we are trying to do is just bring  
in that to make sure that there is a direction for this. So I would hope that everyone will support  
this amendment. Thank you.

1620 **The Deputy Bailiff:** If nobody else wishes to speak, I will invite Deputy Kazantseva-Miller to  
reply.

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Thank you very much everyone for your valuable contributions. I  
think what is quite important is to establish here, and again we do not really know what the  
1625 regeneration and development corporation will look like but I really doubt that this will be a policy  
making body.

In fact I would be slightly concerned if that becomes the policy making body, that assumes our  
responsibility for development of economic-enabling opportunities, such as we are talking about  
and hence I think it is very important and I think Deputy Gollop had alluded to that very well, this is

1630 an economic enabling opportunity which I feel fits really and squarely in the mandate of Economic Development, in collaboration with the rest of committees and colleagues as well.

This is not – until we have further information, notice, what the regeneration will be about – it is not, I see, being in their remit. I see the regeneration board as being: here is what we need to develop, we need to develop in a co-ordinated way, here is a plan for 10 years and funding models, go with it.

1635 The piece of work that is missing right now and I think has to happen as a next step is that identification, really putting the meat on the bones of what that economic opportunity is. Actually, a little bit of that has been done as part of the policy development. We have the marina projects report. Unfortunately, it is really just high level. It does not really go into saying, actually, if you do  
1640 a 600-berth marina, actually the pricing for a berth of this nature is this and it will pay off itself in 10 years' time.

So there is a very high level appendix report with this policy letter that actually does start touching base but it just does not go into any detail of identifying what the opportunities are, how big the demand could be and what kinds of capacities, in terms of harbour/marina development we would need to actually meet, potentially, those demands.

1645 So I think this is exactly the kind of piece of work that I feel needs to be taken and I think it needs to be undertaken in co-ordination, by the States, and we can do it, we can start working on it, if given the green light, straight away. So I think hopefully that answers a little bit some of the questions posed by Deputies Inder and Gollop and others.

1650 Deputy Le Tocq mentions about kind of losing the will to live because Policy & Resources are co-ordinating, but this goes again back into as an economic enablement diversification opportunity – and blue economy is within the Government Work Plan and it falls within the mandate of Economic Development and Environment & Infrastructure – it is just something that we need to drive as joint Committees.

1655 In terms of Deputy Roffey, I am pleased to hear that and I thought they would be neutral because this Proposition 2 and an amendment which related to Proposition 2 is not in relation to the work STSB has to undertake. It is really in relation to the work of the P&R subcommittee, as in funding and co-ordinating the next stage of development, which was identified by section 11.14, that I read out before.

1660 I do have to mention again that, having spoken to the marine industry about the stakeholder engagement, specifically with them, I understand it was limited. This is what they told me. I can only relay what they said. Apparently it was one hour. There were no individual follow-ups during COVID. COVID hit. I think it cut short some of the potential engagements that were supposed to have happened so I believe specifically with the local marine industry it was limited. I am sure with other  
1665 stakeholders, perhaps it was more expensive.

So I think there was the question about the mentality of build and they come. I was not here but from what I understand, when QEII was built and St Sampson's Marina was built they filled up very quickly. As we know, as Deputy Haskins mentioned, we have a waiting list, we have absolutely nowhere to actually even cater for demand of slightly bigger boats. We now have cases where our  
1670 bigger, more luxurious boat, in terms of bad weather, has to actually go and shelter in Herm. This is happening right now. Right now we have no capacity to meet the demand of the current local market.

So I think there is an important piece of – I dare to say – strategic policy development work that has to happen as the next step. It does not, in no way, shape or form preclude from what STSB has been used to do and I do hope that we do vote through this policy paper. This is an additional leg  
1675 in the stool, which I think is absolutely essential to undertake as a next step, in collaboration of the committees together and it does not effect what the mandate and implications for the regeneration board is. The regeneration board can take forward the ideas as they have been developed and help to potentially find those opportunities. In summary, I encourage Members to all vote for this  
1680 amendment. Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** There does not appear to be a request for a recorded ... Deputy Queripel.

**Deputy Queripel:** Recorded vote, madam, please.

1685

**The Deputy Bailiff:** States' Greffier, there is a request for a recorded vote in relation to amendment 3.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Amendment 3*

*Carried – Pour 25, Contre 11, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Matthews  
Deputy McKenna  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Moakes  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Vermeulen  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Bury  
Deputy Cameron  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Fairclough  
Deputy Falla  
Deputy Gabriel  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Haskins  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller

**CONTRE**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Mahoney  
Deputy Queripel  
Deputy St Pier \*  
Deputy Taylor  
Deputy Aldwell  
Deputy Blin  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Helyar  
Deputy Le Tissier

**NE VOTE PAS**

Alderney Rep.  
Snowdon

**ABSENT**

Deputy Murray  
Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Deputy Dyke

\* denotes Member who voted by proxy

1690

**The Deputy Bailiff:** In relation to amendment 3, there voted Pour 25, Contre 11, 1 abstention and 3 absentees. I declare the amendment passed. We are just approaching the lunch hour but before we do and in order to manage time for this afternoon, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, do you intend laying both your amendments?

1695

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Just amendment 4, I think, not 7.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Not 7?

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Yes.

1700

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Helyar, do you intend to lay your amendment?

**Deputy Helyar:** No, madam.

1705

**The Deputy Bailiff:** With that in mind, I think we can adjourn now and return at 2.30 p.m. I think we will have sufficient time this afternoon in relation to the final amendments and then vote and then the debate on the SACC green paper. With that in mind we will now adjourn for lunch.



*The Assembly adjourned at 12.31 p.m.  
and resumed at 2.30 p.m.*

**STATES' TRADING SUPERVISORY BOARD**

**Future Harbour Development –  
Debate concluded –  
Propositions 5-7 (as amended) carried**

[Amendment 4](#)

After Proposition 1 insert the following proposition:-

"1A. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee, through its seafront regeneration sub-committee, in consultation with the States' Trading Supervisory Board, to undertake an analysis of the option to extend St Sampson's Harbour to increase the capacity for leisure berths as well as enhance leisure facilities and other commercial opportunities and use the findings to develop more detailed proposals and submit those to the States for approval by the end of December 2022."

**The Deputy Bailiff:** States' Greffier, when you are ready.

1710

**The States' Greffier:** I believe we are at amendment 4.

**The Deputy Greffier:** Yes. Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, amendment 4. Do you wish the States' Greffier to read the amendment?

1715

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Yes, madam.

*The States' Greffier read out the amendment.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

1720

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Thank you, madam. This may seem like this option has come out of the blue but first of all I just want to say that this is not an amendment to ask you to extend St Sampson's or do anything serious. This is an amendment to actually just put the option of extending St Sampson's for leisure purposes only as a potential site that we should really be exploring, if we are looking at all the possible strategic, tactical sides across the seafront.

1725

How it came about, I was busy looking at the policy paper that was submitted to us by the STSB and the proposals to, whether it is the proposal to extend St Peter Port or building out in Longue Hougue, they are complex and they are quite large construction projects. All of those options require effectively two new, big arms to each harbour to be created, another side of the harbour with the breakwater to be created, so a really huge engineering project.

1730

Sometimes simple answers can be quite simple and straight forward. I would say I am not a professional mariner, unlike my seconder Deputy Haskins and perhaps many others in the Assembly, but I did look at Google Maps to start with and I did look at St Sampson's and I just thought there is a very direct line from Longue Hougue North, up towards the Vale Castle, with a reasonably short-looking distance that could be connected to potentially form a marina and I just wondered why that was not even on the books of this policy letter.

1735

So, I investigated further and the answer I got from the ports team was because an extension of St Sampson's was previously discarded as an option. So I looked further. I do not take no for an answer straight away, as you will find out, and I asked for more information and basically it is based off the back of a study that was done in 1991. Completed in 1991, 30 years ago! It was the Wallingford HR study. But importantly that study looked into the extension of St Sampson's Harbour into a large commercial harbour, pretty much to the same size of capability and usage that we are looking today with the future policy paper.

1740

It was not looking at a much smaller potential extension for leisure purposes only. It was also before the time Longue Hougue was reclaimed. So there was not a big piece of reclaimed land

1745 sticking out of the Bridge, which kind of now creates a potential opportunity for creating breakwaters towards Vale Castle.

So the previous significant research that was undertaken was very interesting to look at – that policy paper from 30 years. It was typewritten. It was quite interesting. It must have taken much longer in those times to write those documents. That policy paper and that feasibility study looked at a much more significant extension. It would have involved harbour arms of about 1 km length or more coming out in the Little Russel. So it was a completely different beast.

1750 So, my understanding is that, because of that study of 30 years ago, St Sampson's was not even on the books for this policy paper and I understand that because we know that the cornerstone for determining the future of our harbours and the seafront is really down to the commercial harbour and I accept that.

1755 Given what we have discussed today, the earlier strong support from the Assembly regarding the importance of analysing the opportunities with the blue economy, I also mentioned that with the best case scenarios, I think we will be restricted in terms of the amount of new leisure marinas that the existing options will provide us and I mentioned that number, 500. I do think that is for a 50-100-year horizon, I do feel it is restrictive.

1760 This is where I think this amendment potentially comes in, to say well, can we at least consider expanding St Sampson's for leisure purposes only, just as another card to have along with those 15 options that have been researched. Add it as the 16th option that can work together with all sorts of other combinations. So it is not instead of but it is an option to have in addition to what we are exploring for the future.

1765 What I would urge Members not to try to do here is to become designers of harbours and make statements on rock, how much dredging we are going to do and these currents. This is really not the purpose of this amendment to go into any discussion of whether it is feasible at all or not to extend St Sampson's. I think we should leave it to, really, the experts to undertake the kind of analysis they have been undertaking before.

1770 But just looking at very high level, it is a very substantial size, as you would see from the picture in my amendment. I have not done exact estimations of what the capacity will be because obviously it will depend on a huge number of things. I think it will only be really reasonable to do if all commercial activity, or most of it, moves out of St Sampson's. So again it is not something we are likely to do now. But it is something that really, potentially, if we are truly unlocking the opportunity with the Bridge, I think this is quite an exciting opportunity, to know that this is something we can do in the future.

1775 As we are undertaking that economic analysis, in tandem with developing, hopefully, what is happening with the commercial port, if we know that we have that option in the future for actually a very substantial increase of St Sampson's for leisure purposes, we know that the potential restrictions I talked about in terms of the full capacity of 30% that the current options can present us, I think that is something exciting to have down our pocket. It is really a card that we could play basically down the line.

1780 I do not know, my very rough estimation is this could potentially triple or quadruple the capacity of St Sampson's from what it is now, which can potentially create a 1,000-berth marina, which I just think is quite exciting just to have as an opportunity.

1785 Deputy Trott raises the importance, or the question about funding of all of these projects, which I completely agree, they are absolutely essential. What is, in addition, exciting about, I think, exploring this opportunity, is that it unlocks much more further land for development, especially on the south boundary around Longue Hougue North, the reclaimed land that is currently actually left completely unused. This is a very substantial piece of land next to Mont Crevelt, so there is a bit of historic interest there. But also on the Vale Castle.

1790 Potentially, instead of dredging all the rock, you can build over it, so again you are just actually increasing and unlocking the area for development on land: residential/commercial, whatever could be determined in the future. And in terms of funding and in terms of potentially looking at this whole area as an opportunity for development that could be done in partnership with a big

infrastructure developer, making that land available is the kind of thing that really makes these kinds of projects much more financially attractive.

1800 So again this becomes not just what happens in the actual marina on the water and how you generate income from that, but actually you are unlocking additional land that can be used for commercial/residential etc. development, which just makes everything else, the potential funding models of this, much more exciting.

1805 So really today, as I said, I am not asking for you to agree to the development of St Sampson's at all. I am just asking that this is put on the map as a location that should be explored. Not to super-detailed level but perhaps to the same level that was done so far by when those 15 different original options that became the seven combinations were explored. So quite high level.

1810 From having spoken to the ports team I understand although it will fit into a lot of the activity that hopefully STSB will be undertaking in developing the further proposals, there will be additional cost involved, which was estimated to be at £150,000 at this stage. It is a cost, I understand that it costs, but for us what it is offering is to have that card on the table, which can be used, but will also be important when further proposals with harbours hopefully will come back next year that we know that we can always pull that card and say, 'Actually we have an opportunity for a 1,000-berth harbour in the north, which will really act as a huge regeneration opportunity in addition to what is available now.'

1815 I just think at such early stages of this policy and this workstream it would be a miss for us, as an Assembly, to not even give the direction to the States to just consider this as an option. So I would seek Members' support in putting this option to the table and do high-level research and feasibility into this option to have among the cards we can play in our seafront regeneration. Thank you.

1820 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Haskins, do you formally second this amendment?

**Deputy Haskins:** Yes, I will.

1825 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

**Deputy Inder:** I am going to go early on this one. Members, this really is somewhere where I have boated around most of my life. In fact, I have even swum ashore there after losing a boat quarter of a mile offshore there. If there is anywhere in the world where I would not want to have to lay-off, because I have missed a sill, it would be outside of there.

1830 Looking at 6.5 knots, if I have missed the tide, I do not know where I would want to go. And this is the problem. With the greatest respect to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller when people go onto Google Maps and they draw pictures for marinas, I am afraid there are times when really, when it comes to matters of marine, we should in some way leave it to people who might know a little bit more than us.

1835 In concept great. Why not have another few hundred marina berths but I would not be putting it there in any way, shape or form, and I just do not believe anyone else in their right mind would do. Also, peculiarly, if anything, we have established and thankfully that a Pool Marina, which is in effectively slack water, you can lay off it if you have missed your tidal times, that has already been established as likely to happen. There is nothing in this document that gave any indication that a tidal marina would happen outside of St Sampson's pier head so I give fair warning to this that I would just not waste any money on this portion.

1840 If anything else, it should actually come under the development board, for them to give consideration in due course. But I would like to ask one question before we go to the actual vote and this is for Madam Deputy Bailiff. At the moment, in all likelihood, Proposition 1 is likely to lose.

