

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

FRIDAY, 18th MARCH 2022

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption	3
1. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) – ninety-first amendment: Affordable housing provision (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)) - as amended - resumption	3
1.1 Senator K.L. Moore:	3
1.1.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	4
1.1.2 Deputy L.B.E. Ash of St. Clement:	5
1.1.3 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:	5
1.1.4 Deputy R. Labey of St. Helier:	6
1.1.5 Connétable J. Le Bailly of St. Mary:	6
1.1.6 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence:	7
1.1.7 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:	9
1.1.8 Connétable J.E. Le Maistre of Grouville:	9
1.1.9 Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier:	9
1.1.10 Deputy G.C. Guida of St. Lawrence:	11
1.1.11 Deputy R.J. Ward:	12
1.1.12 Deputy J.H. Young of St. Brelade:	13
2. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) – sixty-second amendment: Withdrawal of G392A, Grouville (P. 36/2021 Amd.(62)).....	20
2.1 The Deputy of Grouville:	20
2.1.1 Deputy J.H. Young:	21
2.1.2 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier:	22
2.1.3 The Connétable of Grouville:	22
2.1.4 Deputy S.M. Wickenden of St. Helier:	24
2.1.5 Deputy J.A. Martin of St. Helier:	25
2.1.6 The Connétable of St. Brelade:	26
2.1.7 The Deputy of Grouville:	26
3. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) – twelfth amendment: Removal of Field H1219 St. Helier (P.36/2021 Amd.(12)).....	28
3.1 The Connétable of St. Helier:	28
3.1.1 Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier:	30
3.1.2 Deputy J.H. Young:	31
3.1.3 Deputy I. Gardiner:	32
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED	34
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT.....	34
3.1.4 The Connétable of St. Helier:	34

4. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - seventy-eighth amendment: Rezone Field H1219A for accessible homes (P.36/2021 Amd.(78))	36
4.1 Deputy S.M. Ahier:.....	36
4.1.1 Deputy D. Johnson of St. Mary:	37
4.1.2 Deputy R.J. Ward:	37
4.1.3 Deputy J.A. Martin:	38
4.1.4 Deputy J.H. Young:	38
4.1.5 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	39
4.1.6 Deputy K.F. Morel:.....	40
4.1.7 Deputy I. Gardiner:	42
4.1.8 Deputy K.G. Pamplin of St. Saviour:	43
4.1.9 Senator S.C. Ferguson:	44
4.1.10 Senator S.Y. Mézec:.....	44
4.1.11 Deputy R.J. Renouf of St. Ouen:.....	45
4.1.12 Connétable R.A. Buchanan of St. Ouen:.....	46
4.1.13 Senator S.W. Pallett:	47
4.1.14 Deputy M.R. Higgins:	48
4.1.15 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:.....	49
4.1.16 The Connétable of St. Helier:.....	49
4.1.17 Deputy S.M. Ahier:	50
5. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - sixteenth amendment: Field MN410, St. Martin (P.36/2021 Amd.(16)).....	54
5.1 Deputy S.G. Luce of St. Martin:	54
6. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - second amendment: Removal of St. Saviour Fields (P.36/2021 Amd.(2))	54
6.1 Deputy K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:	55
6.1.1 Deputy K.G. Pamplin:	56
6.1.2 Connétable S.A. Le Sueur-Rennard of St. Saviour:	57
6.1.3 The Connétable of St. Ouen:.....	59
6.1.4 Deputy G.C. Guida:	59
6.1.5 Deputy J.H. Young:	60
6.1.6 Deputy K.C. Lewis:	62
ADJOURNMENT.....	67

[9:31]

The Roll was called and the Dean led the Assembly in Prayer.

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption

1. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) – ninety-first amendment: Affordable housing provision (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)) - as amended - resumption

The Deputy Bailiff:

We now return to the debate on the 91st amendment, as amended. Does any Member wish to speak on the amendment, as amended?

1.1 Senator K.L. Moore:

Three years ago I asked this Assembly to rezone a field in the centre of the village of St. Peter for affordable housing. That would have provided 64 homes in the Ville du Manoir site, which Andium Homes were preparing and hoping to develop. Of course, 3 years may seem a relatively short period of time but, as I stated during speeches, at that time 3 years makes a vast difference in the life of a child. I sense that in debating this amendment, as it now stands, a number of Members still wish to take the amendment line by line or item by item. I would like to speak early this morning and urge the Minister to take the amendment as a whole and ask Members to support it as a whole because Members are here to represent the people. Some Members, and I believe one political party, takes the view that everyone in the Island has a roof over their heads so we need not worry about delivering more affordable housing under this bridging Island Plan. However, I would like to remind them of the homelessness strategy. That clearly sets out the need to deliver more affordable housing, and it sets out also the impact that homelessness is having on people in the Island today. While they may have a roof over their heads and somewhere to sleep at night they do not enjoy consistency or even security of tenure because they might be sofa-surfing or facing eviction because the property that they are renting is being sold. People who leave prison often go to either Sanctuary House or they find themselves sleeping in hotels or guesthouses. That cannot be the kind of housing that we hope for, for Members of the public of Jersey. We are all aware of the numbers of people who are on the list seeking housing with Andium. There is a significant waiting list and we all know and have constituents who are experiencing troubles because of the time that they are spending waiting for better quality housing. I can also remind Members of the words of children themselves that are provided to us by the Children's Commissioner in her report *Life on the Rock*. If I could quote one young girl aged 10. It says: "I think houses and flats are really expensive in Jersey and sometimes mums and dads do not earn enough money to afford a nice house for them and their children to live in. Sometimes landlords have nice big houses but will not let children live in them." We all know that housing has been an issue. We all know that there are huge numbers of people who would like to be able to afford housing of a better quality than the housing that they are currently experiencing. This amendment is about delivering a greater number of affordable homes for Islanders and those homes will be delivered through Andium and therefore, because they are affordable housing sites, they will be seeking a lower price to many other housing sites for development. That must be really at the forefront of Members' minds because I sensed yesterday that a lot of Members do not want to enrich people who might sell their land but if we vote against this amendment then we will be forcing more and more people to deliver housing through the private sector, through private development, and therefore there is less restraint on the price of land through those developments. Of course, they will also be focused more on flats and homes without gardens, which, in my view, would be inferior for our children. If Members have a problem with people making money out of the sale of land then I would urge them to address that sole issue by considering a property tax or something, bringing a proposition to the Assembly that would meet that issue that they have with the exchange of land and making it available for housing. Let us put the people of Jersey first. Let us put what each and every one of us know about our constituents and the experiences that they are having in the housing market

and the rental market, and support the Minister in his bid to create more affordable homes for Islanders over the coming years.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

May I raise the *défaut* on Deputy Tadier please?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Are Members content to raise the *défaut*? Yes, the *défaut* is raised.

1.1.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

I think when Members stand up to talk about housing being one of the most important issues facing our Island that would be a bit more credible if we did not have an Assembly which is perceived by outsiders to be full of the landlord class who every time, and it has been so many occasions now, that simple propositions come to this Assembly to ask for things like a landlord registration scheme, like minimum standards so you know that what you are living in meets certain standards, and those standards are regulated and they are inspected.

[9:45]

It is not just left to be a reactive system when people are paying extremely high rents in the Island and they are not guaranteed to get a minimum standard in return. If it was not for the fact that those kind of simple things were batted back on every occasion, sometimes by very small minorities, I think some Members could speak with a bit more authority and perhaps they would be believed more by the public when they stand up and say: "We need to sort out the housing crisis in Jersey." One might be tempted to say that of course what we are debating here today is not rental properties, it is about being able to afford to buy your own home in an affordable way. But what I would say is that you have to look at this - we have to look at this - holistically because they are all part of the same picture. I would say that we simply do not have the information ... the census information has been mentioned already but we could and should have detailed information about the housing situation in Jersey by knowing who owns what. I think we know it in terms of fields. We do not know it in terms of property. I go back to the point that I was told many years ago by somebody working in Social Security who administers income support, and he was not saying the Island is full of feckless, poor people who are benefit scroungers who are too lazy to work. He is saying the Island is full of people who work very hard, who often work 2 jobs between them, and remember in the past just having one person in your family working a full-time job, another perhaps raising the children. I know that is a very classical and quaint notion. That was more than sufficient to be able to buy your own home back 40 or 50 years ago. I know that because my parents did it. They came from a modest background. There was a States loan system there. You were given a plot of land where you found your own builder and there were some plans which you built, and of course you probably paid that off for most, if not all, of your working life. These are ordinary people. We have got to a situation today when you have professional couples who are in, I would call them good jobs, and I do not mean that in any kind of derogatory way; all jobs are good and noble I believe. But we have people who would have been in past classed ... you have teachers, you have all sorts of professionals, civil servants, both of whom are working, possibly even doing second jobs and they are applying for affordable housing schemes that have yet to be built. Okay, Members will be saying back to me: "Why are you not supporting the rezoning?" Because that is not the problem. We have always done this. We have always relied on the broken arguments of supply and demand. That simply is not working because we are not taking the expense out of the land in the first place. When we rezone these places, these fields, they are expensive from day one. If we already own land that we have we do not need to make the same profit as a States, as the Island's Government, but we are setting a completely wrong example here. We should be making homes affordable in perpetuity. Not saying that you can own part of an unaffordable home, which is what we are effectively promising, is this

the best we can do as an Island? When I have those private conversations with other Members in the coffee room and I explain that we have a situation where everybody in Jersey lives somewhere, the problem is we do not have a proper distribution of the housing. We have people in the Island, going back to my contact at Social Security, saying: “Look, you have a system where you have somebody who owns 100 properties in the Island, 100 flats potentially, and we are paying his or her mortgages.” In fact, he probably owns so many of them outright, you are not giving money to the poor, you are giving money to the rich through this system. When somebody stands up and says: “If you do not like it you should lodge your own proposition”, indeed I have lodged my own proposition, the party has lodged a proposition - it is not going to solve all the issues - and it is to do with empty properties in the Island. This was not something that I identified. I look over to my left to the Deputy of St. Mary, he was the chair of the Environment and Housing Scrutiny Panel at the time. I sat on that with him. Deputy Martin who is now the Minister for Social Security, who is unfortunately - it is not her fault - still having to dole out lots of income support to the rich in the Island so that they can get even richer, this is the reality of what we have here. This has sat on the shelf for 7 years not being actioned. We need to get a system so that if somebody brings a proposition to rehouse greenhouse sites, greenfield sites, it should not be down to the lottery of if you happen to have a field which fits the bill, if you happen to know a States Member who is willing to bring it to the Assembly for you, when other people have to go through the planning process and ultimately take their chances on the benefits of that. After that, of course, there is no land transaction tax when it is sold and people might say: “But you voted against the land transaction tax the last time it came.” Of course, because it was a terrible way that it was formulated. It looked to tax the area of the land, not the uplift. Until we get into a position where we can have a joined-up government which approaches that, in a joined-up way, so that you have fair outcomes and that you have sustainable outcomes in our Island, I am not going to accept this false dichotomy which says you either have to concrete over all of your green fields, because that is the direction that we are going in, losing the character, so that some people can become very wealthy and other people are not ultimately going to have affordable homes. They are still going to be in a hand-to-mouth existence. If they lost one of their jobs they would be in dire straits. We all know that. What is the expression, Deputy Ward? You are only ever 2 or 3 pay packets away from homelessness, and that is what we see also in the Island. I am afraid I cannot accept this false proposition that we are being presented with. There has got to be a better way. Unfortunately, we are not going to get it from this Government, despite the fact that I think we have had some very good work and effort from our outgoing Minister for the Environment and his team.

1.1.2 Deputy L.B.E. Ash of St. Clement:

It is probably more of a plea than a speech. Over the last 4 days people have had plenty of opportunity to stand up and explain why we need more houses, and indeed they have, and they have explained why we have a housing crisis and we have seen that, and we have all seen there is a tremendous need for housing. Can we now just concentrate on why field XYZ or 123 is acceptable and if not, why not? I mean Members are obviously free to do whatever they wish but it would be much better if everybody could just stick to the topic at hand rather than making political speeches, but that is my view. But it is a plea.