1845 What will happen if we have given direction to STSB to spend £150,000 looking at something which effectively bocks off St Sampson's Harbour. Because if Proposition 1 loses our boats will still obviously be going into St Peter Port, as I have said before, into St Sampson's and drying out. This

effectively will be asking, if Proposition 1 loses, STSB to spend £150,000 on something that they just could not deliver. So I really would ask Members to reject this and reject this quickly.

1850

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

**Deputy Parkinson:** Thank you, madam. I am responding on behalf of the STSB and as Deputy Kazantseva-Miller knows we cannot support her amendment. But I would like to preface my remarks by saying that we absolutely share the ambition to maximise the use of the port facilities in Guernsey and we share her ambition and her desire to create additional leisure mooring spaces. So we entirely sympathise with her motives, we just do not think that this is the right way to go about it.

1855

1860

1865

First of all, there is nothing in combinations four to seven that would preclude an extension of St Sampson's Harbour at some time in the future. But we think that this should take place, if at all, after the main ports redevelopment. This policy letter is primarily about our commercial ports, and I would think that, if and when the States agrees to redevelop our commercial port arrangements and then that is implemented, which as we have said in previous debates could take perhaps 10 years, then maybe after that has been done, some time in the following five years, perhaps, we could consider whether an extension of St Sampson's Harbour, which would under combinations four to seven now be a leisure port, whether that leisure port could be expanded into the area outside the current harbour mouth.

1870

But in our opinion there are other possible marina sites which are more suitable. So I agree with a comment that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller made that this is a card to play down the line. It is not a card that we would want to spend time looking into at this point. So the other marina sites that are available, of course, include the marina in the Pool, perhaps the marina on the Careening Hard and a marina in the current St Sampson's Harbour.

1875

Between those sites there is a massive scope for new marina development before we need to go outside St Sampson's Harbour, where the area is both shallow, it dries, and it is very rocky, and it would clearly be an expensive investment to turn that into a marina for leisure visitors, or leisure users.

1880

The greatest demand for moorings, we have heard many times during these debates of a shortage of supply of moorings for leisure boats, but the biggest demand is for bigger boats and always accessible moorings. So a marina outside the present St Sampson's Harbour would not be an always accessible marina, it would be quite tidally restricted. So, that is another reason why there are other areas where we would prefer to direct our efforts and any potential investment.

1885

So, we are not saying it cannot be done. We are not saying it might not in the end be desirable, but if one is going for the low-hanging fruit first, there are many other areas that we would rather invest in before we get to the area outside St Sampson's Harbour, which as Deputy Inder has said, presents very considerable navigational hazards and obstacles. So, with regret, the STSB cannot support this amendment, and urges the States not to do so.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** If nobody else wishes to speak, I will ask Deputy Kazantseva-Miller to reply.

1890

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Thank you, madam, and thank you, Deputy Inder and Deputy Parkinson, for the comments. So I think again, I did not want to jump into discussions whether it is feasible to extend the harbour. We know there are currents there but we do have a perfectly functioning harbour that is being used and people do come in and out of there.

1895

I take Deputy Inder's advice about not using maps and pictures. I just want to remind him I think that is what he did in his original requête. But I moved from Google Maps to Digimap and then also Deputy Helyar kindly forwarded a nautical map to me as well.

I think there is a cost to this. Actually the costs for developing any of the marina options are not included in the high-level figures we have looked at. The Pool Marina is not a free project, it is £20 million. Havelet Bay is £100 million. Any configurations of leisure facilities in St Peter Port,

1900 St Sampson's, will come at additional costs. So, yes, absolutely, just answering Deputy Inder's comments, this will come at a cost.

1905 What I was trying to do here is, because it was not on the table at all, and I just thought it was worth, to let the Assembly know, that I think actually this is an option and to have it potentially hanging out there as an option to consider in the future. It was not directing STSB to do anything specific right now, it was directing the Policy & Resources through the regeneration subcommittee, which will become the regeneration board. So I think that is something that I hope is taken, even if this amendment does not succeed, but actually it is taken forward by the regeneration board because of the development opportunities around it. It probably fits much more squarely into their mandate and actually it is what this amendment does. It directs Policy & Resources, via the regeneration subcommittee but obviously in consultation with ports colleagues to consider. So I understand it is an amendment, it is not something we are answering short-term, but I thought to excite the Assembly about the opportunity that we have and we do have this opportunity to do down the line, once the commercial harbour is moved out of St Sampson's – when and if it is moved out of St Sampson's – that there is an opportunity there to explore down the line.

1915 So I think it is an interesting Proposition to have. I accept that it should roll into the regeneration board workstream, because it is part of a Seafront Enhancement master plan, but actually that is exactly what the amendment says anyway and, given the timing that has been proposed to us with a regeneration board, I think actually that it does feed into what we have been discussing in terms of the development and regeneration corporation.

1920 So I think it does fit with what we are trying to achieve, the bigger picture for the seafront. I think it falls onto the regeneration board. It has plenty of scope in terms of timing and any additional costs could be funded as part of creating and developing the mandate of the regeneration board. So I still would like Members to show a sign of approval of this because it does fit with the plans that we have been discussing in the last few days and thank you for the debate.

1925 **Deputy Queripel:** A recorded vote, please madam.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Queripel. States' Greffier, there is a request for a recorded vote on amendment 4.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Amendment 4*

*Not carried – Pour 4 Contre 29, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Deputy St Pier \*  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Haskins  
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller

**CONTRE**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Mahoney  
Deputy Matthews  
Deputy McKenna  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Moakes  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Queripel  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Taylor  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Vermeulen  
Deputy Blin  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Bury  
Deputy Cameron

**NE VOTE PAS**

Alderney Rep.  
Snowdon  
Deputy Dyke

**ABSENT**

Deputy Murray  
Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Deputy Aldwell  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Dudley-Owen

Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Fairclough  
Deputy Falla  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Gabriel  
Deputy Helyar  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Le Tissier

\* denotes Member who voted by proxy

1930

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you. There voted Pour, 4; Contre, 29; there were 2 abstentions and 5 absences. I therefore declare the amendment defeated.

1935

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Helyar, I did ask you to indicate prior to the lunch adjournment, but do you wish to formally withdraw your amendment 5?

**Deputy Helyar:** Yes please, madam.

1940

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, I did again ask you to indicate prior to lunch in relation to amendment 7, do you wish to formally withdraw that amendment?

1945

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Yes, madam.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you. I am now going to ask, before we return to general debate, having dealt with all the amendments, for the States' Greffier to hand out the amended Propositions so that we can see exactly what is being voted for so that when, at the end of general debate, there is a vote, Members can be under no illusion about exactly what they are doing.

1950

*Propositions as amended*

*The States are asked to decide:- Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled 'Future Harbour Development' of the States' Trading Supervisory Board, they are of the opinion:-*

*1. To approve Combination 5 as the preferred scheme for the future development of Guernsey's harbours i.e. to reconfigure operations in St Peter Port Harbour; construct a new northern port at Longue Hougue South for some freight operations; convert St Sampson's Harbour for leisure use only; improve the leisure sector offering in St Peter Port and carry out essential repairs to the current harbours, as set out in the Policy Letter and in particular in paragraphs 8.13 to 8.17.*

*2. To approve the Future Harbour Development as a pipeline project in the capital portfolio, for ratification by the States as part of the Government Work Plan and to direct the Policy & Resources Committee through its seafront regeneration subcommittee, in respect of its role for developing the Seafront Enhancement Area, and in consultation with the States' Trading Supervisory Board, to develop more detailed proposals, including the costs and associated benefits, as set out in paragraph 11.14 of this Policy Letter, and submit those proposals to the States for approval, by December 2022.*

*2A. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee, through its seafront regeneration subcommittee, in consultation with the Committee for Economic Development, the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, the marine industry and other relevant stakeholders, to undertake a detailed analysis of economic opportunities from developing an enhanced Blue Economy offering across the Guernsey Seafront Enhancement Area, including but not limited to leisure marinas, super yachts, overwintering, marine service industry, marine tourism and other commercial opportunities and use the findings to develop proposals for such an enhanced Blue Economy*

*offering to be submitted in the form of a Policy Letter and suitable Propositions for the States for approval by the end of December 2022.*

*3. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee, in consultation with the States' Trading Supervisory Board, to ensure that sufficient space within the existing Longue Hougue Reclamation Site is retained, to maximise the potential for stockpiling of inert waste by ensuring that any new [or renewed] leases entered into for the Longue Hougue Reclamation site from the date of this resolution are capable of termination on 12 months' notice or less.*

*4. If proposition 1 is approved, to direct the Development & Planning Authority to take into account the approval of Combination 5 as the preferred scheme for the future development of Guernsey's harbours in the preparation of the Harbour Action Area Local Planning Briefs for St Peter Port and St Sampson's.*

*5. To direct the States' Trading Supervisory Board to submit by the end of December 2022 a Policy Letter together with suitable Propositions, which provide for a scheme to develop within St Peter Port Harbour a 'Pool Marina' with associated marina facilities and which includes costings and a delivery plan.*

*6. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to establish a Development and Regeneration Board, as an arm's length body of the States or similar entity, to replace the interim sub-committee established by the Policy & Resources Committee to advise it on the development of the Seafront Enhancement Area.*

*7. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to develop Propositions and an accompanying Policy Letter, for consideration by the States of Deliberation at the earliest opportunity and not later than December 2021, which shall include recommendations on:*

*A. the mandate, membership, accountability, funding, and involvement in the preparation of the long-term development strategy for the Seafront Enhancement Area of the Development and Regeneration Board; and*

*B. a timeline and set of steps to develop the seafront masterplan, which shall include within St Peter Port Harbour a 'Pool Marina' with associated modern marina facilities, by December 2022.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Members will see we have put Deputy Inder's amendment 5 as number 5 and Deputy Helyar's amendment 9 is now 6 and 7 then A and B. Then we have 2A, which was Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's amendment. We will now commence general debate. Nobody wishes to speak? Oh, Deputy Meerveld.

1955

**Deputy Meerveld:** Thank you. Well, I am going to start off by describing a salutary tale to this Assembly about an overseas territory of the UK, St Helena, a small island in the South Atlantic. In 1943, St Helena considered building an airport on their small island. They came back and revisited that idea in the 1960s and finally in 1999, they made the decision they would proceed with building that airport. In 2005, the UK government agreed to pay for it. In 2011, funding was provided on an estimated budget of £202 million. The project was finished in 2015. Of course, the final cost came out at £285.5 million, over 40% increase.

1960

But that was not the real problem. When they came to license the airport as an airport and they ran test flights on it, they found they had a slight problem. Despite the fact that they employed all the relevant experts and everybody had come in and helped design this airport and external contractors had come in and helped build it, they had wind shear, katabatic winds coming off a nearby mountain that meant it was unsafe to land aircraft there.

1965

So they could not open in 2015. It was not until June 2016 that they negotiated to have it rated as, rather than a full-blown airport, as an aerodrome, and had to have it limited in the size of aircraft that could service that runway and could no longer fly the routes that were originally intended and basically had serious safety restrictions on it. To quote the chair of the Public Accounts Committee in the UK, Meg Hillier, at the time, she said:

1970



The result is a disaster. A commercial airport that is not fit for purpose, no credible plan to salvage the value for money and no clarity on exactly who is responsible for the whole mess.

1975 Now we have had raised to date some of the issues with the currents and around the proposed Longue Hougue reclamation. There is a danger, there is an analogy here, if you substitute wind shear for ocean currents and tides, we do have some serious issues with this proposed project. Yes, we can bring in all the engineers and experts we like from the UK but there are always risks with a project of this size.

1980 For instance, we had the conversation about, 'well, it does not matter, the harbour will never dry out because we are going to dredge ...' I think it was 7.5 m – about 20 feet – of depth in the inner harbour. Well, that is all well and good. For how long? My favourite beaches to play on as a child were Port Soif and Portinfer and each year we would have to pick which was one was going to be a favoured beach, the reason being that every year the sand would shift.

1985 Tens of thousands of tonnes of sand would move across from one beach to the other based on the tides that year and one of them would have sand that extended up the beach and the other laid bare as rocks and would be uncomfortable to go from the top of the beach to the bottom and we used to use whichever beach had the most sand in it that day.

1990 So again I look at this project and I think how long is that 7.5 m draft going to stay there, because there are much stronger currents flowing about past the mouth of that harbour than was ever flowing past Port Soif and Portinfer. So that is just a salutary trail to say that the experts are not always right and I have reservations just on the technical aspects of what is being proposed.

1995 I do not like, as Deputies Inder, Prow and Brouard pointed out, the fact that we are building a harbour on a beach where the mouth is not navigable at low tide and certain tides. We have Deputy Paint's words as well, a person who has been one of the Island's leading marine pilots for decades, saying that it may have major navigation issues.

2000 All of that basically raises a question mark, are we doing the right thing? Are we pursuing the right course? But there are bigger issues yet. Going back to my original speech on amendment 8, I do not want to see a project like that proceed today. I am not going to be voting for Propositions 1-5 and I will be supporting 6 and 7.

Why? As we have heard said, we should not be designing a port on the floor of the Assembly. Nor should we be designing a port and going ahead with just civil engineering and Guernsey Ports' input. This is, as I have said before, commercial ports. I want the views of the commercial companies, who have a much better idea what the function and requirements of the future will be based on their current business and what they anticipate in the future.

2005 The difficulties will be in a practical way of utilising what has been planned. I want their oversight. I want their opinions added to this to enable us to make an informed decision with Guernsey business people and commercial interests represented at the table.

2010 Also, Government Work Plan. We are committing here, potentially if we approve 1-5, £4 million to a workstream and putting this project into the capital prioritisation stream, in isolation from everything else. The fact is, unless we are willing to borrow a very significant amount of money, and potentially significantly increase taxes, we cannot afford half of the things that this Assembly wants to do.