1.1.3 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:

I thought we all made political speeches in this Chamber. On page 194 of the draft bridging Island Plan, we are able to read about future affordable housing provision. The first sentence says: “This Island Plan will meet the need to provide affordable homes through the use of government-owned land.” I think that is lacking in what we have before us. I would like the Minister to address that when he sums up. The other point I would like to ask the Minister, in fact I will ask the Minister to address, is to give us a definition of what affordable housing is. What it means. Because we are discussing the rezoning of agricultural land for the provision of affordable homes, and I may have missed it when the Minister spoke to this initially, but I am pretty sure he has not told us what the

definition is. My views were expressed yesterday about the rezoning of agricultural land, however I am open to persuasion potentially if the Minister explains why there is nothing here that seeks to provide affordable homes through the use of Government land and I look forward to hearing his definition of what affordable housing provision means.

1.1.4 Deputy R. Labey of St. Helier:

I was just going to declare an interest at this point because the farmer of field 558, which is between Rue des Sapins and La Verte Rue, is farmed by my brother who is a potato grower. I do not have any financial interest in his business but obviously I will not be voting on this amendment. I just feel I should point out to the Assembly that the grower of this field, tenant, has not been consulted by anybody throughout the entire process on his views on this field being lost to agriculture. His view is this: he cannot understand why St. Peter want to extend its village across the road from the George De Carteret into the best land in St. Peter without going first behind the pub and down towards Rue du Bocage and the airport, where there is some of the least productive land in St. Peter and in the Island and that is the direction of travel, he believes, the village should be taking. I said from the beginning, from the in-committee debate I was unequivocal on the Island Plan, that if we were to take green fields they should be the least productive, the least loss to agriculture. I have repeated that, after becoming the Minister for Housing and Communities, in the press and on the floor of this Assembly and in briefings and meetings. What we are too often being asked to do in this plan, process, and I think it is the undoing of this section, is so many of the fields we are being asked to rezone are categorised by the Jersey Farmers' Union as for last resort rezoning only but we are not taking them as a last resort, we are taking them as a first resort, and I will leave that there. If I can help with the definition of affordable housing; it is published. I will run through it very, very quickly: affordable housing on the Homebuy Gateway to buy is houses that are at least 10 per cent below an agreed market value, with a further 25 per cent deferred payment. The buy-out would be buying your property at 65 per cent or less of the agreed market value, which is set independently. There are also other schemes to assist with the purchase of homes, which include a deposit scheme, which means you can buy off plan with maybe a £2,000 deposit and pay the rest of the deposit in instalments during the build period. That is an assisted purchase product to make homes affordable for people and there are other shared equity schemes in S.o.J.D.C. (States of Jersey Development Company) and also in the Parishes. The formula for affordable right-sizing homes has still to be worked out. S.o.J.D.C. are working on finalising their formula for it. We are finalising our formula for it. It is complex because houses are being released and we have to work out the price bracket and make it viable, and that is complex but we are doing it as I speak. As I say, I cannot vote on this because of my connection to my brother who farms 558, but I am grateful for being allowed to make a representation on his behalf.

1.1.5 Connétable J. Le Bailly of St. Mary:

I and many hopeful buyers hate the term "affordable homes". Homes at £500,000 are not affordable as first-time buyer homes, even with subsidies, which are taxpayers' costs. Real affordable housing can be produced for half the current price, hopefully at £250,000 per house. How? Change the method of build. If we build flat pack or modular we can achieve that. The benefits would be units that would be constructed off-Island, which means that we do not have to bring in tradespeople for that process. The simple fact is we do not have enough local tradespeople to embark on a building programme anyway. Local tradespeople are committed to providing their services to the local population, who very often have to wait months. We have a sand supply problem, a quarry aggregate supply problem.

[10:00]

We do not need to build in concrete for first-time buyer housing. I do not envisage a total change in build but we should seek alternatives. The northern hemisphere are building timber flatpack housing

due to permafrost, so factory-produced housing is the norm. The biggest advantage is cost; it is much cheaper. We need to provide homes. We need to provide real affordable homes. We need to do that now. We need to do that if you want to benefit the desperate people who should not have the opportunity denied to them from owning their first home. We can achieve this, it is down to your vote.

1.1.6 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence:

This is an incredibly difficult vote, there is no question about it and, to be honest, as we were approaching this yesterday I was feeling quite sick to my stomach as I realised that this is the meat of, in many ways, the Island Plan debate and it really does bring me in conflict with myself. I am a strong supporter of agriculture in the Island. I think it is really very important for a number of reasons, all the way from food security and the element that it can help - it can never be all because we have far too many people on this Island - maintain the level of food supply from within the Island through to the nature of the Island and the character of the Island that agriculture gives us. As I have said in this Assembly before, the landscapes we see and enjoy because we do like them are there because of agriculture. They are not natural landscapes. It always has to be said a field is not a natural landscape. A field is a manmade landscape but it is one that we almost all, I suggest, enjoy. But at the same time I also accept and completely agree that there is a housing crisis in this Island and that people do need homes, so I have to balance those 2 issues. My problem with this entire Island Plan debate really, and this particular part of it does stem from the process, yesterday I apologised to the Minister and officers as I said that the trouble is I do not trust the process that they have gone through and another Minister said it is 18 months of work and you still do not trust it. The trouble is it is quality not quantity of work that counts. We have heard today from the Connétable of St. Lawrence, we have also heard from Deputy Labey. But, first of all, States-owned land, the Connétable is absolutely correct. I know that Andium Homes are still waiting for the Government to make decisions about whether they will hand States-owned land to Andium or not. This is not Andium saying: "We want to start building on it today, we need to know today about today." They are just saying: "Will you tell us whether in 2023, 2025 you will be handing over that plot of land to us? Because if you tell us now we can start planning what we will do with that land." But the States have not, the Government has not; to be honest it is not the States, it is the Government. The Government has not done that and so Andium is still waiting. I know very well that regardless of the 18 months of hard work that there is States-owned land that is unallocated. I know when I talk to parishioners that they say to me: "But why are they going for the green fields first when we know that there is States-owned land that has absolutely not been allocated?" That is a real problem and it is things like that which make me question the process and not trust the process. Similarly, Deputy Tadier is absolutely right on the unused properties element. The number of speeches that I have heard, and Deputy Tadier is referring to times also before I was a States Member, so there would clearly have been dozens of speeches on this issue. People have raised it time and time and time again and yet Governments, successive Governments, have done nothing. It is not an easy subject; that is why work should have started 10 years ago. They have done nothing to try and encourage people to move unused properties into use. These are the problems that I find before me as I sit here and look at this amendment and think, do I support it or not? Because this amendment is a lot of high-quality agricultural land, as Deputy Labey has said, and that is a massive issue. Because I know when I speak to farmers that one of the things that is really hurting the industry is the chipping away at the fields in Jersey; as more and more are taken it makes it harder and harder to rotate crops. We say to farmers: "We want you to be more environmentally friendly, we want you not to be monoculture, we want you to rotate your fields." It is really hard to rotate fields when there are fewer and fewer fields to rotate in. It is really difficult and that is happening across the Island. Yesterday Deputy Le Hégarat was quite right when she said: "When it comes to dairy farms the fields where you put your cows have to be relatively close to the farm and the milking sheds where you take them." You cannot take cows from St. Catherine's to St. Brelade for milking; that is not possible, they have to be quite close by. These are the issues that I

come across and if I trusted the process I would find it so much easier to vote for this. But, unfortunately, and this happened way back in Scrutiny, initially the Minister came to Scrutiny and said: "COVID is hitting, this is going to affect the Island Plan. We are going to move the Island Plan until after the elections." That seemed to be the right thing to do because then the Island Plan could be done in a proper amount of time. Suddenly it is about 2 or 3 months later the Minister appeared before Scrutiny again and said: "We have changed our minds, we are going to rush through a bridging Island Plan which was for 3 years." I was quite astounded. I was like, okay, not only will you be making us vote on things like this right before an election, which, as people have said, it becomes an issue then, makes it harder to have a debate which has not got the electoral kind of pressures behind you when you are voting, for all States Members, but it means that the work that is going to be done is going to be done very quickly. When I look at things like other elements on this, such as Le Gigoulande Quarry, in my view shoddily. That is the problem, the Minister has given us so little to go on to have trust in that process. It does not feel right, all the way through to things like the plan B sites appearing out of nowhere. Deputy Le Hegarat was completely right yesterday when she said: "The plan B appeared and States Members were still so focused on dealing with everything under the plan A sites and getting on with all their other work, we were extremely distracted; suddenly they appeared from nowhere." Also, a process where States Members can just throw in their own thoughts, whether it is because it is a friend's field that they wanted to put in or something else, they just throw them in and bypass half the process to get there. I am struggling, I want to vote for homes for Islanders but I also want to vote for homes for Islanders when I have a process that I can trust it and I can believe in that we are going to green fields as that last resort. I am very pleased in this amendment that there is at least one glasshouse site on there, that I am pleased with; that is good. But, again, I know of glasshouse sites in my Parish, St. Lawrence, that are sitting there derelict for decades. I do not understand why the Minister has not personally gone up to those people and said: "You have got this glasshouse site, it is derelict, would you consider using it?" At the end of the day I am very likely to fall down on the side of housing because people are people and they need homes. We are now in a situation where the price of housing has gone through the roof. The trouble though is that the price of housing has accelerated for a number of reasons, and supply is not the only reason. They have accelerated because interest rates have been so extraordinarily low for so long. They have accelerated because COVID means that people have built up savings in their pocket and by people I mean the people who do not necessarily need a home, they already have a home but they have savings because through COVID they were not spending. They think Island interest rates are low in the bank: "I tell you what, I will invest in a property." Basically, we are in an asset bubble and 600 homes is not going to affect that asset bubble very much at all in terms of, yes, those actual homes will be more affordable than open market homes, I accept that. But the effect they will have on the wider market I would say is going to be negligible, especially because we know it is going to take 3 or 4 years to deliver these homes in the main. In fact, I would be shocked if come the end of this Island Plan in 2025 if 600 homes have been built; I will be shocked. I just want to say one thing to the Connétable of St. Mary. While the Connétable of St. Mary is right that currently £850,000 for a regular kind of 3-bedroom home is entirely unaffordable, the affordability is not in the high cost price, the affordability is always in can you afford the mortgage repayments? That is where the affordability lies. To some extent some early buyers, for whatever reason, their jobs allow them to pay those mortgage payments. It is difficult, it is shocking when you say £850,000 for a 3-bedroom family home and in the main the mortgage repayments on that are not affordable, I accept that entirely. But even with the 35 per cent off it is the mortgage repayments that makes something affordable rather than the ultimate ticket price, so to speak. Senator Moore started by saying that she asked the Minister to take this *en bloc* and I understand that. Like I say, I am going to err on the side of housing, I believe, in this debate. But one thing I would say to the Minister is I am not the only person in this Assembly who does not trust the process, who feels that the process has not looked at the obvious things first. For that reason, if he wants to maintain any element of trust, for those people who are concerned about it, I would say if people want it taken item by item then I would do that

because that will at least give people the sense of trust that they have been listened to and being able to have their say on individual items. Myself, it probably will not make much difference the way I vote. But I do hope the Minister listens to me because I think Ministers made some fundamental errors throughout this Island Plan process and the fact that many of us are sitting here today, I believe, feeling very similar to me in not trusting that process, despite 18 months of hard work, does make it very difficult today. I do not think the Minister has helped us a lot in making this any easier.

1.1.7 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:

I am really struggling to support the desecration of these good agricultural fields and to for ever take them out of the industry. The previous speaker mentioned the element of food security rising to the fore, particularly now with the situation in Europe, I think it is something we cannot ignore and is high in my mind. Without wishing to repeat what others have eloquently said earlier, we must focus more on brownfield sites and enhance existing developments to achieve the numbers of additional housing units that we so desperately require. We need to make greater effort and not simply utilise the easy route of using greenfield sites, it can only be to the long-term detriment of future generations and our society as a whole. Deputy Labey's remarks were so poignant with regard to using good quality land, and I ask Members to please take note of the comments of growers. The uplift in value is of course always an underlying factor for any landowner and I cannot blame them for wishing to take advantage of their situation. I have a wry smile when I have heard previous speakers saying: "Yes, the owner is in favour of this field being approved or that field being approved." Of course, they are and I give more credit to those who do not agree to the sale of their good agricultural land for development.

[10:15]

It is that not everyone can be as philanthropic and give land for housing, although albeit I am aware that some have made a contribution. In conclusion, we must look further than the ends of our noses and seek better ways of satisfying the current housing need.

1.1.8 Connétable J.E. Le Maistre of Grouville:

A number of references have been made to the Farmers' Union and their comments and I think there is some misunderstanding. They categorised the land into 4 levels; definitely no development, last resort for agriculture, which most of these fields come up, less important for agriculture and not currently used for agriculture. I think people are misunderstanding, and particularly the Constable of St. Helier yesterday, he said because one of the fields that we were discussing was categorised by the Farmers' Union is less important for agriculture. It does not mean that they do not want to keep it. It does not mean to say it is not important, it is just less important than the other 2 categories. The Constable of St. Helier said: "Well, if they do not want to we will have it in trees." Not a bad idea but they do want it. Those fields are in agriculture, otherwise they would be in the category 4. Because they are in agriculture somebody is making a profit out of that and it is part of their business. I have really great difficulty in supporting these fields for development, as pretty much all of them are last resort for agriculture, and I think that says it all. To suggest that because something is less important for agriculture means that it should be taken away is simply not the case. I think the Farmers' Union are just being pragmatic and saying: "If they are going to take some of our land let us make sure they take the one that we are making the least profit out of." I think that explains that to Members.

1.1.9 Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier:

I am pleased to follow the Constable of Grouville. I hope I can correct the misunderstanding I may have given to the Assembly yesterday when I talked about fields going into other uses if they were not required for agriculture. I absolutely agree with him that fields of last resort, as they have been described, should not be lost. What I was saying really was that - and this is particularly relevant to

St. Helier and the fringes of St. Helier - is if a case cannot be made for their preservation for agriculture then there are much better things to do with the fields than building on them. I think I referred to the inspectors having lifted the Sword of Damocles from the 3 fields on St. John's Road on account of their organic farming. The arguments I made to the inspectors was that whether or not these are important for agriculture, they are far too important to put under concrete. I hope that I am absolutely on the same side as the Constable of Grouville when it comes to the valuing of fields. In fact one of the things that I have always enjoyed about the way Jersey is organised is that every field has a number, every field counts. That is not something you can say in lots of parts of the world. I remember a former Constable of Trinity, he used to delight us in the meetings of the Comité des Connétable because every time we referred to a field and it did not have to be in his Parish, he could tell you who owned it and he could go back several generations if he was not stopped. The fields are really important to us and it is absolutely right that Members are concerned. I have moved my position since the last debate on the Island Plan. I remember vehemently opposing the loss of a beautiful and productive agricultural field on the other side of the Trinity Arms pub, which was gifted to the Parish by a parishioner of Trinity who wanted Parish homes to be built there. It was a fantastic build with views right down from the high point of the Island towards the south coast. I thought it was a terrible decision. I have moved my position and I can see that the Trinity, the village of Trinity, the Parish heart has benefited from having young families with Trinity connections moving into that estate. It is an estate in the countryside but I can see that it has benefited the village. The pub has benefited, the shop is doing well, I assume the church is doing well, though as I am not a churchgoer I could not vouch for that. Basically, my position now is that if the Parishes want to protect their village centres, their Parish hearts, they want to welcome parishioners back into the heart of the Parish, then I should support the loss of a few fields in the heart of the villages, in the heart of the Parish centres. I believe that is pretty much mainstream philosophy as far as the Island Plan goes. I do not think I am saying anything very radical. I suppose what is radical is that I have shifted from being completely against the loss of any green fields to saying I think you can argue that some can be lost. But of course, there is this really important point and several speakers have already referred to it, about brown field sites. The whole point about last resort from the Jersey Farmers' Union is that it is not the last resort while there are brownfield sites sitting unused by Government. Every day I walk to work past a derelict terraced house in Val Plaisant. Nobody lives there, as far as I know, nobody has for years. There is one on old Trinity Hill which has been derelict for as long as I have been a States Member. That is a quarter of a century this house has sat derelict and I think that is wrong. I share the Reform Party's concern, nothing appears to have been done about derelict buildings. We are not talking about buildings where the owner has a legitimate right to keep it empty, we are talking about buildings where the owner simply cannot be bothered or in some cases simply cannot be traced. I certainly would be willing, if Government approached the Parishes, to take a long hard look at the Rates Law at least to see, what can we do using the Rates Law to turn the screw on owners who are not putting these properties to better use? It is very hard for me as I walk past properties every day to think that a good agricultural field should be built on; I cannot see the logic. If I can give another example, and I have referred to this before, in Don Road, Royal Crescent as it is called - and that of course makes one think of Bath and the tremendous presence of buildings in Bath - there is a lovely crescent of buildings and of course it has got its main section missing. That was the Theatre Royal which was built in 1828, the opening production was "A New Way to Pay Old Debts", which I thought was rather appropriate. It burnt down in 1863 and I think there was subsequently a building on the site. But, as Members will know now, when they drive up Don Road it is a car park; it is a surface car park. I would contend that not only does it need to be replaced for aesthetic reasons because it is not a Royal Crescent while it has got the central building missing but it needs to be replaced, rather than building on green fields. You could put the parking in a basement and you could build 4, 5, maybe 6 storeys. It needs to be a big building, an imposing building because it is the centrepiece of the crescent. For me the failure of Government to tackle the site of the Theatre Royal is another reason why I am unlikely to support building on green fields and particularly green

fields in St. Helier, but I will come on to that when I propose my amendment. I think there is a real problem here, and it may be reported by the media, it is not that this Assembly does not care about the Jersey people who need homes, it is not that we do not care about rampant house price inflation, it is that we do not want to see the essential character of Jersey that we do struggle to and fight to preserve. We do not want to see that lost because Government has not taken enough trouble to get those brownfield sites into use.

The Connétable of Grouville:

A point of order, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Yes, I would just like to apologise to the Constable of St. Helier. I did not imply for one moment that he does not appreciate the countryside and agriculture. I was merely trying to point out that less important for agriculture does not mean it is up for grabs.

1.1.10 Deputy G.C. Guida of St. Lawrence:

I will try to answer a few of the questions that have been around and also a few of the misconceptions. The first one of course is Andium Homes where there will be a debate on that and a massive misconception, later on where I will be able to talk about actual figures. We have mentioned the importance of green fields and agriculture and I think it would be very difficult not to accept that. Agriculture in Jersey and open fields are extremely, extremely important; they are paramount. One of the problems of course is that if you build on them, you just cannot unbuild; it is a for ever decision. There is one exception of course, the one thing that you can take away from building and going back to a greenfield is a greenhouse. There is a reversal to the process; it has happened many times. It is a possibility, it is just expensive but that is possible. The one thing that is completely in a mess is with security. Jersey - and we have had the experience during the war - where quite a bit more of the Island was dedicated to agriculture, can feed about 25,000 people. We would have to make a massive population adjustment before we could even dream of coming anywhere near for security in Jersey. We will need to import 92 per cent, I think it is today, to 75 per cent in the best of cases, percentage of food supply from elsewhere anyway. There are many, many good reasons for keeping fields but food security is nowhere near one of them. The one thing I would really like to talk about is this weird image of the people in need of more housing. It seems that for some reason in this Assembly the single person, 30 years old, just come out of their parents' home, needs a single bedroom or at the maximum 2-bedroom apartment in town to buy, is the image that we all have in our heads of all those people that desperately need homes. I am sorry, it really, really is not. It is a broad spectrum of needs. It is a very, very large number of different needs. There are 20 year-old single people that need to rent somewhere because their parents are a little fed up with them living at home; they need to rent somewhere. To rent something you need somebody to be a landlord. It can be a large corporation like Andium or it can be private individuals but you need somebody to provide this home for rent. You have 40 years old with 2 teenager kids and a dog who also need a home. They are not going to live in a one-bedroom apartment, they are not going to live in a 2-bedroom apartment, they need a home. They need a 4-bedroom house with a garden and those are the ones that are the most in demand in Jersey. Those are the ones that now demand £1 million to be built, which is mind-boggling because not many families, 2 people, 2 kids growing up needing to be educated, needing cars to be purchased, needing holidays to be purchased, those are people who really have difficulty finding £1 million even on a mortgage to buy a home. This is the market that we must break the most. Single-bedroom apartments, we will make a 15-storey building and we can have hundreds of them, very cheap but 4-bedroom homes with a garden, we do not have any of those; now they are

massively missing in Jersey. I am sorry, if there is any excuse for building on a greenfield, which I agree is sacred in Jersey, it is this one. It is the fact that the homes that are the most in demand are 4-bedroom, semi-detached or detached with a small garden. Having lived in those for a number of years that is your for ever home. When you reach that you are happy, there is nothing else that you need. It is the target for every family in the Island. The only way to build more, the absolutely only way to build more is through this, is through amendment 91. We have already taken about 134 out of the equation because about 500 people will not live the dream and we just cannot take away the remainder.

1.1.11 Deputy R.J. Ward:

I do not know where to start because there is so much that I think is to be mentioned in this. I will say the Constable of St. Lawrence is absolutely correct, we do make political speeches because we have got jobs as politicians. I say that to Deputy Ash and I think there is a very subtle approach here, which is let us just talk about individuals, there is no talk about any principles whatsoever. I think what we need to talk about are the principles behind these things. I have come to this debate and my party and I will mention that because it is important to me, it is saying that we are not going to just *en masse* agree greenfield sites because it is not the right thing to do. There are reasons for that and there are reasons for not just *en masse* agree greenhouse sites, which, by the way, can at the moment already be put forward.

[10:30]

That is simple, we have not dealt with the other issues first. I am so pleased to see the Constable of St. Helier mention us in a positive light for once in terms of unoccupied homes, and perhaps that is the word “property” because they are not being used for homes. There are so many that could be developed before we move into other areas. But there are a couple of things I want to mention, first of all, is this notion of affordable homes and I wonder whether I can ask anyone who is suggesting a field for affordable homes to then state what form of affordable homes that it is going to be. Are you talking about going through the Housing Gateway? Are you talking about going through one of the Parish schemes? Are you talking about going through one of the plethora of schemes mentioned vaguely and briefly by the Minister for Housing and Communities? Are you talking about the schemes that I have been looking up here, the assisted purchase scheme, which I have got to say is an absolute mountain to climb if you want to try and get one of those homes as an assisted purchase? Because there are so many loopholes to step through and then you are going to own only - you are not going to own, the bank is going to own - a relatively small proportion of that and you are going to be mortgaged up to the hilt, probably paying for the deposit over the long term as well. We are putting our young people and our young families into a position where financially they are genuinely at risk of any changes that happen economically, any increases in prices, et cetera. We are putting people at risk; is that really affordable? I want to mention something that we are going to come to later on, and I asked for a debate on this rather than it just being accepted. I will say, unfortunately, the Minister for the Environment has just left the room for a moment and I completely understand because he has been working very hard in the last few days and probably needs a bit of a break, that is fair enough, perhaps a comfort break. I have asked for a debate on amendment 81, which is the removal of passive house standards for affordable homes and major developments outside the built-up area. One of the things that we have to do is think long term with housing. We have to think about 20, 30, 40 years. Building with those standards mean that those homes are cheaper and more efficient to run for a long, long time. But what the Minister has accepted, he says: “No, let us just remove those for outside of town but we will still call them affordable homes.” Over the long time those homes are less and less affordable because they are more and more expensive to run and that is a huge error. It is one of the reasons that I am not going to fall for the affordable housing label that is put on all of those fields. I say to Members look carefully because at the top of this amendment we are looking at now, it says “affordable housing”. What affordable housing? Is it in the long term?