2015 We are going to have to make some very tough decisions and those decisions may be do we build a school, do we extend the Hospital, or do we build a port? It may be that we will do one but not three. I believe this proposal is premature and I want to see included in that process so the combination of approving 6 and 7 will enable us to draw in that commercial expertise to help oversee this project and give another set of eyes of people with direct experience.

2020 Much has been made of the fact we are not experts in this room and we are not. But we are asked to make very big decisions in principle. I want to make sure we bring people who have got direct relevance in this instance, people who are importing the aggregate, the people who are importing the fuels, the trans-shipping companies utilising our ports. Where is their input in this? Where are they looking at the various options and giving advice on which one might work or not?

2025 We can take our engineers, we can take the Guernsey Ports, we can take all of their advice on  
board, but I want to have local people with local experience and an anticipation of where businesses  
are going to go in the future giving their input. I also want to be able to make the decision on  
whether we put £4 million into this now and £300 million, £400 million or £500 million in the future.  
I want to have that decision made alongside the other decisions we are going to have to make as  
part of the Government Work Plan and the Budget. I do not want to prematurely agree to a project  
and set it in train before we have looked at everything in the round and what it is going to cost us,  
2030 either in debt or taxes, to fund it.

So I encourage all Members and incidentally – just before I say this – if I voted for option 6  
because I preferred the idea of an existing harbour rather than Longue Hougue, if option 6 was  
successful, I would still be saying do not vote for Proposition 1, which would have been –  
amendment 6 – I would still be saying the same thing, I want that commercial view and I think the  
2035 States should be adopting that more broadly as we go forward and deal with these difficult issues

Bring in external bodies, with experience on the Island, local people, local business people, to  
give their views on these things and assist this Assembly in making these tough decisions. But also  
make sure that we are considering all the different options and the commitments we have to make  
over the next few years, in tandem, together, because we are going to have to make some very  
2040 tough decisions and potentially some very painful trade-offs. Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Inder.

**Deputy Inder:** Hopefully, this will be my last speech of the day. Members, it is fairly obvious  
2045 from the start, from the email exchanges, as soon as this policy letter was published by STSB I had  
significant concerns that we were going north. It is painted by the board as fairly benign, fairly  
accurate and I suppose to a degree, whatever the present STSB might say, there is an element of  
bias within every paper.

We have been told for the past few weeks it is a smorgasbord, but it is not actually. There is a  
2050 clear preference to combination five. So quite clearly the board have nailed their colours to the mast  
and they want us to approve combination five. It kind of gets sort of a bit worse than that because  
if I spent £800,000 on something, without too much sarcasm – in fact, no, I will drop that bit because  
I am doing alright at the moment – I just do not quite understand how they could have then  
2055 accepted an amendment from which would have been Deputy St Pier and Deputy Helyar, to say 5  
and 6. So is it 5 or is it 6? Are you in, are you out? Because they are completely different Propositions.  
Utterly different Propositions.

Five, leaves a lot of the commercial activity down in St Peter Port. It does not free up ro-ro ramps  
one and two, it does nothing at all. All it does, irrespective of what Deputy Roffey thinks, as we  
transition out, he thinks we are going to have far more aggregate in. I think we are going to have  
2060 less aggregate in. I think, as we move towards different materials such as wood, we are going to be  
using less.

Let us be a little bit, I do not want to use the word honest, which I have just used, but let us have  
a bit of a more neutral conversation. Of course Deputy Roffey again, I think he named the  
harbourmaster, who said pilots getting into St Sampson's should be okay. I am afraid with the  
2065 greatest respect he is not a pilot. There are only four people, there might even be three now,  
possible five if you include the retired, there are only five people in the world that have got a  
certificate to pull a boat into St Sampson's and I am sure, fairly, one of them gets a bit twitchy when  
he is on the helm.

Only four people out of seven, eight billion on the planet are certified to take in expensive fuels  
2070 into our harbour and not hit the quay, not run them up the rocks, not turn the boat upside down,  
not have it drifting off Alderney. These are serious people that are given command of boats to do  
a job to get them into what are some of the most dangerous waters in the world. Guernsey's waters  
on the wrong tide are some of the most dangerous waters in the world.

2075 Now Deputy Roffey sort of suggested everyone was quite cool and the gang about it. I am not so sure that is correct. Because what people say to people with command and pips on their shoulders is not necessarily what they will say in the bar or down in the galley or on watch. I have recently been to some of the people that put boats ashore here and they said indeed there was a consultation but what they then said is that STSB did not listen – so they had a consultation but STSB did not listen. This is the pilots telling you they did not listen.

2080 They went on to say that they confirmed that early simulations were carried out in the UK. We know that. Simulations carried out with a specialised computer simulator with a Southampton pilot. I think Deputy Roffey said as well the reason for all that, because we had COVID, it was all done on simulation. Commander of somewhere else, directions were given to a UK pilot and I assume via telephony or some other way, the Guernsey pilot was giving direction.

2085 Now they attempted entry and approach to the harbour with 30 knots of wind and a full spring tide. That is very different to having a little bit of a chat and looking out at Guernsey on a day like this. Because if Guernsey was blowing 40 or 50 knots from the south-east now, on top of the *[inaudible]* not one of you would vote for this. You try turning – I say you try turning a ship as if I had – us as day boaters, all of us will know that when we hit current what happens is either the nose will be taken port or starboard.

2090 Now you do that on an 80-metre boat when you have got your nose going to slack water and your tail sitting in six-knot tides. This is serious skill and they are telling you, Members of this Assembly, to stay away from Longue Hougue South. Do not do it. That is what they are telling you to do but of course in the policy letter it is okay, we will spend another £4 million and find a way around it. It is not going to happen. It just is not going to happen.

2095 So the attempted entry when approaching harbour, 30 knots of wind and a full spring tide, with five knots of current from an easterly. Now that sounds like a storm. That is standard in Guernsey. That is kind of what happens, with a bit of a gale on a north east direction, and the moment the bow of the ship entered the slack water of the inner harbour, the stern of the ship was still in the strong northerly flow and they lost control of the vessel.

2100 So under simulation they lost control of the vessel and these pilots, these people, these men of the sea, these people who know far more than we have done, who risk their lives, are saying no. Now it is entirely up to you. We can all go to Google Maps and look at a nice green sea and decide it is okay, look at it, it is a bit wide, I can just add 600 feet here, 300 feet there, and you just pile in. The sea is not like that. It is not like pulling up to North Beach car park. It is a moving surface. The sea is a moving surface and when these people are telling you do not do it, please do not do it.

2105 Or do it. Go ahead and do it. Because when we come back in two years, the last thing anyone in this Assembly wants is Neil Inder in an 'I told you so' t-shirt. Honestly, if you want to spend four million quid that is fine, but do not come back in two years' time with Inder with an 'I told you so' t-shirt. Really, you just do not want that and that smug grin that goes with it! (*Laughter*)

2110 Anyway, of course, commercial freighters, there is all this discussion that it is kind of okay, you just wait an hour either side of a low tide. It does not work like that. You are not pulling up outside of your mate's house in a taxi, because he has not done his hair, and waiting for the guy to come out half an hour later. Stemming six-knot tides with north easterly winds of 30 knots, that is the real deal.

2115 I really do wish people would think very differently or at least give some consideration to what I am saying. Because like I did in the requête almost two years ago, it is normally un-channelling the expertise of other people with the same passion and the reason that they will not say that, because they are men of the sea. They just get on and they do their job. They put their lives at risk, they go alongside boats, they climb up pieces of rope, get alongside, talk to foreign captains and put boats in.

2120 I have been on one of the boats. Not much scares me but trust me I was twitching. When the boat goes into St Sampson's at high tide and you cannot see the pier heads, that is fairly scary. There is some skill there. I have said my piece. Under no circumstances should we be spending

2125 another £4 million looking towards something that in my view the decision at least, the Proposition and the solid Proposition should have come today.

It is often said of consultants that they take your watch and charge you to tell you the time. Well they have not done that. They have taken our watch and have not had the decency to tell us what the time is. Right now, we are no further forward than we were two years ago, except we have spent  
2130 £800,000. We are told there is a smorgasbord. There is another word for it and it is not smorgasbord.

We are told it is a smorgasbord and they want you, the people of this Island, to spend another £4 million on the decision on the policy letter that we should have had today. At £800,000 I would ... looking at 808 Chart what the depth and the under-keel clearance would be on a six-metre drafted boat. It is just not acceptable. This policy letter is a total lash up and I ask you please to  
2135 reject Proposition 1 because it is going nowhere. Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Does anyone ...? Deputy Taylor.

**Deputy Taylor:** I kind of wanted to speak a little bit later but I will have a punt at following  
2140 Deputy Inder there. I will not be quite so animated. Something that has kind of got me reading through this and all the rhetoric that has come out afterwards and the presentations that have gone on, it reminds me of a marketing campaign. Something I was told with marketing, it is not always about what you are trying to sell, it is about trying to hide what you do not want people to see. You do not want them to get the bad side of the story.

So, I am thinking about the good points to this that have come up, the good points of the marketing campaign for option 5. Number one seems to be freeing up extra space and the regeneration of St Sampson's Harbour. Now, who would not support that? We saw a lovely article in the *Press* from the St Sampson's Vale Douzaine. We are going to put some money into St Sampson's, they would love that.  
2145

There is extra talk about moving all this heavy industrial stuff out of the north of the Island. Is Longue Hougue South really that different in location? We are not really moving things out of St Sampson's Vale, it is still very much staying there. I highly doubt that in a few years' time Deputy Le Tocq will be looking in a French yachting guide and will read about St Sampson's being the St Tropez of the Channel Islands. It is just not going to happen.  
2150

Then I think about what else do we do. Why do we need this big harbour? What are we doing this for? If you are looking at the historic trend, lo-lo ro-ro is on a downward trend, bulk fuel is on a downward trend, bulk solid downward trend. I could carry on but I think you have all read it. So why are we doing this?  
2155

Well, we will regenerate St Sampson's with this lovely port. But then what we might have to start doing, if Chouet is quarried and Chouet does run out in 20-odd years' time, whenever that may be, and we have to start importing aggregates, probably importing them to help build this massive harbour that we do not really need, what are we going to do with that aggregate once it gets into Longue Hougue?  
2160

Are we going to drive it through the St Tropez of St Sampson's? Because that would be lovely, wouldn't it? All these businesses investing in their marina-side properties, they are going to have lovely restaurants there. You sit out with you £8 gin and tonic that I mentioned last night and you will have a big truck drive past with all the aggregate. Because where is it going to go? They are not staying in Longue Hougue.  
2165

Deputy Roffey said – apologies it may not have been Deputy Roffey, somebody said – that we could move the different plant from north side to south side. Well yes, we can but that is not in our gift to do, is it? That is relying on a private, commercial company, to move their entire operation so we can save on these delivery boats.  
2170

Then we hear about investing in our future and that always makes me chuckle because it kind of suggests that if you do not support this you do not believe in investing in the future. What absolute poppycock because investments come in two ways. You have good investments and you have bad investments. Just because you put some money into something does not really make it a  
2175

good idea. It does not mean you are investing in the future. You could just be pouring money down the drain, very early on. So I do not really support that one.

2180 Then I think about the different terminology that has been used so far and I have heard one term, it is quite emotive and makes it sound really important, it is referring to this as the keystone. Now I have heard a lot of reference to our forefathers, amazing mariners, they have stonemasons, all these different things. Has anyone asked them what the role of a keystone is?

2185 You see, a keystone might sound like the real important part of an archway, it is the bit that everything in the arch relies upon. But it is also the very last piece to go in. You do not design a whole arch around the keystone, you have the whole picture. You have the whole arch and then you design your keystone to suit accordingly. And, contrary to common belief, every stone in that arch is equally important because they all work together. You could have the most magnificent keystone in the world but if you pull out one of the supporting arches it is a complete waste of time.

2190 The really important part is the foundations or, if you want to use another term, we could have called this the cornerstone, because you start with your foundations or, if you are building a wall, maybe not a windmill, you would start with the cornerstone and then you would work along. So I do not really buy that. As much as it sounds like it, this is the keystone of our seafront enhancement, our regeneration, I just say that is rubbish.

2195 Then I actually started looking at what the information involved in this policy letter tells us and looking at the scoring. Now we are told from the questions, or the frequently asked questions, that cost was ruled out. It was not really a factor. I appreciate that. I can see if we are going to look for the best option that will tick all of our boxes, we should not be blinded by cost. We have to give consideration later on.

2200 But looking at the different comparisons. Now, combination seven, I appreciate this is not the option that is laid on the table. Combination seven is a pretty substantial development. It involves an extension to the harbour and the creation of a new harbour, coming in with a price tag of £706 million. Now that got a score of 76%. Pretty good. That is only 20% higher than combination two, which is to re-jig our current operation.

2205 So we are not really gaining, we could spend £700 million, or as near as dammit, £600 million more than just rejigging what we have got, which would have considerably less environmental impact, because we do not really know what the environmental impact is, because the assessment has not been done.

2210 We have got it as a judging criteria about the environmental impact but we have not done it, so I am not really sure how we are relying on that. So for an extra £600 million we can do a massive thing that still does not tick 100% of our needs and is only 20% better than what is really the probably most realistic option on the table.

2215 So why are we doing this? I have kind of being sitting here listening into the debates and I think I am sharing a viewpoint with Deputy Haskins. What exactly are we going to achieve? Anyone? We will have a new harbour. We are not de-conflicting anything. You bail option 5, we will still have sailing dinghies with children in sailing out past the Condor Clipper, past the Alderney ferry, the Alderney cargo boat, the Sark cargo boat, the Herm Sea Horse. There is still commercial activity going on in St Peter Port and you will still have your little children sailing out because we will be so busy doing all this massive £4 million of research we will probably forget to rebuild the slipway at Havelet. (*Laughter*) Sorry for slipping that in! Slippery that was it not!