Is it in the long term we are going to have the standards for those people to stay in? That is one of the issues I think we do have to address very accurately. I am increasingly seeing our bridging Island Plan and the Island Plan that we have as, effectively, just the developers' charter. The developers are the ones with the power here, with the power over housing and there may be people who have experience of being a developer in this Assembly, we see no problem with that. But for somebody who represents the centre of St. Helier where so much development is going on, I see a serious problem with that and I see a serious problem with the States of Jersey Development Corporation effectively being the States developer with, I think, the wrong priorities at times. That has nothing to do with the people who work there in terms of whether they are right or wrong, it is to do with the drive and the leadership from Government, which we are not getting on housing, as Deputy Tadier mentioned. I am in a situation where there is so much wrong here. It is really difficult to know what to say. What we are not talking about here is the security that comes with a home. Our rental market is broken, it is entirely broken. Rental is unaffordable. So many people are paying somebody else's mortgage plus some and they do not have the chance to have their own home with that level of security that they need. They have short-term tenancies, they can be out, when somebody says in fact he is selling up to a property developer you will have to get out soon in a month or so. We have given no security of tenure in this Assembly. We do not have a licensing law, we do not have a system of registration, we have just let that go. This Assembly voted against that, they voted for it and then voted against it because it was lobbied, effectively. Now we are talking about affordable housing sites and let us just build on green fields all over the Island, before we looked at how many are empty, before we look at other sites that are owned by the Government and the States and let us just carry on and do that. The headline and I say to those in the media please look at your headlines and look at your analysis of the situation because you are simplifying this analysis and people are not getting a true argument and picture of what is going on in this Island. You have a responsibility as political media to report appropriately and effectively and with detail. This is a complex argument about population, about housing and about affordability and this plan is not looking at that and this amendment is not looking at that. Let us just chuck a few fields in and everything will be solved. It will not. That is the issue we have got with this bridging Island Plan, there are some good parts to it I am sure and I recognise the fabulous work done by the officers. I mention Natasha, who is one of the officers there because I said I would, and she has done phenomenal work with her colleague as well, who is sat out there, keeping track of this all of the time. But, unfortunately, the broken system - I am looking at Deputy Tadier and I understand where he is coming from - it is so difficult to verbalise this. I will use an analogy of a house, we are building houses on foundations that are failing us, on a theoretical foundation and principles that are simply not working. Then lo and behold we come back in a few years' time with this bridging Island Plan and say: "The houses are not working the way we thought they would because the foundations are crumbling." That is exactly right, the free market has led us to a position that is not working on this Island because it is a fixed market. It is a fixed market because it was talking about an essential need for everybody on this Island. Unless Government steps in and takes some control over this situation it will not work. This bridging Island Plan does not do that. These few fields are extra to build some failed models on do not do that. We are not going to get a model village, we are going to end up with unaffordable housing by the back door if we are not careful. I would just say to people, please, as we go through these, let us look really carefully at it. If you are going to talk about a field for affordable housing in the next few debates, please define to me what form of affordable housing you are going to be talking about. I may need more logic than is available at the time but this is not working for me and I have real concerns over this.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy. Does any other Member wish to speak on this amendment? If not, I call upon the Minister to reply.

1.1.12 Deputy J.H. Young of St. Brelade:

I kind of sensed we were going to stop at that point. I think the debate has been as difficult and as, frankly I will be honest, unpleasant as we all expected. I think I could be doing so many things, having been in this place, having to bring forward proposals, proposals where I know in my heart we had no choice. I had no choice to put to you, I said that at the start. I would have not wanted to get here. Yes, for the record I wanted population on it, we did not get that. For the record I wanted Government intervention, the Government to buy brownfield sites in town, develop them, develop them for low/medium rise, for family homes in the urban areas; I wanted that, I failed. Why? Because we are still locked into a ... I suppose it is in our D.N.A. (deoxyribonucleic acid) that where we have become now to rely completely on market mechanisms to deliver us homes. Given it is a small Island and how we are and the pressures there has to be intervention. The message in the future is, please, the next Government rethink strategy, rethink strategy. As years ago I can remember back in the 1980s when I was civil servant, let me tell you, in those days the Island Development Committee, the Planning Committee of the day, they had a land vote, they had £100 million of capital to spend in the 1980s. They made the decisions and what they made sure is that every decision on planning was integrated into the way we manage States-owned land; that was all thrown away in the 2000s, gone. We can rely on the private sector, we do not have to intervene, we will use the market, that is what was said and we have seen the end results of it. If you want to look back and see the benefits of what we have got just look around town, La Coie, Ritz, all over, all over town. All over intervention was made. We have decent homes for people but now what are we relying on? We are relying on high rise. We have got a system where the dots are not joining up; no question. But obviously what my role and the job has had to be is try and make the best job I can within that system. Some people may say, why did you bother? Why have the officers spent all this time, why bother? Let us put it all off. Because we have allowed our problems to become so acute - so acute - we have to make improvements. What we do we bring a plan and it has got the numbers in it, 1,600-odd affordable homes, okay, is an argument, and I will deal with that in a minute about what is affordable. There are about 600 of those already coming from States-owned sites anyway. What are they? Probably social rent and others. What we proposed, where are we going to make the balance up? We will make half the balance up, we say, from green fields that we do not want to lose. I hate it. Do you know what, I empathise with Deputy Morel? I felt sick in the stomach having to do these things. I know, when I am not in this Assembly anymore, people will say: "Look at that field, we lost it for that John Young, he was the Minister for the Environment", this is what they will do; they will. But some people will say: "Why did you not just leave it to somebody else?" That would have been not the responsible thing to do. Bring it here and make the choices. The 600 now is gone; it is gone now. We have started the process, 600 were on the table. Yesterday we took 131 off the table, they have gone. I think there has been criticism about units and I was like thinking coming in this morning that is 131 families who have expectations, hopes, in St. Owen perhaps and now I know that they were false hopes. That is gone now, they do not come back until the next plan. Families, maybe youngsters thinking: "Well shall I leave the Island or not? Shall I go and work somewhere else?" I think it is possible some of them may well decide it is now time to go, they have been waiting a long time. It is real people. We did get an extra 24, so we have a net loss so far of 107. Left on the table, depending entirely on your votes, you are just about to press these buttons, is another 130 units. Press the button against that they have gone. Okay. I ask myself, yes, okay, look, agriculture has to be a priority but we have got ourselves in a mess. Okay, I want as much transformation as Members have said. Deputy Morel, I want a better system. But we have had to do our best because of the failure to deal with population and a failure to manage the effect of that on housing. There is nothing more basic in human rights than somewhere decent to live. What is affordable? I will try and deal with that. The Connétable of St. Lawrence rightfully asks for what is a definition. Look, put it this way, the law allows us to zone lands for occupation by people who are unable to access the normal housing market. The housing market, we know what it is, it is open market, it is unaffordable.

[10:45]

The planning system, it cannot set the rules under the current law for what is affordable homes. What anybody wants to do of course is to set a price, like the Connétable of St. John, £250,000. If we want to do that we can but we need to have States developments such as they were done in the past, where Government buys the land, develops the home and sells them at a fixed price. That was the way things were done for decades and that served this Island brilliantly. But it stopped, we do not do that now, so that has to be on the agenda for the future. But if we say we are going to work through the open market, you have to have schemes to help people find that money but in a way which is viable under the market. What did we do? We set up Andium Homes to try and do that and they have come forward to our Minister for Housing and Communities and come up with some devices, if you like, that Deputy Russell Labey explained. The whole thing, it does need to be flexible because what will work on one site will not work on another but the whole idea is to enable people to at least get that home in the way that Deputy Russell Labey outlined. That is the basis of the plan, we have a Minister for Housing and Communities. There is a huge amount of work for the Minister for Housing and Communities downstream as we go on site. We have heard, for example, some very good explanations, we heard it from the Constable of St. John, we heard it from the Constable of St. Peter, about how in their communities they see these sites being taken forward. But the reality is that is not part of the planning system who brings them forward. But what is part of the planning system is that every site will have a planning obligation agreement. The planning obligation agreement will force the terms and conditions to what we need to make sure they are affordable and that we get the right sort of homes on those particular sites, and we get things like village greens and we get open space and we get all that. The Constable of St. John spoke about that, absolutely infrastructure improvements, junction improvements, not just the miserable little bus shelter, better than that. If there is no planning agreement they will not get the planning approved. Of course, every site will go to the Planning Committee or the planning inquiry if it is big enough, and all the issues raised on each site by site by site will be aired in public with an open chance to make people's views, that we hear from people; that is what will happen. But what we are doing today is just starting up and saying, in principle, here is a field which comes through the process of priority setting. It is correct that agriculture was only one factor. Obviously, what I hear loud and clear from the Assembly is in future Members want agriculture to be the overriding priority. If that is the case that is perfectly valid, we have to have other ways of getting the brownfield sites developed, as I have said when I started with that. We have to do that. If Members vote this down then that has to happen like lickety-split, as I think the Americans or Canadians say. I have only borrowed that from a friend that told me that. The rules for what is not affordable will be under Ministerial control. I have explicitly made it that the Parish representatives, if this is Parishes or the town representatives are engaged in that in detail, work it up round the table, I have said that. How could I be confident because none of that will carry any weight unless it is done through a supplementary planning guidance, which the Minister for the Environment has the statutory control over? I think Constable of St. Lawrence asked me: is there consultation? An S.P.G. (supplementary planning guidance) has got a statutory requirement for consultation, it is in the law. You cannot write an S.P.G. without consultation in public. This is the start of the journey and today what I am asking Members is, look, we are in a bad place. I did not want to do this, I have to, I have tried to minimise it as best as possible. As all the comments have said, the officers have worked absolutely night and day not just for 18 months but longer than that to bring this to the table. We are at a critical point. We have had good debates on 5 amendments, 5. Members who had strong views on that. They are not just put the amendment, but we have been able to debate them and we have the result and we have 3 of those sites gone and 2 have been added. But overall the balance of numbers is that we are down very significantly. I think this is the crunch now and Members, I think, need to ask themselves, we have signed up trying to meet the housing need, we have here a proposition which is probably the most important, I think, to attempt, to at least make some contribution to that from these sites and Members can either bomb it out, collapse the whole thing or doing what I am having to do, which is on the basis of putting the overriding housing needs first. Of course, the other thing I would mention is I know the Reform

Party, and I agree with so much of what they say, and what I have said about intervention, you will go with that. But I have to ask them, please, do not think that we can solve all our housing problems by only having apartments and flats in the urban areas. Please do not think that. We have been acutely short of family houses for far too long and that has become acute. I think that is a factor to bear in mind. I know Reform, next week we are going to have a debate, I am sure, about the way that States-owned land is developed and it is right too and Members will know that I voted for Senator Mézec's proposition for 50 per cent affordable housing. Why I did that? Because I anticipated with the Council of Ministers that this debate today would be awful. We have to have that - I have put in an amendment - next week we will discuss that and I can see the reaction to it. Members of the Reform, I know, so please. What, of course, I have got from here is that because of that situation the Reform Party members are seeking to say, well, we are not going to have any green fields, we do not want them, we do not want houses in the village, we do not want the villages to be allowed to breathe, we do not want youngsters in those villages; that, I think, is what the message is coming to me and it is not a message that I can swallow. I want a mixture. We have agreed Deputy Gardiner's proposition that we can have a mix of Parish and ... everybody is on the Gateway but a maximum of 50 per cent. As I have heard other Members say, it opens us up and stops some of this division between country and town; it breaks that down. I think also there are real good social reasons why that is a good thing to do but it quite modest, we are not talking big numbers here. One would not want to come up with anymore. I heard lots of words like: "The system is not believable. There is no credibility" and I have written here: "Other people have to go through the planning process", everybody has had to go through the planning process. I must admit it has been very unsettling where after this debate is over, whichever way you go, there are a string of amendments on individual sites, none of which has my support. Two smaller ones are potentially considerable maybe as alternatives, but they are certainly not done with my support or encouragement to come forward. I will be honest, I am pleased that a lot of those amendments have been withdrawn. They have unsettled the public; they have unsettled. Now, Deputy Morel criticised the process and, yes, he has always thought it was the wrong decision to do a bridging Island Plan. I remember when Senator Morel ... sorry, Senator Morel, I have promoted him, Deputy Morel was a member of the Infrastructure, Housing and Environment Scrutiny Panel, until he got promoted to higher status as a Minister. He was always unhappy about that and he expressed those views. Of course, then he dropped off the panel and probably every single hearing I have had with the Infrastructure, Housing and Environment Scrutiny Panel we have talked about the Island Plan process. We tried to adjust it. We had to make it as best as we could because, as Deputy Morel knows, given the COVID emergency and everything that we went through, what would have happened is that the Island Plan would have gone on to the next Assembly and who knows when that would come? These problems would become more acute. It is a horrible situation. We have got here a list of fields and the debate has been about principles and about some points of detail. I am just looking at my notes to see, because I want to wind up, if there is anything else I need to cover. Again, I think lots of Members made the point about value, where at the moment what happens is that when Government selects a field for zoning then there is a windfall under the current arrangements. One of the things we wanted to do, I certainly would have wanted to do, was to have a development land tax. I have argued consistently in the Council of Ministers for a property tax. We have argued for a land development levy. Every time those measures come before this Assembly, no, people run away from it. Again, in the future, that is something that has to be addressed. Is it fair that landowner X gets a windfall and landowner Y over here does not? That is a public gift. We make that decision in the public interest and the gain goes to a private owner. Until we change the law, until we put in place the mechanisms to manage that, which we have failed to do, we are stuck with it. What we can do is to take as much value out of it as you can. For example, if we have social rented housing that seriously depresses the residual land value, and I know what we are going to get or what the next Minister will get: "I do not want any more social rental housing on this site because I can hardly make it viable and my land value goes down and I do not want that" or where you get one site and other people say: "Oh, I want all affordable homes for sale. I do not want to have any

rented housing. Can I put the rental housing over here?” That is the sort of thing that I tell you will go on under the current system, but we are living in a capitalist society. I would like an alternative society, I would like a different type of rules, but we do not have that, but we can intervene in the market. For example, I keep on citing in the 1990s Government bought the brownfield site at Belle Vue Pleasure Park. They bought it with a compulsory purchase, which was very controversial, that went on for 10 years, right the way up to the Privy Council, and that enabled, by Government buying that land and then commissioning developers to build, I think nearly 300 homes and then selling them to first-time buyers at fixed prices, get this, £140,000 and in those houses everybody said: “Oh, they cannot do that because they might profit and they might sell on” so there was a device, sell on within 10 years and you pay some of it back. It was a sliding scale. Sell after year one you pay 90 per cent back, year 2 80 per cent and so on right the way through and in 10 years you got rid of it. That was a very successful Government intervention in action. That was supported, not just supported, it was by States Members of the past.

[11:00]

We have just lost that creative ability or the bravery to do it, so we are stuck with the market, and that is really the root of why we have to have a plan like this, that works within such a system. I plead to Members, because we are not in a perfect place, what I would like to see is almost like a parallel universe, but it is not. We are here, now. People are in terrible trouble and if families are breaking up because of this issue are we going to say: “No, I would like something better”? I urge Members, I urge them, not to vote for amendment 91 as amended down; so I urge Members. I go now to Senator Moore. Overnight I thought about it probably most of last night, I was in bed, and could not sleep very much thinking: “What am I going to do here?” There are Members here who would like to unpick this, I am clear about that, and say: “I want this bit out. I want this bit out. I want votes on this, that and the other.” I decided no, I am going to ask for a vote as it is and then we will all know where this Assembly is. Are you really with homes or are you not? I think that is a choice and if you are not, well, that is your democratic right to do so, but I think you might find that after that debate that questions arise and I am not prepared to be the person that does not make their best efforts to make some inroad into improving housing supply, a very limited supply, with the damage minimised as best as I can, with extensive planning processes to try to make sure we avoid the worst things. I ask for the *appel* and make the proposition.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Will you accept a point of clarification from the Deputy of Grouville, Minister?

Deputy J.H. Young:

Of course, absolutely.

Deputy C.F. Labey of Grouville:

I think the Minister answered the question in his summing up, because I think the St. Peter fields are the only ones in (vi) and (vii) that we have not had a vote on, and I am going to struggle voting for these, so I would have to vote the whole thing down, which I do not especially want to do, but I think that is what we have got in front of us.

The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

I would like to ask the Minister if he would consider taking them as separate sections, so (a) for the withdrawal of the fields and (b) for the inclusion of sites, and then (c) and (d).

The Deputy Bailiff:

I am not sure that is a point of clarification, but, Minister, you have made your position clear.

Deputy J.H. Young:

I think the Connétable does make a good point. I have thought about this. I think technically there is a separate proposition under (a) to follow within the Order Paper, and so if I was to force the vote as an all or nothing that one would still fall to be debated, so I think that seems to be a bit of a spurious situation. So, I would be agreeable to take in a vote on part (a) separate from (b) and the other parts.

The Deputy Bailiff:

So, you propose that the Assembly considers part (a) and then (b), (c) and (d) together?

Deputy J.H. Young:

Yes, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The *appel* has been called for, Members are invited to return to their seats. We are voting on the amended proposition part (a) first. Those joining the meeting via the Teams link are invited to cast their votes in the chat channel and I ask the Greffier to open the voting for Members in the Chamber. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes then I ask the Greffier to close the voting, and part (a) I can announce of this amendment has been adopted.

POUR: 38		CONTRE: 2		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator I.J. Gorst		Senator K.L. Moore		
Senator L.J. Farnham		Connétable of St. Brelade		
Senator S.C. Ferguson				
Senator S.W. Pallett				
Senator S.Y. Mézec				
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)				
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)				
Deputy of Grouville				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy M. Tadier (B)				
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)				
Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy of St. Ouen				
Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)				
Deputy of St. Mary				

Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)			
Deputy J.H. Young (B)			
Deputy L.B. Ash (C)			
Deputy K.F. Morel (L)			
Deputy G.C.U. Guida (L)			
Deputy of Trinity			
Deputy of St. John			
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)			
Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)			
Deputy R.J. Ward (H)			
Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)			
Deputy I. Gardiner (H)			

The Connétable of Grouville:

A point of order, Sir. Am I allowed to ask the Minister if he would take the item (b) fields separately, because I find myself in the same position as the Deputy of Grouville, I am inclined to have to oppose them all, which is not what I want to do?

The Deputy Bailiff:

He has already made his position clear in relation to that and we are taking (b), (c) and (d) together. So in relation to the balance of this amendment as amended those joining the meeting via the Teams link are asked to cast their votes in the chat channel and I ask the Greffier to open the voting for Members in the Chamber. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the balance of amendment 91 as amended has been adopted.

POUR: 30		CONTRE: 10		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator I.J. Gorst		Senator S.Y. Mézec		
Senator L.J. Farnham		Connétable of St. Helier		
Senator S.C. Ferguson		Connétable of St. Lawrence		
Senator K.L. Moore		Connétable of St. Brelade		
Senator S.W. Pallett		Connétable of Grouville		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		
Connétable of St. Peter		Deputy of Grouville		
Connétable of St. Mary		Deputy M. Tadier (B)		
Connétable of St. Ouen		Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)		
Connétable of St. Martin		Deputy R.J. Ward (H)		
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)				
Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy of St. Ouen				

Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)			
Deputy of St. Mary			
Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)			
Deputy J.H. Young (B)			
Deputy L.B. Ash (C)			
Deputy K.F. Morel (L)			
Deputy G.C.U. Guida (L)			
Deputy of Trinity			
Deputy of St. John			
Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)			
Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)			
Deputy I. Gardiner (H)			

2. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) – sixty-second amendment: Withdrawal of G392A, Grouville (P. 36/2021 Amd.(62))

The Deputy Bailiff:

The next is the 62nd amendment lodged by the Deputy of Grouville and I ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

After the words “the draft Island Plan 2022-25” insert the words “except that – (a) the following should be removed from the list of sites to be zoned for affordable homes at Policy H5 – Provision of affordable homes – “1. Field G392A Grouville (0.75 hectares/4.2 vergées)”; (b) the draft Island Plan 2022-25 should be further amended in such respects as may be necessary consequent upon the adoption of paragraph (a); and (c) the Draft Bridging Island Plan Proposals Map Part A – Planning Zones should be amended to reflect the adoption of paragraph (a).

2.1 The Deputy of Grouville:

Field 392A provides one of the last remaining open spaces along the east coast road, where the public can enjoy the most spectacular views to open countryside and the escarpment beyond and, if developed, I believe would have an enormously detrimental visual impact to this area, not just for the residents, because as we all know in planning terms no one has the right to a view, but in this case a rare piece of open space and a respite to the ribbon development which blights the eastern coast road is offered to all road users, people waiting at the bus stop and residents. I have always thought that a picture speaks a thousand words, so I included appendices in my report, which can far better illustrate what would be lost if the fields were developed, and on pages 5, 6, 7 and 8 you will see photographs of the fields and the stunning outlook across the open countryside and the escarpment. While I do not have the experience of the planning inspector I do know this area very well and so do the community and I know that a development on this field, let alone at least 26 units including flats which have been suggested, would ruin this space and create a lot of housing in a very condensed area, an area which is also accessed by a 15-foot wide country lane, Rue des Fonds, which has taken its toll of housing developments in recent years, not least the housing estate at Clos des Fonds opposite. Notwithstanding the fields are not classified as prime lands in a recent survey by the Jersey Farmers’ Union, they are in active agricultural use and grow crops every year. With this in mind, and if I could go a little off piste for a moment, given my current international responsibilities on the Ukraine conflict, I put to you the very real prospect that we may suffer a 30 per cent reduction in global grain supply and cereal shortages in these coming months. The conflict has obviously erupted since the commencement of the bridging Island Plan process and I believe that we need to consider

the protection of good, arable land in a renewed light. The conflict may be a far cry from a field in Grouville or elsewhere in the Island, but the possible consequences to food security cannot be ignored as we ride roughshod over agricultural land and it is for this reason I will be voting against, and have voted against most of the agricultural fields in active use. Equally, these fields are rich in biodiversity and offer important carbon sinks. During the course of the bridging Island Plan process I have been contacted and I have met with many parishioners, especially those who live around field 392A, and Members may have followed the coverage of the requete in Grouville last week where a 250-strong meeting was organised to consider the site put forward in Grouville. The result of the meeting was an overwhelming vote against this site and, indeed, all sites in Grouville because of their value to wildlife and the environmental value of our carbon sink.

[11:15]

Another strong message from the meeting was the need for a population policy and with the forthcoming census data due later this year a robust population policy has simply got to be a priority and how we provide for our young people in Jersey. I would like to make my amendment and I look forward to hearing Members' views on field 392A and our last remaining open space along the East Coast Road.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy. Is the amendment seconded? [**Seconded**]. Does any Member wish to speak on the amendment?