2220 So why are we doing this? Hopefully, somebody will give me a genuine reason other than saying well if we meet our really high level forecast targets then we might potentially need it. But where are all these extra imports going to come from? Accepting if we do have to import aggregate, that will be a hell of a lot of work. I do accept that and that would not be very nice for residents near St Sampson's, having to import aggregates. We are talking 21 years down the line. A lot can happen in that time.

2225 I see Deputy de Sausmarez is shaking her head but I have not seen the policy letter that is suggesting what our future aggregate supply might be. So I believe, at this time, all cards are still on the table. So the historic trend, everything is going down, we are coping currently in our current

2230 harbour. If we were to throw in, as approved in a previous amendment, a marina berth or lots of  
marina berths in the Pool, we will meet one area that is growing – the leisure market. There is  
demand. There is clear demand. It is not some kind of pie in the sky thinking that if we build it they  
will come. People are asking for that. People on the Island with money to spend. Thank you.

2235 So, why do I think this is a stupid idea? I think you know why I think this is a stupid idea. Why  
did I not lay an amendment? As Deputy Roffey pointed out, I could have laid one, I could have  
changed it. But most of the work that needs to be done in our harbour is maintenance and I do not  
believe an amendment should be made to the future harbour plans to encourage STSB to carry out  
their mandated responsibility to repair our harbours. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

2240 The harbours are used. We have decided how important they are. I am not disputing that. We  
need to spend money on them. No one is shying away from that. But the real people who are kicking  
the can down the road are the people who vote for this £4 million investigation into what is a  
massive waste of time. That, my friends, is kicking the can down the road. We need to get on with  
repairing St Peter Port as soon as possible. Forget all of this and if we do start to see an increase in  
demand for all our load-on, load-off, or ro-ro, then we can start to look at it. But before that I hope  
Members will just vote this out as quickly as possible. Thank you.

2245 (*Applause*)

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Can I not encourage clapping? Anyway, Deputy Ferbrache.

2250 **Deputy Ferbrache:** I think it is right that Members know before they vote about how I anticipate  
Policy & Resources will vote in relation to the amended Propositions. But before I do that, can I say  
how much I really enjoyed the last two speeches? We had the effervescent – always – energy in a  
bottle Deputy Inder and then we had the cultured, modern, interesting, humorous speech of new  
father Deputy Taylor. Both of those, I thought, were wonderful speeches.

2255 If I could just mention a character – this has got nothing to do with the debate but I want it on  
*Hansard* – a Guernseyman of great distinction, Jim Jamouneau was buried today. Many of us will  
know him. A character of Guernsey and I would just like to put that on *Hansard*. It has got nothing  
to do with the debate but he deserves a mention. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) So rest peacefully  
Jim, you wicked old devil, we will be thinking of you.

2260 In relation to where we are, Deputy Taylor mentioned surveys and it is a point that Deputy Inder  
also talked about, experts. Now my paternal grandfather was born in 1872 at the Dunes at Vazon.  
He lived for over 90 years and he was a stonemason until he was gone 80. But he did have other  
things that he spent time on, because my grandmother had 14 children. But in relation to all of that  
he built things with his father, who was a stonemason, and at the very beginning of his time as a  
stonemason, his grandfather, who was a stonemason, without a bundle of experts, without many  
cultured consultants coming from all over the place, and the buildings that they built still stand.

2270 I look at my house, which was built 1580-1590, something like that, and in there, there is actually  
a fireplace that was built in 1475, about 100 years or so before the house was built. It is not built on  
the ground floor, it is built on the first floor, using American terminology in floors. That was again  
built by stonemasons without any experts. Could you imagine if you were doing that now? There  
would be experts to the left of you, experts to the right of you, experts in front of you. They would  
all wear suits but none of them would really know what they were talking about that.

2275 It is a point that Deputy Inder made. There are only four people, I am not sure four or five, the  
arithmetic tended to vary when Deputy Inder was talking about it, but there are four or five people  
who can take difficult boats into the harbour. One of them, I do not know if he has still got a current  
licence but certainly one that used to do that was ex-Deputy Barry Paint.

Now ex-Deputy Barry Paint has described in graphic language, seaman's language I think was  
the phrase, about how nonsensical the Longue Hougue scheme is. Now, I love Deputy Paint. He is  
a great character, he was a great States' Member, he knows his stuff backwards. He knows his  
onions. But for all of that, I would not want to dismiss Longue Hougue and cast it asunder.

2280 But equally I think we have got to look wider about what P&R did yesterday; the meeting with  
Deputy Roffey and his Committee was to agree this amendment 9. Now when it comes down to it  
because I think it was only fair, we wanted everybody to debate everything because otherwise if  
amendment 8 had succeeded, which frankly it looked like it was going to at the time, there would  
not have been a full debate, there would not have been a debate of the other amendments, matters  
2285 would not have been as fully considered as they should be. They now have been.

We are in a position whereby we have had some excellent ideas put forward by Deputy Brouard.  
I would not want to get rid of those and I made that point clear when I responded to his comments.  
We have had an excellent amendment put forward by Deputy Kazantseva-Miller. Again, blue  
economy etc. All of those are good points. They should be considered.

2290 But we cannot consider them in this scattergun approach that we have currently got. We just  
cannot do that. We have to have people looking at it who know more than us. People who are  
going to ... this regeneration group that we have recommended that would be Proposition 6. And  
we also have got the same timelines that we referred to in other documents that I referred to again  
when I was speaking yesterday.

2295 So what I am going to ask the States to do, and what I believe that my colleagues in Policy &  
Resources are going to do, is to vote against Propositions 1-5 but vote in favour of Propositions 6  
and 7. So effectively you have got amendment 8, but you have now had amendment 8 after you  
have heard everything. After you have taken into account everything, after you have heard people's  
comments and, in my view, my humble view, that would still allow Longue Hougue to be considered,  
2300 it will allow St Peter Port to be considered, it will widen out the blue economy, it will allow us to  
consider other marinas and it will allow us to consider the point that Deputy Inder wants to consider  
that the marina, the Pool Marina, whatever it is called, in relation to all of that.

It will allow all of that to be considered in the whole and be considered on a time finite basis. In  
other words we would be looking at coming back in a very short period of time, as proposed in  
2305 Proposition 6 and 7, with something that would be concentrated, or it would have a wider purview,  
that would look at everything in the round rather than be, as we look at Proposition 1 as it is  
currently worded 'to approve combination five as the preferred scheme'. So if you vote for that, that  
is the preferred scheme. Everything else has got to be read in that context. I do not think that is  
right, having regard to what we have said.

2310 But I would just like to say a few comments. I think, not because I was a previous President of  
the States' Trading Supervisory Board, I think it is unfair to say the States' Trading Supervisory Board,  
either with its present President, its previous President or its previous, previous President, were at  
fault. All of us were hampered with a lack of funds. All of us knew that there was significant work to  
do at the harbours. All three of us would have wanted to do it, all the Members of our Committee  
2315 would have wanted to do it. There just was not the money to spend the £30 million-odd, otherwise  
we would have done it.

I am sure my grandfather, at his rates, could have done it a lot cheaper than £37 million but he  
would be 150 now, so I think he probably would have been past his best. Although I do not know,  
my grandmother would say, let's have more children, but she had enough anyway. In relation to all  
2320 of that, I would like to say, congratulate, because I think it is a good report that has been produced  
and it does put all of the issues before us ... a lot of people have done good work, so it is no criticism  
of the STSB, who have discharged their mandate. But I think we have got to take the decision now,  
that we have got to look at it in a more holistic and a more wide-ranging form. Thank you.

2325 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

**Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** I think Members will agree it has been quite, especially new  
Members will agree, it has been a fascinating few days. I guess eye-opening on many sides of things  
of the dynamics of our Assembly and potentially things to come. I perhaps wanted to offer some  
2330 observations but also a few new points as well.

So I think we have been, there have been questions. Deputy Taylor asked why do we need to do anything – why, what is the reason? Well apart from the port is falling apart, the NAABSA vessels are coming to the ends of their lives, so we need to signal what is happening and all the many reasons kind of displayed in this policy.

2335 The other part has been just fascinating to listen to, many Deputies slogging expertise and offering solutions and stuff like that. That to me is extremely worrying. This has been commissioned by a commercial investigation board, which was collated with experts from the ports team, project management and beyond.

2340 They worked with local and international agents and consultants, with whom ports have worked for many decades. I refer to the Wallingford study from 1991. Well I think the teams are working with them now. So I do respect Deputy Paint's expertise but I am not sure if he has ever commanded an 80-metre boat, for example. So I am just extremely, deeply concerned from what I have heard today that actually all those experts and consultants out there, you are all shit! What a wonderful message it sends to the local economy –

2345

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, I know it is quite an emotive topic but please be careful with your language.

2350 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Apologies madam. What message does it send? We are looking to improve our local procurement. Well, in terms of local procurement, if our internal States' view of contractors outside is that, well, actually, we do not trust them, what kind of message it sends? What kind of message would that attitude send to Dr Brink to say we do not want expertise, we are going to make decisions based on our own expertise? I am just extremely concerned that there has been a continuous and consistent that we cannot trust what has been presented to us. We cannot trust  
2355 this comprehensive policy paper. I am looking forward to debate much thinner policy papers down the line.

There was talk about this is coming in isolation to the Government Work Plan. I think again we have discussed this falls outside of the Government Work Plan cycle and part of this project is included in the capital allocation process. It has been submitted as all other projects that were  
2360 requested to be submitted into the Government Work Plan. It is part of the Government Work Plan process. So Deputy Meerveld, who is not here right now, was mentioning it falls outside of the Government Work Plan cycle but, actually, I do not think it does. It has been submitted. The £4 million had been submitted, the project to finance the regeneration board, £975,000, whatever it is, have been submitted. It is all part of the Government Work Plan.

2365 So I have been in touch with my former colleague, Simon Holden, who is still a non-voting member on Guernsey Ports. He comes from a very deep expertise of infrastructure funding and sits on the boards of various private equity companies involved with infrastructure funding and he has come up with a simple model to see how infrastructure projects can be funded. They can be funded with just borrowing, with just seeking money as equity from private investors or in between. You  
2370 know, debt and equity.

Debt and equity have different financing costs. Debt is cheaper but obviously you take more of a risk. Equity is more expensive because if investors want a return. If you allow for different percentages of debt/equity funding models and if you are looking at an infrastructure funding cycle of about say 50 or 60 years, which is what this project would be, the additional cost for us, the  
2375 additional net profit that the port of the wider economy will have to make over that period of 60 years, depending on what debt/equity percentages you want to accept. I was looking at about £5 million additional annual revenue you would have to generate from this investment, and that is such a small number in terms of actually being able to fund this investment, which we all say we do not have the money, it is not the right time.

2380 Actually it is absolutely the best time right now to borrow money, in partnership or not, with investors. There will not be a better time. It will become more expensive. So if we ever want to invest in a big vision, really, it is one of the best times to do so right now. Just running very basic funding



simulation models for infrastructure projects, we would need a marginal increase in net profits, just from the ports, to be able to cover this long-term investment and I am very happy to share with colleagues if Mr Holden is happy to share that model as well.

2385

What is interesting I guess is what is next. I think we have discussed the formation of the regeneration board. What is a development and regeneration board? It is another body of experts who are going to be coming back with decisions, back to us, to do exactly the same that we have been discussing today.

2390

In relation specifically to the harbour, do we think they will come up suddenly with very different proposals of where the commercial harbour will go? Really? Can we pull out of the bag a new option of what to do with commercial harbours? In addition the regeneration board, this board of experts that we are going to be setting up, will have to deal with a much bigger programme of investment. They will have to deal with the funding models; actually looking at commercial ports will be only one of the things they will be doing.

2395

But I really would not be surprised if they come up with exactly the same policy paper, except it will be in two years' time or longer than that. So what we are approving today is effectively delay, a delegation to another set of experts. I think it has just been disappointing there has been so much criticism from many Deputies but without any offer of what is alternative.

2400

I guess that is a sign of the strength of the Assembly. It is how do we move forward in a constructive, positive way, so we are moving forward, we are taking on board the work, we take on board, respect the work that has been done so far, and move in a constructive, positive way, with regards.

2405

This regeneration board is seen as the *panacea* for all but as I have explained, it is another set of experts. It will take time to form. They will have many things to worry about and the work on commercial harbours. This comprehensive work that has been done off the back of a directive of the States will not be done. So that is what you are going to be voting for if you do not vote for this policy paper. Thank you.

2410

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

2415

**Deputy Gollop:** Thank you very much, Madam Deputy President. I am on the horns of a dilemma, to be honest because, as you heard in my speeches earlier, I am a bit of a sceptic of this process and how we got to it, even though I did attend, probably, most of the harbour presentations at some point.

2420

I take on board the point that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller has made about people's denunciation of experts. It reminds me a bit of how a former education secretary in the United Kingdom, Mr Michael Gove, denounced educational experts and got himself into difficulties with that, although perhaps he won some popularity too, but I think perhaps he alienated educators and teachers.

2425

There is always a fine balance in politics between expertise and political judgement. If we follow a strict line of listening to the experts, actually we would have a better governmental system maybe if the Bailiff and the Deputy Bailiff appointed about 50 statutory officials – we already have a lot, 38 at least – and those people would make the decisions on our behalf and we would not have a States at all because we would just empower people to make decisions based on their credibility, experience and degrees.

2430

But that would not exactly be a democracy as we know it and that is definitely a tension between listening to expertise and working. Because politics, until the 20th Century, was really the politics based on a mixture of military objectives and religious objectives and class objectives and basically most political representatives were from the upper class. Their views were important because of who they were rather than who they represented.

I am still concerned on something as major as the seafront and harbour developments that the public as a whole have not really got behind any issue. I appreciate stakeholders have been consulted and then we hear that some have different views in what has been expressed and so on. I think if I understood what the President of Policy & Resources said, they are minded obviously to

2435 support the work that they are doing, which I support too, about a development and regeneration board, and perhaps the Pool Marina, but they are unwilling to commit to 1-4.