2.1.1 Deputy J.H. Young:

This site is the only one in Grouville that I have supported and this is a site that was in what euphemistically is called the plan A list, so it has been out there since April last, when we published the draft plan, April 2021, and it has been right the way through the process, extensive process, of consultation and examination at the inquiry. There were certainly representations made at the inquiry because it is quite a small site. It has, as you say, got the potential for 26 homes but it does not mean to say that 26 homes will happen, and of course I heard the Deputy speak of flats. I have just asked about that. I said: "Where does that come from? Who has agreed flats?" and I have said: "Well, apparently, Andium Homes are already in discussions with the landowner on this site" so that explains the fact why this process is going to have to be supervised by the Minister for Housing and Communities on the zoned sites, and of course they will have to get planning consent and if the design or the layout is inappropriate then it will not get it approved. I do not think any assumptions can be made about what that development is. Now, in all the work I did, it was my understanding that there was a wish - maybe I have got this wrong in view of recent developments - in Grouville there was an aspiration to have a small amount, a limited number, of family homes within their Parish, exactly as we have heard from the other Parishes. If that has changed and now that is not needed then I think I would like to hear that either from the Constable or the Deputy when the Deputy sums up. Of course, what has really made life extremely shaky is all these amendments that came forward. In fact, the Connétable had one, this issue of agricultural land; the Connétable rightly makes the point about agricultural land, but until a few days ago there was a proposition from him proposing the zoning of green lands, which I was not very happy with, because it goes right on to an S.S.I. (Site of Special Interest) but that has gone now, thankfully. So, we have just got the one site, and of course what does the agricultural industry tell us about it? They say it is the least problematic site. It is not one of the top priorities, die in a ditch site. It is not. So, it is a good site, and it would be a shame, in my view, to lose it because of what has gone on in that lovely Parish down in the south-east corner, which is I think wonderful, but to have a limited small site which can be tightly within the built area, which will not spoil it, I think it would be really sad to lose it. Much has been made of flood risk. The advice I got from the officers is that that can be dealt with, there will be mitigations in the supplementary planning guidance and that will deal with highway access and footway connections

and, most particularly, improvements to the eastern cycle route network. I can hear the Deputy asking how that can be done. It will be done by planning obligation agreements, where I say we will not just get bus shelters out of these schemes, we will get more and if the developer does not sign a planning obligation agreement they will not get consent. It is possible I believe from all the advice to be able to have landscape and boundary treatments of that, whatever goes on there, and open space. We do not want wall-to-wall homes, so the way all that can be done in terms of the work it cannot just be left to the landowner and one party, Andium Homes, on their own. I do not know if there has been consultation with the Connétable, perhaps the Connétable could speak and let me know, because I would like to know that, because if it has not that has to be rectified, but always assuming the site remains in the zoning. I cannot support. I understand the Deputy's sincerity absolutely with her commitment to agriculture and that has been demonstrated in all the votes thus far, I understand that and there is nothing wrong with that, but in terms of this site I think there is a bigger picture to address. As I say I would like to hear what has happened to the aspiration of homes in Grouville. Has that gone away now? Has that gone away because of what has happened that has scared us off? Really good points were made in the debate but it is such a shame that really reflected on this one good site, where the others I do not believe had any chance, but I would like to hear from the Constable about that. Also, he may not have the answer to this about whether or not there has been consultation with the Parishes, because I think it is important that Constables take a lead to ensure that wherever sites go ahead what we get is what the Parish can live with or accept, and not something foisted on them.

2.1.2 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier:

I am sure I am not the only States Member that is really struggling to make decisions through this debate. There are inconsistencies, there are big question marks around how many houses we need as we are basing our decisions on the 2019 numbers, which is 3 years ago. We do not have a census; at the same time we know that we are in a housing crisis. I know the Minister, and I note he is leaving, has a really difficult job on his hands to convince us to allow to build more, because this is where we are. I understand that he needs some time. In the last vote I have changed several times from pour to contre, I basically changed the buttons but I really struggled because I agree that there were fields that I did not agree, at the same time it is genuine I do not want to build on green fields. At the same time I do not want to build on green fields in St. Helier more. I realise we are not going to build on the glasshouses for the next 3 years and I realise we need to supply houses, but guiding me through this, with these green fields next to the village centres, for sure none of the green fields in St. Helier I will be voting for. I really feel that St. Helier residents deserve some countryside next to their houses, so next to the villages, not used currently by herds, this is where I was and I think the last one, it is about what parishioners think, what the Constables think, what the Deputies think. It is important because at the end of the day these are residents in these Parishes. Again, I need to apologise to all Grouville residents; I did not have a chance to respond to all emails. I have read them and I do understand them and I hear what residents of Grouville are saying to me as a States Member. I can hear what the Deputy of Grouville is saying to me, altogether green fields not next to the village, and the wish of the residents I would be supporting the Deputy on this amendment.

2.1.3 The Connétable of Grouville:

I note the Minister is not in the Chamber but I do hope he is listening next door, which I am sure he is, because he asked me some questions and, yes, of course I recognise and the Parish recognises that we need to provide some affordable homes, and I would like to provide affordable homes for people who have got connections with the Parish, and that is why I put forward the field that I did. My field had one big disadvantage, the field that I put forward, inasmuch that it is close to Grouville Marsh, and I was hoping that within my proposition the buffer zone between where the buildings would end and Grouville Marsh would be able to mitigate it. Maybe we went about it the wrong way as a Parish and we should have had more consultation, because there is an acknowledgement within the

community that we do need to find some homes, and maybe there are other fields that are better than this one. As far as its value to agriculture is concerned all of the fields in Grouville, bar 2, and the Minister's is one of them, I have worked and I know the soil pretty well and he is right that this is considered by the Farmers' Union as their third category, as is my field, but this is every bit as good as the field I was putting forward. I acknowledge that we do have to find somewhere but I do not think this is the right site. I was required by presentation of a requete to call a Parish Assembly, which of course I did. The Deputy is right that 250 people did say they were coming, we had a pre-registration system to try to make the management of the meeting a little bit easier. As it turned out 199 people turned out, and we know that is an accurate figure because we had our officers from the Parish checking people to make sure that they were eligible to vote. The fourth and last item on the agenda that evening reads: "To request the Constable to relay to the States Assembly their strong support on environmental and other grounds for amendment 62 to the Island Plan 2022-25 P.36/2021 in the name of the Deputy of Grouville in relation to the withdrawal of field G398 Grouville from the list of sites to be zoned for affordable homes." So the meeting was overwhelmingly in favour of that proposition. I was prepared and my officials had ballot papers ready should we need to take a ballot if it was close, so even if we were struggling to know how many were opposed, as it turned out I initially had asked for a show of hands and had prewarned my officials if they could count those numbers, if it was manageable to count, and they counted 17 hands that were put up. So they may have missed a hand, there may have been the odd person who abstained, but quite clearly 10 per cent or less of people at that meeting were against this proposition of Deputy Labey. The meeting was overwhelming and the agenda item mentions their strong support. I think that indicates tremendous support but what it does not reflect is the passion of the people in that Parish all that evening who were so vehemently opposed to this development. The 1771 Code directs a Constable to, when he thinks necessary, consult with his parishioners but when I am in here I have a free hand and I should do what I think best and I have always done so. In this case I have a free hand but I am only too pleased to be able to support this amendment. I am also not seeking re-election, so I do not have to do anything that is popular. I do so for a number of reasons, similar to those of the Deputy of Grouville. People do live around here and I know some of them, some of them I have known for a very long time, and it will have an effect on them and the area where they live. There is a very derogatory term in my view, a N.I.M.B.Y. (not in my back yard) and it is only N.I.M.B.Y.s. It was not only N.I.M.B.Y.s in the Parish Hall the other evening, but I think we are probably all N.I.M.B.Y.s. Who would want a development in front of you and it could be in St. Helier here?

[11:30]

My son lived in an apartment here, they had an apartment on the fifth floor and a building was built alongside it and they lost their sea view. I am sure they did not want that, and I am sure pretty much all of us are to some extent N.I.M.B.Y.s. They are ordinary people, and this development will affect their lives and there is quite a number of them, and the more people who are affected the more we should take that into consideration. Enjoyment of their life will diminish, and the value of their property will diminish, but it is not something probably we take into consideration enough, but I do recognise that if this were to be developed it would affect those people. I have not worked this field, but I have worked a field a stone's throw away. It is a good field. It is low-lying so you cannot grow overwintered crops, but you can grow anything and just about everything else and it is an easy field to work. It grows a crop of potatoes every year and it has some advantage when you are growing potatoes because it is very easy to harvest. If you get a wet harvest season and you get 4 or 5 days of rain, if you try to harvest a field near me you simply cannot do it; you have to wait 4 or 5 days because the machinery gets all gummed up with mud, potatoes are covered in mud and are unmarketable. This field, because of its light soil, it can rain for a week and you can go in the next day and harvest it, so it has some massive advantages. It will grow anything that you would expect to grow in Jersey; in fact the coastal plain of Grouville, St. Clement and St. Ouen are microclimates. I know this because glasshouse growers monitor the temperature and I know that the average

temperature in this area is approximately 1½ degrees on average per day higher than where I live up near Hougue Bie. So, it is good soil and the Farmers' Union on their category made it category 3, less important, but it does not make it not important at all. It is a good field, it is in use and people are making a profit from it. St. Ouen's Bay, the other end of the Island of course, is fantastic and from Corbière, past the end of the airport runway all the way to L'Etacq and all the escarpment below, all the land below right down to the seashore, the low water mark and beyond, is fantastic and quite rightly it receives the highest protection in our existing Island Plan and certainly in the new one. You can drive along the Five Mile Road and you can see it and enjoy it and you appreciate it and whether you appreciate it just for what it looks like or because you appreciate the environmental importance of it, it is spectacular. Of course, Grouville's coast road is completely different. There has been ribbon development, which stretches now pretty much from St. Helier all the way to the Vardon statute and there are hardly any breaks in the whole length of that road, so if you get to the St. Clement, Grouville La Rocque border you will go probably a mile before you see the first field, and there is a tiny one at Le Hurel but you do not really get to the countryside. You go on a little bit further, well, a little bit further, it is probably another mile, and you get to the Marais à la Cocque Meadow, which is on the other side of the road to the fields that Deputy Wickenden is proposing. You do not see much countryside. There is a meadow and then you cannot see any further because there are the remains of an embankment of the Eastern Railway. So the only real stretch of that road where you see the countryside, and you can imagine if you were a tourist and you were staying in one of the east coast hotels, you might be forgiven for thinking it is a coastal town with the countryside miles away, but the only window you get on the countryside from St. Helier all the way to Gorey is this particular window. I do not know if any Members have got the map of the field that is being proposed in front of you, but just looking at it over one-third of that window is going to be closed. We are going to be blanking up some windowpanes of what is a fantastic view. How long before we get mission creep? If you do not think that would happen, fields just on the other side of that gap were being proposed by Deputy Wickenden. Fortunately, he has withdrawn those. This is the only window where you see Jersey's countryside along the whole of that road for locals to enjoy as well as holidaymakers. This is not part of a village. There is no village. I have never heard of anybody talk about Verona Stores Village. It is visually significant and will change the area. The final point I would like to make, which is the most important one, if we had not had all the ribbon development on the coast road it would be a bit like the Five Mile Road. You would go along it, see the spectacular, unique foreshore, of course, which is incredible, nothing else like it anywhere else in the world, but you would be looking across to unspoilt countryside all the way along and I suspect, if that were the case, we would have a western coastal park and an eastern coastal park, because that land is a very important environment. Just because there is a row of houses along the main road does not make the environment behind it less important and the Minister recognises that because he does note that it is important as part of the wildlife corridor between the Grouville Marsh and the wet marsh of the Fauvic wetlands, marshlands and he is absolutely right. At the Parish Assembly, a local environmentalist, Bob Tompkins - and I mention him because he will be well-respected by Members here and I know he will not mind me mentioning his name - he explained just how important this was, far better than I can, of course. In the winter, because crops are not grown, it provides essential habitat for all sorts of migratory, wading birds and all other sorts of wildlife. It is every bit as important as the coastal park at St. Ouen, St. Peter and St. Brelade. We would not dream of extending buildings out into that coastal park and I suggest we most definitely should not be doing that here.

2.1.4 Deputy S.M. Wickenden of St. Helier:

I raise some of the things that I was hoping the Constable in his speech before me would have at least mentioned. That is, the Parish did go out in Grouville and ask 2 questions on 2 different things. One was how many parishioners want, require or need over-55 housing? How many need first-home buyer housing and how many need social rents and they went out and sent a letter to every household in Grouville, and I have got 2 of them. There were 59 parishioners within Grouville that came back

saying they would like over-55 housing, and there was 29 Grouville parishioners that came back saying they would require first-time buyer housing. They may not have been at the requete, they may not have wanted to be jumped on by their neighbours, and being on the Planning Committee for 6 years I know that planning ruins more neighbourly friendships than anything I know on this Island. I wanted to quickly add those points, that though there was a requete, though there has been lots of people jumping up and down, former Senators, 2 of them, there are some parishioners in Grouville who want to downsize, who want to buy their first-time buyer homes and want to stay within the Parish. Now, the Deputy of Grouville is right about this field. If this field is built on it will change the view and landscape on driving through Grouville and up towards St. Martin to Mont Orgueil for ever and that would be a tragedy. You can see straight across, as the Constable says, from the road to the countryside, across this field, and it would be missed greatly, I am sure, that view evermore if this is to be done. But I wanted to make sure that the Assembly is aware, because it was not mentioned, there was a report that went out, a questionnaire that went out on the scheme to all parishioners if they required, if they wanted to stay in the Parish, if they required different levels of housing need. They responded, they are out there and there is a need of parishioners who want to stay in Grouville who do not have the ability right now. With that I just think it was fair to put it there and leave it there.

2.1.5 Deputy J.A. Martin of St. Helier:

It is good to follow Deputy Wickenden but I have probably got a different take on this. I have had many, many, many emails from Grouville, I have told every single one of them that I watched the whole meeting on Teams. So, there was, I now know, 199 people there. I would say the 199 people there, every man, woman and child of them probably live in a very nice home. Seventeen voted for the field to be built on. Then I think back, I have done, this is the third Island Plan and I do know that land has been rezoned in Gorey, Grouville, for the last couple of times. It even gets a bit more: "Well you built me a home; I built a home on reclaimed land but no more." That is how I am seeing it. It took a very brave 17 people to put their hands up. I was out in Grouville, I had something on, but I should have said to the Minister for Housing and Communities: "Can we go to every single person who is on the Andium waiting list, the Gateway to buy, to rent, over 1,000 or more, 2,000, can we get them in that Grouville church and the Grouville Parish Hall next Thursday and then put their points?" Because they do not have a home. The majority do not have a home. I am sorry that there has been some recent development and you cannot see the meadows. What do you see when I walk from St. Clement all the way through St. Saviour, all the way through town to get to Broad Street? Not meadows, I can assure you. I am seeing homes and I said to the people in Grouville I will listen to this debate and I am still listening, but I said to the Minister for Housing and Communities I want to vote for everywhere that it has been through the proper channels, the inspector has put these in, there was no issue from X, Y, or Z, and that will be the Farmers' Union, et cetera, because I am not the type of person who 3 months ago, and if you identify yourself in this, stand up screaming: "We have a housing crisis." It is a crisis. It cannot be said nothing more than a crisis. Admit it is a crisis. Put your fingers out and say it is a crisis. Then today go: "No, I am going to vote against building anymore homes though." These debates, this is my third one, they are never good, and I think my ex-Constable, lovely Len Norman, God rest his soul, fought to stop having Samarès even in the last debate. As I say, today I look out of my window and I see some beautiful homes, kids playing, where they come from I do not know, but they are beautiful homes, some are bought and some are rented. Then there is a field next door, so they do have a field next door. They have the sea just across the road and they have all little integral parks and walkways through the estate. I walk around there often myself, just going out for a walk. So I have sympathy for the people who wrote to me. The marsh one, I think that has gone, but this is the field that the Minister wants because the inspector said it was fine. It was a one-sided meeting, to go there and say: "No, not in my backyard, no more."

[11:45]

When they were probably sitting in a house that was rezoned 20 years ago and, if not 20 years ago, 30 years ago. They are denying all those thousands of youngsters who we are all supposed to be caring about, because we have a housing crisis. Reform, they have told us this. Well, if you want us to agree it, let us see which way you vote. I really think we did miss a trick; we should have had more people at that Parish Hall. I got the impression it was only people from Grouville that were wanted there. I was told, no, that I would have to put my name down. But, anyway, my opinion would not have counted. But I would have loved to have paraded 1,000 people who really need their homes to tell them exactly what they feel.

2.1.6 The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I am going to cover a couple of brief points to pick up on the Minister's response. I would like just to understand the definition of improvements. We all have a different interpretation of that. His was that supplemental planning obligations would control the whole development in terms of these improvements. Now I make the point that not everybody likes the suburbanisation of our countryside and we are probably on different planets when it comes to that. If this field is developed, in fact if any fields are developed, there is complete suburbanisation of those areas. The whole aspect will change. The Connétable has pointed out that this will alter the look from the road where the public pass regularly. It will be a different scenario. I would just like to ask Members to consider that particular point when they are voting.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Connétable. If no other Member wishes to speak, I call upon the Deputy of Grouville to reply.

2.1.7 The Deputy of Grouville:

The Minister described this as a limited small site. Yes, it is a limited small site and, like I said in my opening remarks, it has so far 26-unit homes identified for it. But we all know that will not happen, do we not? The 26 will become 36. But, regardless of limited small site, it is the wrong site. That is what I say. I know this area really well. It is what the Constable said, it is what the community said. To answer Deputy Martin about where were the first-time buyers, where were the rightsizers at the meeting? Good question, where were they? Why were they not there making their point of view? I know, and I understand that they would have had to be quite brave, because they may have been in the minority, but nonetheless they could have come, it was a very well-run meeting. They would have been listened to. But they did not and that I feel is unfortunate. When the Minister said this is a limited small site, and like I say the wrong site, because it has the last remaining open views for everyone to enjoy between St. Helier and Gorey of the countryside and the escarpments. Those who went around on the planning bus will know exactly what I mean, and indeed I have those photographs in my report. Grouville has taken its share of development in recent years and we have played our part. What is more, our school, which is an excellent school, is full. The surrounding area, which is the lane which runs parallel to this field, has taken a lot of housing of late. We have had housing at Left Fork Farm, Old Forge Lane, Rue de la Pasture, Pike Farm, Clos de l'Église, and the 30-plus houses on the estate opposite field 392A at Clos des Fonds, all serviced by very small lanes, 15-foot wide in some places, which to my mind not only calls into question the safety and enjoyment of pedestrians and cyclists trying to access their homes, but their constant use erodes hedgerows, vegetation and the whole character of country lanes. The Planning Department themselves demands a 16-foot access road to new builds, yet this inspector approved this field where the access lanes fall short of their own regulations. Another 26-plus houses in this area would simply be too much and too dense. As I say, we have an overcrowded school and it will have a hugely detrimental visual impact to the area and it will adversely affect our food security, biodiversity and carbon sinks. The environment, the landscape, the school, the lanes, simply cannot take it. Now, we all recognise the failure to find an acceptable balance for our community between our environment

and the economy, but it should not be paid for in this valuable land. We know young people need homes, but these homes have to be in the right places. This field is not one of those. I make my amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is the *appel* called for?

The Deputy of Grouville:

Yes please.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy. The *appel* has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. Those joining the meeting via the Teams link are invited to cast their votes in the chat channel and I ask the Greffier to open the voting for Members in the Chamber.

Deputy M. Tadier:

I voted on the wrong desk, just so you know, obviously this is Deputy Alves' desk. She is not here. I have voted on mine but I do not want 2 votes recorded.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, we will try to sort that out. That is fine. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the amendment has been adopted.

POUR: 25		CONTRE: 13		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator S.W. Pallett		Senator S.C. Ferguson		
Senator S.Y. Mézec		Senator K.L. Moore		
Connétable of St. Helier		Connétable of St. Saviour		
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Connétable of St. Peter		
Connétable of St. Brelade		Connétable of St. Ouen		
Connétable of Grouville		Connétable of St. Clement		
Connétable of St. Mary		Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)		
Connétable of St. Martin		Deputy of St. Ouen		
Connétable of St. John		Deputy J.H. Young (B)		
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)		Deputy L.B. Ash (C)		
Deputy of Grouville		Deputy G.C.U. Guida (L)		
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)		Deputy of St. John		
Deputy M. Tadier (B)		Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)		
Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy R. Labey (H)				
Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)				
Deputy K.F. Morel (L)				
Deputy of Trinity				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)				
Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)				

Deputy R.J. Ward (H)			
Deputy I. Gardiner (H)			

3. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) – twelfth amendment: Removal of Field H1219 St. Helier (P.36/2021 Amd.(12))

The Deputy Bailiff:

The next is the 12th amendment lodged by the Connétable of St. Helier. I ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

After the words “the draft Island Plan 2022-25” insert the words “except that (a) the following should be removed from the list of sites to be zoned for affordable homes in Policy H5 - Provision of affordable homes - 5. Field H1219 St. Helier (1.20 hectares/6.6 vergées); (b) the draft Island Plan 2022-25 should be further amended in such respects as may be necessary consequent upon the adoption of paragraph (a); (c) the draft Bridging Island Plan Proposals Map Part A - Planning Zones should be amended to reflect the adoption of paragraph (a).”

3.1 The Connétable of St. Helier:

My concern is that with each successful bid to save good agricultural fields from development it gets harder to do so. I do not know why this field in St. Helier is so far down the list, but there we are. It is of course the fifth of the 5 fields in St. Helier that were slated for development in the bridging Island Plan. It is the fifth one and it is the last one. I hope the fact that 4 others have been saved from development will not tempt Members to think: “We better let this one go through.” The Roads Committee of St. Helier visited all 4 sites, because of course the fifth one was a Johnny-come-lately plan B site, but we visited all 4 sites that were put down for development last year on a brilliant summer day. Meeting many of the residents while we were doing so. As Members will I hope know by now, the St. Helier Roads Committee is a little like the Comité Rural that the Constable of St. John has been talking so usefully about in that it is an elected body, it has met in public for nearly 16 years with published agendas and minutes and it is an important elected body for St. Helier’s population. So, the fact that the St. Helier Roads Committee was unanimous in its view that the 4 fields we visited on that summer day should not be developed I hope will carry some weight when the Assembly comes to vote. This field of course, if Members are not familiar with it, there is a lot to take in, in this debate, is right next to Haute Vallée School, in between the school and the extension of Clos Vaze across from the west. It was of course debated in the last Island Plan.