Now, I came into this debate this afternoon thinking I probably would vote for the whole lot. I am not so sure now, having listened to the speeches. Because I was a supporter, not necessarily a passionate supporter, but I thought of all the options Deputy Brouard's had the most traction in it from my lay perspective as a way forward and I hoped that would be continued in the mix.

2440 But of course to read these Propositions strictly, once we have approved combination five as the preferred scheme for the future development it goes off on its own and therefore all resources, the £4 million alluded to, just relate to that one. In a way it is a pity that Deputy Helyar withdrew the amendment because at least we would have had two on the table.

2445 I listened to Deputy Ferbrache's speeches about the wonderful build of his house and actually I almost lived in the house for a few weeks, with my mother, actually, because we were moving house and at one point it was a distinguished guest house, in the days when perhaps the hospitality sector was larger, and I saw then it was a gem, a bit like La Seigneurie, and certainly Guernsey people knew how to build then and hopefully now.

2450 But when Deputy Trott praised the foresight of the Board of Administration, as he often does and of course he was indeed a Member of the Board of Administration, I would suggest – I might be corrected by historians and still-alive people who know more than I do – that right up until recent times, the personalities on the board, the political board, to a degree made the decisions. They got advice. They listened to advice, they listened to people with technological, business and financial – they often financial nous themselves of course – and maritime understanding. But they also commissioned experts and they would have listened obviously to what the harbourmaster, harbour pilots and so on would have said.

2455 Indeed, as we heard only yesterday, or two days ago, we actually changed the nature of the Pilotage Board because it was so full of people with wisdom in that area. But my point is this. They would not have followed quite the same process as we do today. Deputy Roffey responded manfully to a point that was made questioning the political bias by some other Member and his argument, and Deputy Parkinson, I think, reinforced this, was far from being politically biased the committee, to a degree, took a hands-off approach and they allowed perhaps people who knew what they were talking about, experts, officers, to rate the schemes, to weight them, to make the recommendations, to go through all of the different permutations and then at a later point the Board would come to a decision based upon that work.

2460 Now that is probably how many boards of governance would go in the corporate or other fields but it is not of itself a pure political process. It is not a case of a politician with a particular vision, sound or otherwise, driving a scheme forward. I think this is the uncertainty because what I would not like to see is to vote for nothing and to set off the States' Trading Supervisory Board on a no-man's land or worse still run the risk of individual Members losing interest in the Board or moving on or whatever. That would not be good at all.

2470 That is why I am tempted to vote for 1 on the assumption that other ideas will come in. But the problem with combination five is I do not think it is entirely clear on its environmental mission, much as I support maybe an additional car park at the North Beach, I do not think without a much clearer view on what you are doing at the seafront with the piers, with bus services, with electric transport, you can just go for car parks in isolation.

2475 The problem I have, a bit like Deputy Taylor, with combination five, is we are expending an enormous sum of money, with implications for taxation and yes I can see a case for a larger taxation for the Island but not to spend on, if you like, what could turn out to be an unnecessary project or a vanity project even, to use a phrase.

2480 But I cannot quite see what the vision is here because we would desecrate the environment at Longue Hougue, we would create a northern port for some freight operations but, as Deputy Taylor and Deputy Inder pointed out, we would still have the current or maybe significantly larger clippers, car ferries, catamarans, inter-Island vessels, ro-ro vessels to France and England and Jersey coming into the harbour.

2490 I think the fundamental decision is do we want ro-ro ramps with car ferries coming into St Peter Port or moving them north to Longue Hougue or St Sampson's. That is the first question and I kind of felt that for several years now we have been led by harbour workshops and those sticky dot things we see and pictures and I do not know, Beau Séjour, to actually think maybe we reinvent it, we make Town leisure only and we move what amounts to our passenger links somewhere else.

2495 That has been the direction of travel and that is really what we will support today if we go for 1. It has its advantages and it has its disadvantages. I would like to see a lot more studies and a lot more advice from everybody from economists to hospitality experts and environmentalists, as to the implications for that. So I probably will not vote for 1-4 but I do think we need to be positive to the States' Trading Supervisory Board and somehow provide them – maybe it could happen next work with the Government Work Plan actually, as an amendment or some appendix – a positive way forward because we definitely want action on the development and regeneration board.

2500 I do not want it entirely full of commercial entrepreneurs. Deputy Meerveld always wants commercial understanding. He is right. But I think you need people with a social conscience and ecological understanding too and who are in touch with the next generation. We could make the mistake of replacing one team of specialists in marine engineering with another team who are just looking at venture capital. We have economic opportunities, we want a broad base vision and I just hope we come out today with something that we can work with and move forward on rather than a dead zone.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Duke, you were up very quickly.

2510 **Deputy Dyke:** Thank you madam. I would just like to make a couple of comments on some of the points raised. Firstly Deputy Trott and Deputy Kazantseva-Miller made the point that now is a good time to borrow, interest rates are low, Deputy Trott has correctly suggested that a long-term bond at a low interest rate is probably an efficient way to borrow.

2515 But borrowing is one thing. The question is what are you borrowing for? We have already lined ourselves up for a debt of about half a billion. So one should not be borrowing unless it is for a very good purpose indeed. We should not be borrowing any more money.

2520 Secondly, I do not think at the moment ... and I did not vote on any of the amendments, I did not vote on Deputy Brouard's amendment. It was a well-presented piece of work and I thank him for that. At this point I think we have got on the table Deputy Brouard's favoured Proposition, Deputy Roffey's favoured Proposition and perhaps I could pick up on what Deputy Taylor was referring to, which was the baseline position, which was combination two in the proposal, which we have not really discussed at all.

2525 The marginal cost of that, if one does both the necessary remedial works and the extra works that change the terminal and all those things, the marginal cost of that is around £80 million as opposed to the marginal cost of £360 million or £450 million and as Deputy Taylor has pointed out if you look on page 49 of the proposal the rating for combination two is actually relatively close to the ratings of those other Propositions, at a fraction of the cost.

2530 So those points need to be borne in mind and the other reason that predictably I am coming to that I will be voting against Proposition 1 right now is that we do need more information. The paper that the States' Trading Supervisory Board has prepared is a very good paper. I do not think anyone has suggested that the experts are not very good. But it is part of a puzzle and we need the economic side looked at. What are the business opportunities? Are they good enough to justify these huge expenditures?

2535 Then there is a third part of this. P&R have to push this into the Government Work Plan, somehow. So there are three parts to all this. Therefore we should not be committing ourselves to spend £4 million on something looking further into a proposal that may well not happen. To use Deputy Trott's equation, in terms of how we look at these things, £4 million is roughly 1,000 people's tax payments over a year, at around £4,000 per person on the median income.

2540 So that is a big sum of money and we should not commit ourselves to that until all parts of the puzzle have been put together and thoroughly looked at. So, I am very much in favour of not voting for Proposition 1 and I am very much in favour of the proposal from P&R to have the development board look at things first. Thank you.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

2545 **Deputy Parkinson:** Thank you, madam. Why do we need to do anything, Deputy Taylor asked us and I rise to respond to that challenge. There are a number of obstacles or threats to the current operation of the harbours and there are also a large number of opportunities around the harbours, which are not currently being exploited.

2550 The list is probably too long to make an exhaustive speech about but if we look at some of the threats, we all know that the future of NAABSA vessels, for transport of fuel, is let's just say under question and how much longer we would be allowed to go on bringing ships which dry out on the sea bed full of fuel into Guernsey is an issue. It is an international issue because essentially the oil companies will not be banned by Guernsey from using these ships but we could reach a point where they are not allowed to upload fuel wherever they bring the fuel from by international codes of practice. That is one issue.

2555 Another issue is I think it is more likely that we will run out of pilots than run out of ships. There are, I think, three or four people in the world who are qualified to bring a ship into St Sampson's Harbour. They are all in their sixties. There are no apprentices. There is no succession to those three or four people who are allowed to bring ships in and when they retire there will be nobody who is licensed to bring a ship into St Sampson's Harbour.

2560 Obviously these gentlemen are in their sixties. We do not know how much longer they are going to want to work for but conceivably within a relatively short period of time we may be left without pilots and therefore unable to bring any ship into St Sampson's Harbour.

2565 We have under-used assets, of course, but that is not so much a threat as an opportunity. There are large areas of land around St Peter Port, which we could all, without much imagination, come up with better uses for. The Cambridge Berth, for example, is a very under-exploited piece of real estate. Using the North Beach as a single-level car park is clearly a wasted opportunity and there are many other pieces of real estate around the ports, which could be generating a significant income and assisting the Guernsey economy.

2570 On the threats pile, one that I do not think we should under-estimate is the effect of rising sea levels. Obviously there is some dispute about how likely it is that sea levels will rise and how far they will rise, but figures I have seen suggest that a rise of one metre by the end of this century is entirely plausible.

2575 That obviously has profound implications for many areas of our coastline, particularly in the north but also down the east coast. And the most valuable real estate in Guernsey is in and around St Peter Port and that, amongst these other areas, will certainly need to be protected.

2580 Now there are many ways you could cope with a one-metre rise in the level of the sea and I suppose the traditional way would be to build up sea walls all around the quays to keep the sea out. We know at the moment, on a high spring tide, that the water comes over the quay in Town and it comes over the bridge in St Sampson's. So if you imagine adding another metre of water on top of that, you can see that the potential damage to very valuable real estate in Guernsey, and indeed the threat to life, would be absolutely colossal.

2585 As I say, one approach to responding to that threat could be just to build sea walls all the way around the quays so that, if you were standing on the quay in St Peter Port, instead of looking directly onto a marina, you would be looking at a sea wall at maybe a metre, maybe one metre and a half high, which would be there to cope with high spring tides.

But actually probably a more intelligent way of dealing with the threat in the context of the harbours would be to gate the entrance to the harbour. You then would not have to build little sea walls around all the quays, which apart from being pretty ugly would be a very expensive operation,

2590 and if you simply gated the harbour mouth so that on high spring tides the harbour could be closed, you would avoid having to create other defences further inland.

That is a threat which I do not think we take seriously enough. We are talking about building infrastructure here with an anticipated lifespan of let us say 100 years. So, within the life of the infrastructure –

2595 I give way to Deputy Taylor.

**Deputy Taylor:** I am very grateful to Deputy Parkinson for giving way there. I absolutely share his concerns with rising sea levels. I am not quite sure what option 5 does to address rising sea levels and water overflowing the quay. It is all very well to suggest a gate on the entry to St Peter Port but then how are we going to get the ro-ro ferries in that still have to come into St Peter Port under the option?

2600 If he could also clarify one of the risks of the current age of our pilots bringing ships into St Sampson's is they are all quite old, they may be retiring soon? If they have retired, what on earth are we going to do with our new £360 million harbour that is right next door to it?

2605 **Deputy Parkinson:** To address the second, rather more flippant, question first. Obviously Longue Hougue South could be built to be more accessible than the current St Sampson's Harbour. There are rocks in the approaches to the current St Sampson's Harbour and the fuel ships, for example, can only get into the harbour on high spring tides and then a fully laden fuel ship entering that harbour only clears the rocks in the pathway to the harbour by maybe a metre.

2610 Those obstacles would not exist outside Longue Hougue South. We would clear any pathway that needed to be cleared. No, I am not giving way again. So the navigational difficulties would be greatly simplified. But to go back to the first question Deputy Taylor poses, I make no secret, and I think Deputy Roffey would share this point of view, that we would have preferred option 6 and we were presented with this very unbiased assessment by our staff, which came up with a preference for option 5.

2615 So we sort of just went along with their proposal, but to me the benefit of this whole scheme will only be fully realised if we get the ro-ro ferries out of St Peter Port and get all the major shipping up into the northern commercial port.

2620 We were very happy when Deputy St Pier and Deputy Helyar laid their amendment to say option 6 should be appraised alongside option 5. Deputy Roffey will say that we think there was enough scope in the original policy letter and in the original Propositions for us to consider option 6 anyway. But certainly in relation to the rising sea level threat, the option of closing the harbour mouth can only be fully exploited if all of the large commercial ships are removed from St Peter Port; and then the harbour mouth, as I say, can be gated against high spring tides.

2625 So, as I say, we are dealing with infrastructure, which will be there for 100 years, or we are planning today the first steps along the development of new infrastructure and we have to be aware that the world is going to change quite a bit in the next 100 years. Rising sea levels is just a potential part of that.

2630 Now, there are other problems with the existing arrangements. Why do we need to do anything? I am still responding to Deputy Taylor's question. These have been set out in the policy letter. We have a problem of congestion in St Peter Port. We have conflicts on land and sea, some of which pose potentially serious risks to the public and leisure boat users and so on. And we have to deal with all these problems of congestion and conflict, compounded by changing patterns of trade.

2635 So we have entered a world where we now export our solid waste by sea, which is part of our brilliant Waste Strategy. We may in the future be importing fuels in iso-tanks. That has been mentioned several times in debate. There are issues about whether the Island will continue to be self-sufficient in aggregates and that also go referred to in debate. We do not know whether Ronez will be allowed to quarry at Chouet headland and, if not, then obviously we will be importing large quantities of aggregates within the next whatever it is, five, seven years or something.

2640

The aggregates arrive in ships of 2,000 tonnes. They are very small ships. They are only 80-feet long but they carry 2,000 tonnes of aggregates. That aggregate is discharged from the ships into lorries that each carry 10 tonnes, so it requires 200 lorries to empty one ship, and 200 empty lorries going into the port to collect the aggregate.

2645 So you have got 400 lorry movements now, related to one shipment of aggregates. If we were importing an additional, perhaps, 25,000 tonnes of aggregates, I am not going to attempt to do the maths in my head, but you will soon realise that there will be a massive number of lorry movements to discharge a ship and the ships of course would likely become much larger than the current 80-foot ships, which are able to use the port of St Sampson's.

2650 So essentially the world is changing around us and we have to be forward-thinking and respond to the threats and opportunities that we face –

**Deputy Inder:** Point of correction. I am sorry –

2655 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Sorry, Deputy, you have to wait until I say.

**Deputy Inder:** I beg your pardon.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Carry on Deputy Inder.

2660 **Deputy Inder:** Point of correction, Deputy Parkinson keeps referring to 80-foot boats. There are cruisers in Guernsey bigger than that. I really do not know where he is getting his information from.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson was referring to specific 80-foot boats.

2665 **Deputy Inder:** I am sorry, madam, with the greatest respect, he was referring to aggregate boats of 80-feet in length. It is just not true and that is a point of correction and he needs to withdraw it immediately.

2670 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

**Deputy Parkinson:** As far as I know the ships that bring the aggregates in are 80-feet long but if Deputy Inder has got a better figure then he can offer that to the States. In fact the size of the ship is not particularly relevant except to the point that in any new commercial port facilities, whether those are at St Peter Port or in St Sampson's, the ships are likely to be bigger than the ships now. So pick a different number if you think 80 feet is wrong. My point remains that the ships of the future, using our commercial port, will be bigger.

2680 And my point remains that it takes 200 lorry loads to shift one cargo of 2,000 tonnes. That is the size of the cargos which come into St Sampson's now. If the ships are bigger, the cargos will be bigger, the lorries will not be bigger because we cannot take bigger lorries, and the number of lorry loads will have to increase.

Now –

**Deputy Gabriel:** Madam, may I make a point of correction?

2685 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy Gabriel.

**Deputy Gabriel:** It might help Deputy Parkinson to know that the MV Ronez, which brings in cement, which is a dedicated ship, is 62.19 m long, rather than feet. Perhaps he is referring to a metre specification rather than a feet specification.

2690

**Deputy Parkinson:** Well, perhaps I was and I thank Deputy Gabriel for correcting me if so. My point remains that the ships using any new commercial port facilities will be bigger than whatever number you have come up with and they will carry more and will require more loads to discharge them. I hope we are at least on the same level on that point.

So the reality is Guernsey is faced with a combination of threats and opportunities in a rapidly changing world in relation to commercial freight and carriage of hydrocarbons and so on and what the STSB has had to try and do is to think about what port facilities we need. And yes, we have been concentrating on the commercial port facilities. We recognise fully the potential benefit to the leisure marine trade and we are wholly supportive of that. We want to maximise the value that the Island gets from exports, but at the end of the day the core of what we needed to do was to provide the States of Guernsey with options that would satisfy the demands of the Island in the future for commercial port facilities.

So our very able staff, which included a bunch of professional seamen and port design experts, in consultation with the port users, the pilots and a whole range of other people, came up with a number of options, which technically could meet the Island's future demands and I said in an earlier speech that all we were looking for from this Assembly was to narrow that list down to one, two, maybe three options, whatever, so that we can spend a bit more money working up the fine details of what those investments would cost.

Now, if we accept Deputy Ferbrache's recommendation and kick Propositions 1-4 into the long grass, then essentially what we are saying is this august body of the Seafront Enhancement Area mark two, or whatever it is going to be called, will go away and do some more thinking about what to recommend to the States and that they will be coming back some time, presumably, next year.

It is possible, of course, that they may come up with different options or a different order of priority among the options than we did in our assessment. But to evaluate those options properly they will still need to do the work that we were asking the States to fund. We cannot, without knowing more about the technical aspects, come to a concrete recommendation.

So it is in the hands of the Assembly. At the end of the day the States' Trading Supervisory Board are, if you like, your servants, not your masters and if the Assembly says, 'No, thanks, guys, your report was quite a good one but we think a different report might be more instructive' then fine, kick it down the road and some future body may come back to this Assembly with different recommendations.

My view is that whatever recommendations they come back with, they will need to do the sort of research that we were asking you to pay for and so you are not saving £4 million by kicking the can down the road, you are probably just postponing the bill. At the end of the day, these technical appraisals, for example around the tide streams outside Longue Hougue, will need to be done.

Fine, if you think it is better to spend £4 million next year than this year, then that of course is the prerogative of the Assembly. But to come back to where I have started, there is a very real case for change in thinking about how we meet the Island's needs for commercial ports into the next 100 years.

There are very big questions and it is not easy for us amateurs to get our heads around all of the technicalities but my view is people should still allow ... Proposition 1, as I have said, we will interpret that as allowing us to look at combination six, and we may be able to come back to you before very long with a detailed appraisal of what that option would cost and what it would entail. But it is perfectly possible for the States to delay the start of that process for perhaps another 12 months and if that is the will of the Assembly then we will accept that.

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

**Deputy Brouard:** Thank you, madam. I have just got one comment to make and then two points just for the President of STSB. Unfortunately I will not be able to vote for Proposition 1, which is combination five, so I will be looking for the lead from Deputy Ferbrache on that. But I am concerned that if this happens and everybody else does the same, what are we going to do about the repairs

2745 that are essential, that we need to do to our infrastructure today and I just wondered if Deputy Roffey could say where that is coming from.

I am also concerned that we keep on talking about our commercial ports but they do not seem very commercial to me because every time they have got anything they need to spend, it is the taxpayer, the general taxpayer, that has to come to their rescue. Now they will use the excuse that they cannot use the piers because they have got cars on them, etc. but they were given the harbour for free by our predecessors, so the drive to get the income from tariffs for imported goods or the marinas, that is all in their gift and I am just a bit concerned that we are not getting our ports commercialised enough to even wash their face, to even cover the day-to-day repointing of the piers that we have got now.

2755 So if Deputy Roffey can give some idea what is going to happen now with the £35 million that we need to do the repairs and what sort of sums do we need on an ongoing basis that the port has to make just to keep on top of the maintenance once we have got rid of the backlog.

2760 My final point is I just want to pick up on something that Deputy Parkinson was saying which was about ships are likely to get bigger and I am assuming he means not only for the freight vessels but also the ferries. So my question to Deputy Roffey is this, why did you design both of these two ports, the option for St Peter Port and Longue Hougue at 130-metre ferries when in fact that is the size of the ferries we have got now? We know in the future, I think, they are going to be bigger. So why did you not design it for bigger ferries when you are telling us now that in fact ferries are going to get bigger? Thank you.

2765 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** Madam, I was going to reserve these comments until when we debate the Government Business Plan, but they are as relevant now as they will be then and I may need to read them twice. So I will have a first crack now and it is in direct reference to comments made by Deputy Dyke.

2770 At the time of the election, madam, I wrote a blog piece for my website, which those who look after these things tell me has received 7,800 unique visits. I say that because I do not think my friend, Deputy Dyke, was one of them because he referred to us having half a billion pounds' worth of borrowing. The truth is we currently have no uncovered borrowings whatsoever.

2775 Now, a little bit of a history lesson. The States decided in 2013 to issue the first ever States of Guernsey sterling bond. A total of £330 million was borrowed but this was not to fund public services. The money was borrowed to lend on to others. Our own trading and associated entities, in order to reduce their cost of borrowing.

2780 Now madam, approximately £163 million of this had been lent – this was accurate as of the end of September last year, with a further £25 million of commitments awaiting finalisation. That funding is supporting critical national infrastructure in Guernsey, providing certainty and low rates. The largest beneficiary of the bond proceeds to date has been the Guernsey Housing Association, which has borrowed nearly £100 million of long-term money, which has helped us to lower the cost of social housing in Guernsey and is backed by the rental income from that bricks and mortar.

2785 There is approximately £140 million available for new lending, which is invested in the Consolidated Investment Fund, ahead of being lent out. This lending can only be made currently where there is a secure income stream capable of repaying the debt without recourse to the taxpayer.

2790 Now, it is that £140 million that has been invested in the Consolidated Investment Fund that has created this quite significant surplus of over £30 million, which the current Policy & Resources Committee wishes to utilise for the benefit of infrastructure investment in the future.

Now there is also something called a revolving credit facility and that has been drawn down, rather than to sell down into what was a depressed equity market at the time. But that revolving credit facility is backed by our contingency reserve. So even if we were to borrow £200 million from



2795 banks through that credit facility, we would have the equivalent amount set aside in a contingency reserve.

So, right now, we have absolutely no uncovered debt at all. What we do have is about £160 million or £170 million of the bond reserve left, which, if we changed the rules, or even if we do not change the rules it would be available, but we may seek to change the rules dependent upon what the recommendations are at the time.

2800 The reason I make this speech now as I have said is because it is relevant because we are not, when we are talking about very significant sums of money, like £300 million or £350 million to be invested over a period of say the next 10 years, we do that from a solid starting point, not from a point where we have already borrowed and have an issue with half a billion pounds' worth of debt. So I hope that is clear. I do recall my friend Deputy Dyke – I will give way in a moment, I will just make this point first.

2805 I do recall my friend, Deputy Dyke, referring to us having £1 billion worth of borrowing pre-election, so I am delighted that he has managed to halve that but I hope that he now sees that in reality we have no uncovered debt whatsoever. He should sleep well tonight, I am sure! (*Laughter*)  
2810 I will give way for now.

**Deputy Dyke:** Thank you, Deputy Trott, for giving way. I was not questioning the morality of the borrowings we have or what they have been used for to date. As an side, my question whether one should be borrowing to invest is not usually recommended. The point I was trying to make is that although now is probably a cheap time to borrow, which it undoubtedly is, a point you made, that does not mean that we should borrow to make a bad investment. That was the point I was trying to make.

2815 In terms of the actual sums we have in terms of borrowing, obviously they are going up now. We had a very bad year last year, the projections that P&R have given us are very bad and in negative territory, so that is the way we are going already. That was my point.

**Deputy Trott:** And that point is well made and I agree with that part of your analysis.

2825 Finally madam, the issue about how little investment in infrastructure we have done over the last few years, it has been a source of constant frustration to many of us, and frankly that has been where we have been, I would argue, at our weakest. But sometimes to make these significant investments, one really does have to be bold and brave. In making those decisions it is important that one understands the current fiscal position and not what some perceive it to have been.

2830 So should we borrow to accelerate our recovery? Well the simple answer to this is yes and that is not simply the view of me or the States' senior committee, as it now transpires because of the Government Work Plan recommendations. It is the conventional or fiscal wisdom, the global conventional wisdom and the longer one leaves that investment the more expensive it becomes. Not only in terms of the rate of which the cost of providing that infrastructure rises but also in this scenario at the rate at which interest rates are likely to rise.

2835 Now only this afternoon the main US index has fallen by one of its larger falls so far this year on the back of very real concerns that the US Federal Reserve will need to raise interest rates to combat inflation. This is real, it is galloping ahead and it will become a significant problem very quickly. So I do hope that has been helpful. I have listened very carefully to this debate. I did come into it undecided. I have heard enough. I will support Proposition 1. Thank you, madam.

2840 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Trott. Deputy de Sausmarez.

**Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you, madam. I think the post-lunch slump in energy is beginning to settle in but this is a really important debate so I hope we can summon the energy to engage our brains in time for the final vote. I am really just going to make some general comments about the need, following on from Deputy Parkinson's helpful reminder of the problems that we are trying

to address and the potential we are trying to seize, really just encourage a bit of continued momentum.

2850 I was at an event last night and actually there were the big posters all about this project, this debate, the various options up on visualisation boards and a good number of the people I spoke with were really quite enthused. So it is quite interesting hearing the disparity in the community, or the disparity between voices that are coming from the community, about this and the sort of tone or debate we have had in the recent days. But I think there are some really exciting opportunities and certainly some fairly pressing issues that do need to be addressed. Personally I would like to see that forward momentum continue and I would like STSB to crack on with it.

2855 The Confederation of British Industry has been increasingly vocal recently about putting sustainability at the heart of projects, especially big infrastructure projects and I think that is something that I am very keen to see being moved forward. So I hope, irrespective of the outcome for today, as and when we move on this, that will be taken to heart.

2860 I have got serious concerns, Deputy Gollop alluded to this, but I think the make-up of any regeneration board or whatever it is going to be called is going to be crucial. It is something of a recurring theme with me that I am wary of making high-level strategic decisions without taking the broader factors into account. So I think the make-up of that regeneration board will be crucial, but I think any of the options, well certainly the options before us, can deliver a wide variety of such opportunities.

2865 As I say, I just get the impression there is quite a lot of enthusiasm in the community in the people that have approached me to talk about it. We have had encouragement from the Chamber of Commerce. There is a broad enthusiasm, I think, for getting on with infrastructure developments that can realise some of those opportunities and I think, if we are heading towards the situation where Propositions 1-5 are rejected, then we are left in the same position we were when we were debating amendment 8 yesterday. We are introducing delay. Actually it is indefinite and I am really not encouraged by any sort of platitudes about bringing things forward.

2870 What are we really expecting? As Deputy Kazantseva-Miller said, are we really expecting them to come back with anything particularly different to the options that are on the table at the moment? Is there really any enthusiasm for the option at the heart of Deputy Brouard's – with apologies to Deputy Brouard – what are we expecting? It does remind me of that famous saying of Einstein, the definition of madness is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result.

2875 These are the logical options. I have not seen anyone bring forward amendments to put anything very different on the table. We do have to make a decision. I came into this debate thinking that there probably would not be appetite in the Assembly to make a big decision. This is really our first test and then actually, I think it was on amendment 6, it was on one of Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and Deputy Haskins' amendments about the blue economy, I thought, actually no, maybe there is enthusiasm to move something forward and to actually take the bull by the horns here but again my confidence in that scenario is fizzling somewhat and I think it is going to be something of a damp squib. Maybe it should be a damp squid, given the topic.

2880 But I hope we can move forward. I hope we can actually vote for ... I think it is very easy to vote against stuff. I think it takes a lot more backbone to vote for something but I for one am really keen to see the momentum forward and to crack on with this particular project, which I think has got enormous potential to shape the Island and its economy and indeed the social fabric and our environment for generations to come.

2890 **The Deputy Bailiff:** If no one else wishes to speak in general debate, I will ask Deputy Roffey to reply.

2895 **Deputy Roffey:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Bailiff. I am not going to do a very long speech because I get the sense that people feel like they have been through the spin dryer. But I will do a moderately long speech instead. Because there were a few things being said that I have to take up.

2900 Deputy Inder said options 5 and 6 in the Billet are very different. He is right and he is wrong. He is right to the extent that the outcome of what we achieve with 6, if it is possible, is more substantial, which is why, as Deputy Parkinson has said, the STSB would have preferred that to be a favoured option if they felt it was safe to put forward. It is why we put in the Billet that if you went with option 5 we could continue to look at whether that could morph into option 6 and it is why I gave that guarantee to Deputy Helyar so he did not have to lay his amendment.

2905 Because the actual harbour that would actually have to go at Longue Hougue will be incredibly similar in both instances so the modelling ... modelling five or six options that are different would cost an absolute fortune. Modelling those two will hardly cost any more than modelling one of them because they are basically the same. That modelling, that work that research will inform us about whether option 6 is possible or not and it is possible that it will not be possible, which is why we felt we could not put it forward as the preferred option.

2910 Deputy Inder also said the pilots are against it. Well, no, that is not true. I know former Deputy Barry Paint is very much against it but our pilots have been involved in this throughout. The Chief Pilot was very much involved in the exercises for modelling different types of ships coming into a new harbour at Longue Hougue. If he had said it was a no-go, we would have absolutely listened to that.

2915 We did not go into that with any preconceived ideas and, as I have said, since we have published this Billet, a former chief pilot of Guernsey has come forward and said, actually if you change the design somewhat you can probably do option 6 because you can overcome some of the constraints that the computer modelling of the Rembrandt system showed. So it is far too black and white to say that the pilots are against it.

2920 If I had been the main architect of this policy letter, I would have probably taken on the chin his 'this is nothing but a lash-up' but actually I think I have to respond to that. I was not one of the main architects, in fact my input was very little. I have led the team of dedicated professionals that produced a really good piece of work.

2925 I do not mind at all if States' Members utterly reject the results and say, 'We think you got it wrong and we are not going to vote for this in a month of Sundays.' But it is not a lash-up, it is a professional piece of work and if they are listening to this debate today I want them to hear me say that because I think I would be failing in my duty as President if I did not say so.

2930 A few other comments. Deputy Taylor, is Longue Hougue South really that different to St Sampson's? Yes, absolutely. I am a Bridge boy – I know I am a Bordeaux boy – but I spent a lot of time on the Bridge when I was young. That is a really special place around a traditional harbour. My granddad was a deputy harbourmaster at the heights of the granite trade. That is the nub of the north. That is Guernsey's second town.

2935 Longue Hougue South, out by the waste transfer station, out by the cattle incinerator is totally different. Yes, it is in the hinterland, yes, it is still in St Sampson's but ask St Sampson's Douzaine whether they think there is a gain by making St Sampson's Harbour and its environs a much nicer, cleaner and more leisure-focussed place and focussing the dirty activity out at Longue Hougue and St Sampson's Douzaine will give you your answer: 'Yes, it is in our parish but it is a very different proposition altogether.'

2940 STSB, carry out your mandate. Well, yes, sir, we will. In fact it was the States who told us to do this piece of work. It is not our normal mandate. As for the repairs, absolutely. I arrived at STSB a year ago and we want to crack on. We are shocked to see that over decades, slowly, disrepair had set in. Yes, quite a lot was spent in maintenance but not enough and we need to have a catch up.

2945 Certainly, if we are ever going to look at, and I do not want to open up the debate on commercialisation, but if we are going to commercialise the ports and expect a corporate entity to look after it, they are going to expect those ports to be capitalised at the outset, in a way that will allow them to be a commercial proposition.

So if none of these go through, I do not know. We probably will have to bring back a policy letter saying please can we just fund these repairs in isolation? That is a shame because that actually does not make the ports more efficient. It repairs them, which is great, but it does not increase the

2950 income generation, it does not reduce the cost of running them, which some of these other ideas absolutely would.

Deputy Ferbrache – that was a weird one. His pretty short speech was in two parts. The first part was ‘do not listen to the experts, experts are overrated, if experts had built my fireplace in 14- whatever it was, exactly they did not’. That was the first half. The second half was, ‘do not vote for this today, let me set up this new panel, let me bring in the experts, let us have the experts have a look at this!’ Maybe he can reconcile those two parts in his brain but mine finds it slightly difficult.

2955 Deputy Gollop, he wants to have more studies but he does not want to vote any more money to do more studies until he has got more studies to know whether or not it is worth voting that money. Okay. Right, well. Deputy Gollop if you vote against 1-5, the studies that ought to be flowing here next, the seabed studies, the Wallingford studies, all of those sorts of things, will not be able to go ahead because they will not be funded.

2960 I have to say, one of the things that would have been serendipitous that we are being asked – I will have to wait until the end of the vote of course – to look at a Pool Marina, one of the things we would like to do or have to do with that is bring over the barge that does the sub-seabed studies to know what is there and what dredging or blasting will need to be done and we would like to be able to use it, at the same time, to actually look at Longue Hougue and actually, in fairness to Deputy Brouard, we would also like to use it to look outside of St Peter Port Harbour as well.

2965 I am not sure what message would be sent if 1-5 is removed. If we are being told Longue Hougue, no, in any circumstances, because the cost of that barge of mainly its mobilisation in getting it over here, we would like to be able to use it for all of those studies at the same time.

2970 Deputy Brouard, are our ports commercial enough? No, they are probably not commercial enough. They generate a profit. It is not fair for him to say every time we need money we come to the States. Actually, the vast majority of the capital investment in our ports is done out of revenues received from the port users.

2975 There was one exception, Deputy Ferbrache, because the ports are both the Airport and the harbour, he brought the whole baggage handling system to the States, asking for a capital injection. I will not give way to Deputy Brouard. (**Deputy Brouard:** QEII Marina?) Yes, well that is going back a bit. Okay, Deputy Berry did do that and I have to say, as has been said earlier, that was a really good investment that actually paid back. Of course a large part, there was also a big car parking element to it as well, which I think would have been unfair for the port users probably to pay for. But okay, Deputy Brouard has got a long memory.

2980 Basically, on a year-by-year basis, apart from the whole baggage handling system, it has reinvested itself. But it probably is not doing enough and I have to say, if it is commercialised, I have no doubt mooring fees will go up very considerably. Even if it is not commercialised we have wanted a more commercial approach and trying to generate more income to invest in it, we will have to look at that route as well because Guernsey is just incredibly cheap compared with any other marina facilities.

2985 But it is one of those merry-go-rounds. In order to do that, we ought to provide the facilities first. When we are trying to ask to provide the facilities we get told by the DPA, quite rightly, we cannot allow new shower blocks and things, because we have not got the harbour action areas. Well what do you need before you can start really working on that? Go to the States and get a decision on the future of commercial ports, then we can draw up the plans for the harbours. So we would do that and then be told not now, not today, go away and we will give it to another body. Well, we might be about to be told that. I will find out in a minute.

2995 Finally, on Deputy Brouard, yes, somewhat bigger ships will be able to come in, both into the Longue Hougue or if his option had gone ahead, they are not massively bigger, I think what Deputy Parkinson was talking about was bigger freight ships. The ships that come into St Sampson’s are limited, I think, to 80 m, not 80 feet but 80 m, but actually all of the indications as far as our ro-pax passenger vessels is that they are not likely to get much bigger.

3000 If anything, we are being told, certainly by Condor, if we do that, do not expect fresh food on a regular basis because we will come here less regularly. It would have to be then a unique service

just to Guernsey, not with Jersey, because they will not be able to get in there, which I think would be incredibly inefficient. But we are building in the flexibility for somewhat bigger vessels in that respect.

3005 So madam, to close, how is this Assembly going to vote on Propositions 1-5? Propositions 1-4 of course were the original Propositions in the policy letter. I do not know. Well, I think I probably do. But I do not know for sure for a few more minutes. But I do know one thing. This Assembly is a horse. It is a horse that asked, it has instructed us, asked to be led to water. It told the STSB to lead it to water. It voted £800,000 to enable the STSB to do that but it was a very opinionated horse,  
3010 which set up the parameters which set out the parameters of what that water should look like –

**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Point of correction.

3015 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey, Deputy Dudley-Owen has got a point of correction.

**Deputy Roffey:** Oh, sorry.

3020 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you and I do apologise for interrupting a person in free-flow. It is not very nice to have that done. But it was the previous Assembly's decision. That was the horse that took the STSB to water, not this Assembly.

3025 **Deputy Roffey:** This is an Assembly that flows on. It changes its membership. If we are talking about projects that are going to take years and years to complete, I am afraid that this Assembly is this Assembly. I do totally accept the membership has changed and even if it was the same Assembly, they could change their mind. I totally accept that. But this Assembly asked for options. As I say, they asked to be led to water, they told us what the water should look like, they wanted it to be a new commercial harbour somewhere between the existing harbours of St Peter Port and St Sampson's inclusive.

3030 It knew, when it set us that task, that the final sum would be in the hundreds of millions of pounds. There was never any question about that. Madam, we have not only carried out that task but we have offered the Assembly seven coherent, usable, workable options. Of course we favoured our own, we put forward our own considered favourite in the form of options 5/6 but we offered up all the alternatives.

3035 This Assembly today, and it really is this Assembly this time, voted on the principal alternative option to 5/6, which was option 3, and defeated it heavily. So that has really been rejected. No one, I do not think, has championed any of the other options that we put forward in the Billet. Well, we have heard one or two words about option 2 and option 2 does have its merits. It is relatively cheap. It will improve the ergonomics of St Peter Port but nobody has felt strongly enough to put forward an amendment saying that that should be taken forward.

3040 Nor have they asked for any other ideas, their own ideas perhaps. Things that we have missed, to be considered. So if this Assembly rejects particularly options 1-4 today I think there is only one logical way to read that outcome. We do not really want to do anything about our commercial ports provision. We may want to marina-ise, if that is a word, more of our current port space, but we do not want to expand our ports provision. In other words, thanks for leading us to water but, do you  
3045 know what, now we are here, we just do not fancy taking a drink any more. It is an outcome, I suppose, and from the STSB's point of view it gives us a degree of certainty.

3050 We will all know where we stand. It will be a disappointing result but we will simply put this report on top of the stack of others on the same subject and to quote Deputy Taylor, we will get on with the day job. However this issue will not go away. The reason there have been so many reports on it over the last 40 years is that there is a clear need –

**Deputy Taylor:** Point of correction. I know it is a bit pedantic but I did not say get on with the day job. If I am being really flippant, not repairing the slipway, you have not been getting on with

3055 the day job. I apologise, I did not mean to make a comment so blunt but that was not my words.  
Thank you.

**Deputy Roffey:** No, it was carry out your mandate. If that is not quite the same as get on with the day job, I apologise. It is called paraphrasing but I do not think it was evilly distorting what he was saying in any way whatsoever.

3060 I do not think this issue will go away. The reason there have been so many reports on deep water berths on provision of commercial harbours outside our existing Victorian structures over the last 40 years is that not just this Assembly or the last one, but repetitive Assemblies have realised that there is a case and a need to do this. None of them have had the strength of mind to see it through.

3065 I really hope that is not going to be the outcome, though. I really hope it for a host of reasons. Not just because we at STSB are convinced it is a good idea to show the courage to move forward but actually because an awful lot of other people do too.

3070 Firstly, these plans have very extensive support in the business community and that is not surprising because when we carried out this work – the work that the Assembly asked us to do on the commercial ports – even we were astonished at the resultant economic opportunities that it threw up. Not just for the blue economy – and by the way can I ask for a real definition of the blue economy? I sort of know what it means but it would be useful, when it is being used so often these days, to know its parameters and its bandwidth because otherwise I think other people could be speaking at cross-purposes while using the same expression.

3075 But it is not just for the blue economy. The opportunity it throws up for Guernsey's general economy, for housing, for retail, for hospitality and for a whole range of other sectors. It really is the perfect vehicle, to generate the right sort of economic growth just when we need it most.

3080 Vote against 1-4 and you lose or at least defer a massive part of that opportunity. Sure, you can go on and create a regeneration board but you will have taken away, at least for the time being, many of the key tools, levers and opportunities for that board to use. But madam, it is not just business that will be upset. The Douzaines of the Vale, St Sampson's and St Peter Port have made their support very clear indeed and why would they not? Particularly the first two, given the unique change that it provides to completely rejuvenate and transform the Bridge into something very special indeed.

3085 Then there is the public support. My officers have commented that all the drop-in sessions that they have put on for big projects over the year – and some of them have done many of these over the years – none have come even as close to this as to getting such public support and yes, there has been the odd critic, but the overwhelming public support is something completely out of their experience.

3090 Madam, I know that this is a big decision. It is true that we are 'only' asking you to commit £4 million today but of course we would not want you to do that unless you are at least mindful to see the project through. Someone said to me, six, eight months ago, you are going to really struggle with this one. I said yes, I think you are right. But we both looked at each other and said, 'Guernsey does not do big.'

3095 Well we may have been right for the last few decades. In fact, as Deputy Trott says, in the last decade, 'the States does not do anything', would be closer to the mark when it comes to investing in our infrastructure. But generally, yes, we do have a problem, I think as a community, of doing big. But it has not always been the case. Our predecessors did have the courage. Our forefathers did have the courage to do big and we have been the beneficiaries.

3100 Now I thought most Members here today stood on a platform of creating a can-do States. A States of action. A States that did not kick the can down the road. Well, madam, this horse has now arrived at the water and it is time to decide whether we have the courage and the vision to take a drink and show confidence in this Island's future, to invest in our Island so that private investors can see that we at least have confidence in where our community is going. Or, more likely, to shy away and put this subject in our already overflowing 'too difficult' tray. The results of the votes and in particular the individual votes will be truly revealing.

3105

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Roffey, in relation to the Propositions, you have spoken and indeed others have spoken of 1-4 all standing together. Do you wish 1-4 to be put together or as individual Propositions? I am mindful of Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's 2A, which does not necessarily sit, although it is number 2A.

3110

**Deputy Roffey:** I almost think there are not that many Propositions and after two long days of debate it might be best to put them all individually so that we do get a clear decision.

**Deputy Inder:** Sorry, if I am understanding correctly, I might not have heard, I would like 2A separated.

3115

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I am going to be guided by Deputy Roffey as it is his Proposition. I shall put each individual Proposition and you are asking for a recorded vote, Deputy Queripel?

**Deputy Queripel:** A recorded vote on every Proposition, madam, please, yes.

3120

**The Deputy Bailiff:** So there will be recorded votes and each individual Proposition will be voted for separately. States' Greffier, in relation to Proposition 1.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Proposition 1*

*Not carried – Pour 13, Contre 21, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 6*

<b>POUR</b>	<b>CONTRE</b>	<b>NE VOTE PAS</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Deputy Moakes	Deputy Leadbeater	None	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Parkinson	Deputy Mahoney		Deputy Murray
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Matthews		Alderney Rep. Roberts
Deputy St Pier *	Deputy McKenna		Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Trott	Deputy Meerveld		Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Bury	Deputy Oliver		Deputy Burford
Deputy Cameron	Deputy Prow		
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Queripel		
Deputy Fairclough	Deputy Soulsby		
Deputy Falla	Deputy Taylor		
Deputy Gabriel	Deputy Vermeulen		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Blin		
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller	Deputy Brouard		
	Deputy de Lisle		
	Deputy Dudley-Owen		
	Deputy Dyke		
	Deputy Ferbrache		
	Deputy Haskins		
	Deputy Helyar		
	Deputy Inder		
	Deputy Le Tissier		

\* denotes Member who voted by proxy

3125

**The Deputy Bailiff:** In relation to Proposition 1, there voted Pour 13, Contre 21, there were 6 absentees. I declare the Proposition defeated. Proposition 2 please States' Greffier.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Proposition 2*

*Not carried – Pour 14, Contre 20, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 6*

<b>POUR</b>	<b>CONTRE</b>	<b>NE VOTE PAS</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Deputy Matthews	Deputy Leadbeater	None	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Oliver	Deputy Mahoney		Deputy Murray
Deputy Parkinson	Deputy McKenna		Alderney Rep. Roberts
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Meerveld		Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy St Pier *	Deputy Moakes		Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Trott	Deputy Prow		Deputy Burford
Deputy Bury	Deputy Queripel		
Deputy Cameron	Deputy Soulsby		
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Taylor		
Deputy Fairclough	Deputy Vermeulen		
Deputy Falla	Deputy Blin		
Deputy Gabriel	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy de Lisle		
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller	Deputy Dudley-Owen		
	Deputy Dyke		
	Deputy Ferbrache		
	Deputy Haskins		
	Deputy Helyar		
	Deputy Inder		
	Deputy Le Tissier		

\* denotes Member who voted by proxy

3130

**The Deputy Bailiff:** In relation to Proposition 2, there voted Pour 14, Contre 20, there were 6 absentees. I declare the Proposition defeated. States' Greffier, a recorded vote on Proposition 2A.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Proposition 2A*

*Not carried – Pour 17, Contre 17, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 6*

<b>POUR</b>	<b>CONTRE</b>	<b>NE VOTE PAS</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Deputy Leadbeater	Deputy Mahoney	None	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Matthews	Deputy McKenna		Deputy Murray
Deputy Oliver	Deputy Meerveld		Alderney Rep. Roberts
Deputy Parkinson	Deputy Moakes		Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Prow		Deputy Aldwell
Deputy St Pier *	Deputy Queripel		Deputy Burford
Deputy Trott	Deputy Soulsby		
Deputy Bury	Deputy Taylor		
Deputy Cameron	Deputy Vermeulen		
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Blin		
Deputy Fairclough	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy Falla	Deputy de Lisle		
Deputy Gabriel	Deputy Dudley-Owen		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Dyke		
Deputy Haskins	Deputy Ferbrache		
Deputy Inder	Deputy Helyar		
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller	Deputy Le Tissier		

\* denotes Member who voted by proxy

3135

**The Deputy Bailiff:** In relation to Proposition 2A there voted Pour 17, there voted Contre 17, there were 6 absences. So, in accordance with the Rules, the Proposition is defeated. Proposition 3, States' Greffier.



*There was a recorded vote.*

*Proposition 3*

*Not carried – Pour 12, Contre 22, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 6*

<b>POUR</b>	<b>CONTRE</b>	<b>NE VOTE PAS</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Deputy Parkinson	Deputy Leadbeater	None	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Mahoney		Deputy Murray
Deputy St Pier *	Deputy Matthews		Alderney Rep. Roberts
Deputy Trott	Deputy McKenna		Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Brouard	Deputy Meerveld		Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Bury	Deputy Moakes		Deputy Burford
Deputy Cameron	Deputy Oliver		
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Prow		
Deputy Fairclough	Deputy Queripel		
Deputy Falla	Deputy Soulsby		
Deputy Gabriel	Deputy Taylor		
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller	Deputy Vermeulen		
	Deputy Blin		
	Deputy de Lisle		
	Deputy Dudley-Owen		
	Deputy Dyke		
	Deputy Ferbrache		
	Deputy Gollop		
	Deputy Haskins		
	Deputy Helyar		
	Deputy Inder		
	Deputy Le Tissier		

\* denotes Member who voted by proxy

3140

**The Deputy Bailiff:** In relation to Proposition 3, there voted Pour 12, Contre 22, absent 6. The Proposition is defeated. In accordance with the wording of Proposition 4, as Proposition 1 was not approved, it falls away. So we go now to Proposition 5.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Proposition 5*

*Carried – Pour 22, Contre 10, Ne vote pas 2, Absent 6*

<b>POUR</b>	<b>CONTRE</b>	<b>NE VOTE PAS</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Deputy Leadbeater	Deputy Mahoney	Deputy Brouard	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Matthews	Deputy McKenna	Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Murray
Deputy Moakes	Deputy Meerveld		Alderney Rep. Roberts
Deputy Oliver	Deputy Queripel		Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Parkinson	Deputy Soulsby		Deputy Aldwell
Deputy Prow	Deputy Blin		Deputy Burford
Deputy Roffey	Deputy de Lisle		
Deputy St Pier *	Deputy Ferbrache		
Deputy Taylor	Deputy Helyar		
Deputy Trott	Deputy Le Tissier		
Deputy Vermeulen			
Deputy Bury			
Deputy Cameron			
Deputy Dudley-Owen			
Deputy Dyke			
Deputy Fairclough			
Deputy Falla			
Deputy Gabriel			
Deputy Gollop			
Deputy Haskins			
Deputy Inder			
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller			

\* denotes Member who voted by proxy

3145

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Proposition 5, there voted Pour 22, Contre 10, there were 2 abstentions and 6 absences. I declare the Proposition passed. Proposition 6 please, States' Greffier.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Proposition 6*

*Carried – Pour 24, Contre 9, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 6*

**POUR**

Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Mahoney  
Deputy Matthews  
Deputy McKenna  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Moakes  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy St Pier \*  
Deputy Taylor  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Vermeulen  
Deputy Blin  
Deputy Cameron  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Dyke  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Haskins  
Deputy Helyar  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Le Tissier

**CONTRE**

Deputy Queripel  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Bury  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Fairclough  
Deputy Gabriel  
Deputy Kazantseva-  
Miller

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Falla

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Murray  
Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Alderney Rep. Snowdon  
Deputy Aldwell  
Deputy Burford

\* denotes Member who voted by proxy

3150

**The Deputy Bailiff:** In relation to Proposition 6 there voted Pour 24, Contre 9, there was 1 abstention and 6 absentees. Therefore I declare the Proposition passed. States' Greffier, now the final Proposition, Proposition 7.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Proposition 7*

*Carried – Pour 28, Contre 3, Ne vote pas 3, Absent 6*

**POUR**

Deputy Leadbeater  
Deputy Mahoney  
Deputy Matthews  
Deputy McKenna  
Deputy Meerveld  
Deputy Moakes  
Deputy Oliver  
Deputy Parkinson  
Deputy Prow  
Deputy Roffey  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy St Pier \*  
Deputy Taylor  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Vermeulen

**CONTRE**

Deputy Queripel  
Deputy de Lisle  
Deputy Gabriel

**NE VOTE PAS**

Deputy Bury  
Deputy Falla  
Deputy Kazantseva-  
Miller

**ABSENT**

Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Murray  
Alderney Rep. Roberts  
Alderney Rep. Snowdon  
Deputy Aldwell  
Deputy Burford

Deputy Blin  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Cameron  
Deputy de Sausmarez  
Deputy Dudley-Owen  
Deputy Dyke  
Deputy Fairclough  
Deputy Ferbrache  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Haskins  
Deputy Helyar  
Deputy Inder  
Deputy Le Tissier

\* denotes Member who voted by proxy

3155 **The Deputy Bailiff:** In relation to Proposition 7, there voted Pour 28, Contre 3, there were 3 *je ne vote pas* and 6 absences. Therefore I declare the Proposition passed.

**14. Scrutiny Management Committee –  
Freedom of Information Review –  
Voting results: Proposition 1b carried**

3160 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Just before we move onto the SACC Committee's green paper, I understand that in relation to the Freedom of Information Law it was not picked up by *Hansard* because there was an issue with the recording.

So I will just formally read out that in relation to 1a; that was lost on the basis of 8 Pour, 30 Contre and there were 2 absences. In relation to Proposition 1b, that was carried, Pour 37, Contre 1, with 2 absences.

**Procedural –  
Proposal to extend sitting –  
Not carried**

3165 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld.

**Deputy Meerveld:** Thank you, madam. I am just considering whether we should either put it to the Assembly, through you, to sit late or to possibly defer the opening speech until the next Meeting?

3170

**Several Members:** Pour!

**The Deputy Bailiff:** It needs to be one motion or the other. I will put it to the Assembly that we should sit late and complete the business of this week's Assembly. Those in favour; those against?

3175

*Members voted Contre.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** I guess the motion was defeated.

3180 **Deputy Ferbrache:** There is one matter, madam, that does need to be done, which is the Schedule for next month's Meeting.

**POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**15. Schedule for Future States' Business –  
Proposition carried**

Article 15.

*The States are asked to decide:- Whether, after consideration of the attached Schedule for Future States' Business, which sets out items for consideration at the Meeting of the 14th July 2021 and subsequent States' Meetings, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.*

*STATES OF DELIBERATION SCHEDULE for FUTURE STATES' BUSINESS*

*(For consideration at the Ordinary Meeting of the States commencing on the 16th June 2021)*

*Items for Ordinary Meeting of the States commencing on the 14th July, 2021*

*(a) communications by the Presiding Officer including in memoriam tributes;*

*(b) statements;*

*(c) questions;*

*(d) elections and appointments;*

*P.2021/49 – Committee for Home Affairs – Independent Monitoring Panel: Appointment of New Members and Notification of Resignation*

*P.2021/67 – Committee for Health & Social Care – Re-appointment of the Medical Director as Responsible Officer under the Regulation of Health Professions (Medical Practitioners) (Guernsey and Alderney) Ordinance, 2015*

*P.2021/68 – Policy & Resources Committee – The Administrative Decisions (Review) Guernsey Law, 1986*

*– The Appointment of Additional Members of the Complaints Panel Committee for Economic Development*

*– Appointment of an Ordinary Member and Chairman of the Office of the Financial Services Ombudsman*

*(e) motions to debate an appendix report (1st stage);*

*(f) articles adjourned or deferred from previous Meetings of the States;*

*(g) all other types of business not otherwise named;*

*No. 25 of 2021 – The Copyright (Prescribed Libraries, Archives, Museums and Galleries and Copying of Copyright Materials) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Regulations, 2021*

*No. 30 of 2021 – Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (Vaccine) (Limitation of Liability) (No. 4) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Regulations, 2021*

*No. 31 of 2021 – Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (General Provision) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (No. 4) Regulations, 2021*

*No. 40 of 2021 – Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (General Provision) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (No. 4) (Amendment) Regulations, 2021*

*No. 43 of 2021 – Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (Vaccine) (Limitation of Liability) (No. 5) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Regulations, 2021*

*No. 44 of 2021 – Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (General Provision) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (No. 5) Regulations, 2021*

*No. 48 of 2021 – Emergency Powers (Coronavirus) (General Provision) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (No. 5) (Amendment) Regulations, 2021*

*No. 51 of 2021 – The Prison (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2021*

*No. 54 of 2021 – The Tobacco Advertising and Related Activities (Guernsey) Regulations, 2021*

*P.2021/60 – The Abortion (Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2021\**

*P.2021/61 – The Public Thoroughfares (Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2021\**

*P.2021/62 – The Health and Safety at Work (Equality Provisions) Ordinance, 2021\**

*P.2021/63 – The Machinery of Government (Transfer of Functions) Ordinance, 2021\**

*P.2021/64 – The Income Tax (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2021\**

*P.2021/69 – Committee for Education, Sport & Culture – Secondary and Post 16 Education Reorganisation\**

*P.2021/66 – States' Assembly & Constitution Committee – Dates of States' Meetings – 1st September 2024 to 31st August 2025\**

*P.2021/50 – The Guernsey Financial Services Commission: 2020 Annual Report and Accounts\**

*P.2021/65 – Guernsey Electricity - Interim Amendments for Tariff Regulation\**

*Amendments to the proposed meeting dates and order are permitted only for those items marked with an \*.*

*Items for Special Meeting of the States commencing on the 21st July 2021*

*P.2021/xx – Government Work Plan – Stage 2*

*Items for Special Meeting of the States commencing on the 2nd November 2021 P.2021/xx – States' Budget.*

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Greffier, if you wouldn't mind formally ...?

**The States' Greffier:** Article 15. Schedule for Future States' Business – the Policy & Resources Committee.

3185

**The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache? No. Those in favour; those against?

*Members voted Pour.*

3190

**The Deputy Bailiff:** The Proposition is passed. Therefore that concludes this week's sitting. Thank you all for your contributions.

*The Assembly adjourned at 5.21 p.m.*