[12:00]

When it was debated in 2011, it was described as good-quality farmland, which is a good shape and size with a long history of agricultural use. The development of the eastern half of the field for housing would be considered a loss to the farming industry. That of course is the position today. When we visited it I think it was in cauliflowers. But my memory may be wrong on that. So, the committee, when we were there, were very struck by the fact that it is of course right next to Haute Vallée School. While the agricultural arguments are strong here, I believe that the proximity of this site to St. Helier’s only secondary school is worth thinking about. I would be hopeful that St. Helier Deputy and Minister for Education, Deputy Wickenden, would be willing to support my amendment when he considers the strategic importance of this field being right next to the school campus. The part that is slated for development is next to the car park and the other section of the field has long been reserved for an expansion of the school. It seems to make no sense to me to argue that one part of the field will be useful for the school but not the other one. It does not make sense. I believe that is a very good reason to keep this field in agriculture. Because, if it were to come out of agriculture, then surely it should come out of agriculture to give the school more room to breathe, more room to

grow. The committee were considering, for example, if it came out of agriculture, why not use it for the use of the school? What school cannot do with more space for its pupils? We were thinking, and I have mentioned this before in the debates, about the possibility that it could be used as some kind of community field for the school to use. We were also aware as we viewed the field that it is well used by local residents of that part of St. Helier and, even as we were there, there were people walking, of course sensibly around the edge of the field because it was full of caulis, with their dogs and so on. The Roads Committee was also concerned about the impact of potential housing on the field because of the fact that it is right next to Clarke Avenue and the top of St. John's Road and Members will not need reminding how difficult traffic is at that junction. Of course, it has been very much on our minds with the potential movement of the hospital up to Overdale that the traffic chaos that exists on Queen's Road and at the top of St. John's Road can only get worse. Putting another housing estate into the mix is going to make the traffic even worse. It is not so much the traffic we are concerned about as Parish-elected representatives, it is the fact that hundreds of schoolchildren walk to and from Haute Vallée School every day and it is really difficult. To place another housing estate in this would make it even more difficult for the children who live there. The Roads Committee accepts that more housing is required in the Island. But our contention is that St. Helier is already fulfilling more than its fair share of meeting housing demand. There are currently more than 1,000 units, which are being built and will come on stream in the north of town alone. I pick up occasionally a slight inference that St. Helier should be talking about sheltered housing schemes and people have sometimes asked me: "Why is St. Helier not pursuing a sheltered housing scheme the way such-and-such a Parish is?" Of course, I suppose you would have to go back to the 16th century to find our Parish church with a field next to it that could be developed for people wanting to live in the heart of St. Helier, as of course happened in Trinity recently. St. Helier does not have the luxury of green fields that we can build homes on. Although I should add that of course one of our residential homes, St. Helier House, which had to close due to the problem with the cladding, on People's Park, the use of that is being explored with Andium to see if we can have some kind of sheltered accommodation there. Because we would like, as a Parish, to have a Parish sheltered accommodation, kind of cottage homes if it were possible. But of course, being in the town centre or being near the town centre it will presumably be slightly more densely constructed than equivalent cottage homes around the Island. St. Helier is already doing a lot and I have argued in previous debates that allowing the Parish to extend into the countryside is simply wrong. The people who live in the outskirts of St. Helier, the people who live particularly La Pouquelaye at the top of Queen's Road, they need their space too. They need places to walk. They need places to relax and get exercise. Allowing the town to simply sprawl into the countryside is wrong in every respect. I want just perhaps finally before I finish to pick up on a point that Deputy Guida made in a previous debate. It was on the 91st amendment. It was quite interesting to me because it was the first time in this entire debate that anyone has really raised the whole, you could describe it as, the elephant in the room. That is a bit of a cliché. What Deputy Guida said was that the real problem in Jersey is the lack of 4-bedroom homes. Of course, he does not mean homes at all; he means houses. He means houses. In fact, he said houses with gardens, small gardens, he said. It is interesting to me because in previous debates on the Island Plan we have spent a lot more time debating what we mean by a home in Jersey. I believe it is frankly unsustainable for the Assistant Minister for the Environment to be saying that everybody has a right to live in a 4-bedroom home with a garden and with a garage. It is unsustainable. The way the population is increasing we simply cannot do that. We have to accept, in the interests of sustainability, that the closer we live to the village centres, the closer we live to the capital, then the more sustainable that is going to be. I am afraid that the Island has yet to really grasp true environmental sustainability when it comes to housing. Because what that means in other places, what that means in Paris, what that means in Vienna, is that people do not see living in a flat, in an apartment, as a problem. Families live in apartments because the apartments are big, they have high ceilings, they have extra rooms, they have big balconies, they have roof terraces, they have enormous parks around the apartments where the people can live. But if I had a pound for every time I hear

someone saying: “We do not want to live in St. Helier because we want to live in a house in the countryside.” It is a great idea and perhaps if we were in the U.K. (United Kingdom) or in France that is something we could do. But in Jersey we cannot. If we continue to feed the argument that everybody has the right to live in a house, semi-detached or detached, with a garden, hopefully front and back, with a garage, with a carport, then we are going to cover the Island with houses. I would urge Members to bear that in mind so that when I make the argument here that St. Helier is fulfilling the requirement for homes in St. Helier, these are homes in the heart of town with access to all the services, with easy access to schools and to work and to shops and to restaurants. There is nothing wrong with pursuing that agenda because in the end it will save green fields from development. So, I urge Members to spare this field on the outskirts of St. Helier from development. It is in agricultural use. It could one day be important for Haute Vallée School. If it is to have a future outside agriculture that is where it should be. I urge Members to support the amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Connétable. Is the amendment seconded? [**Seconded**]

3.1.1 Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier:

It is most unfortunate that I am today speaking against this amendment to remove field H1219 from the bridging Island Plan. I am soundly of the opinion that agricultural fields should rarely, if ever, be given up for housing. My primary reason for doing so is to hopefully ensure that fully-accessible homes for people with disabilities will be able to be developed on this site. My reasoning for this will be explained in more detail during the debate on the 78th amendment, which will follow this debate if this amendment is defeated. The strategic issues and options consultation carried out as part of the Island Plan review in 2019 found that, of the 7 different spatial strategy options presented in the consultation, respondents showed the most support focusing development within St. Helier with 71 per cent of respondents supporting this option. The independent planning inspector’s report into the draft Bridging Island Plan noted that H1219 lies well within the urban area at perhaps the most sustainable location of all the proposed allocations and that the field appears to have no exceptional ecological value. It therefore seems as if this site is a strong candidate for rezoning. The benefits of its urban location are likely to be more keenly felt by people who are more dependent on services, such as, for example, public transport. The *Objective Assessment of Housing Need* report states that homes are best provided in those parts of the Island’s built-up area with best access and proximity to local services, facilities and public transport. It is logical to conclude that people with disabilities would benefit from accommodation, which affords the best access and proximity to services that they require. If this is accepted, then field H1219’s proximity to Mont a l’Abbé School might prove a great help to families with disabled children. The proposer, in his report, informs us that the western half of the field is allocated to the school and only the eastern half is being discussed today for allocation of homes. The proposer is primarily concerned about the impact of traffic congestion if this area is developed further. I understand the Roads Committee’s objections to this development, however I do not think that any major traffic disruption will be caused if the site is appropriately assigned. I do not believe it will be necessary to install traffic lights at the end of Clarke Avenue to prevent further congestion, as suggested by the report. I do accept that the land is regarded as being good agricultural land and that the Jersey Farmers’ Union has suggested that it should be retained for that purpose. Unfortunately, we are here to make some difficult decisions and I believe that this sacrifice is one that we should seriously consider today. The pressure of delivering housing to our Islanders continues to fall predominantly upon St. Helier but hopefully this will be the only concession that the Parish will have to make. I ask Members to give all consideration to my amendment while contemplating this proposal and to therefore endorse the decision to allocate this field for suitable homes, thereby rejecting this amendment.

Deputy J.H. Young:

I have a point of order I would like to have clarified, the point of procedure here. Deputy Ahier mentioned his amendment that follows. Could we have guidance on whether or not that still will be debated; that is amendment 78, which amends policy H6? Whereas the Constable's amendment that we are debating now amends policy H5. Sorry to ask, but I would like to just be clearer, do the 2 stand separately or are they linked?

The Deputy Bailiff:

They are linked to the extent that if this amendment succeeds then the next amendment will fall away.

Deputy J.H. Young:

In its entirety?

The Deputy Bailiff:

In its entirety. That is accepted by Deputy Ahier. Does any Member wish to speak on this amendment?

3.1.2 Deputy J.H. Young:

Thank you for clarifying that. I wanted to be clear about that. Again, this one, this particular field, I remember it many, many years ago when the land for the Haute Vallée School was, from my memory, compulsorily acquired. Indeed, it was always considered at that time that, by acquiring the land as a whole and with the school layout, there would be the potential for additional housing development if needed in the future. The Haute Vallée School has probably been there 25 years. But also recognising absolutely, as the Constable says, that it also offered the lands for expansion of the school in future. That is why this field has been protected for education purposes and it still is proposed that the western part would be protected for both.

[12:15]

That obviously does allow the capability in the future for community facilities for a school. At the moment of course there is a big security fence, as there are all around all schools these days, for valid reasons, between the field and the school. That did not use to be the case but of course it is now. The question arises, the Constable asked, it is a good question, what is the sense? As I see it, looking at the drawing there, the issue of access, I do not see that there would be any difficulty in having the access from the existing Haute Vallée School to the western part separately. So that does not ruin the opportunity for that to happen. Of course, it is absolutely right, and again this is not unusual, that development on this site will require major access and highway improvements, which again would have to be done by planning obligation agreements with the developer. Obviously, that is completely a downstream issue. Of course, I do understand the Constable's point, he has long been, as far as I can remember, an advocate of European apartment-style living. I do understand that. Of course, that goes with people not having cars and all this type of thing and of course we do have an amendment from the Constable about parking and so on. So, we are not there yet. I do understand that vision of urban living in apartments. But we still have a more mixed situation, younger single people are very much taken to that situation, but others do not. So, for example, we have also seen recent successful developments around Clos Vaze and Upland Court, for example. So that sort of development of homes, which are not apartments, is very much Jersey at the moment. Now the Constable criticised my Assistant Minister, Deputy Guida. I think he was illustrating a principle. I do understand what was said about 4-bedroom homes because they are large homes. But, in my mind, I have a much more modest thing, probably family homes of around 900 to 1,000 square feet or 100 square metres, whichever way you want to call it in old money, and very small gardens. We are talking about gardens of no more than 15 metres, so they are really quite small, and trying to use those spaces. So I do not think that is a reason for saying no. Of course, this has been and is true this is a loss to

agriculture, I have to accept. But Members who take the view that the overriding issue is always agriculture then obviously they will not be persuaded by my arguments. But this is one of the most sustainable sites because it is right on the edge of St. Helier and it has all the amenities. You have everything. In terms of sustainability and so on, it is not right for the Constable to say this is not sustainable. The sustainability review said that it was. How it is developed, I do not think for one minute it will finish up, if it is approved for development, being 4-bedroom homes. It is likely to be something different. That is all I wanted to say. It is rather disappointing because, I must admit, I had hoped that we could take these 2 amendments separately. That we would be able to decide on this one of the Connétable and then, if that was won, still debate Deputy Ahier's amendment. Because the second part of Deputy Ahier's amendment refers to a completely different policy, which is about homes for people with disabilities. It is a real shame that we have to make a decision here, which will bomb out the possibility for homes for the disabled. Because they desperately need that. Is anybody going to argue this is the wrong place for homes for disability? In view of your direction, to me that absolutely adds to the case for voting against the Constable's amendment. Because, if I could have voted, I would have voted against the Constable and voted to support Deputy Ahier, because where else, H6, special homes, let us recognise that. Very important. I know it is true that all modern buildings now are built to building regulations. But to have a scheme especially for and could be promoted for the people who have those special needs strikes me as being really important. To put them on the edge of town, I mean are we going to plonk them, are we going to do those developments miles away from anywhere? No. So, I add the fact that we have that procedural situation, which is very disappointing, because obviously Deputy Ahier could have still brought forward his proposition with only (b) on it, in which case I would have hoped we could have discussed it. So all that means to me is it adds to the reasons why regrettably, Constable, I have to vote against it. Now, if it is rejected, I would hope that you would be supportive of what Deputy Ahier proposes. There we are. I will leave it there.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

It is really just a point of order and it is the same one. If the Greffe could look at whether the entirety of the 39th item, the 78th amendment, falls away. Because I entirely agree with the Minister's point that they were talking about 2 separate policies and so taking one out of one policy does not ordinarily take it straight out of another policy. Otherwise, it would have been better to debate Deputy Ahier's amendment first and then the Connétable's amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The difficulty is, Deputy, it is the same site, and once it is removed from the list of the sites it is removed and there is nothing to amend. Does any Member wish to speak on this amendment?

3.1.3 Deputy I. Gardiner:

I wish that we would discuss the 2 amendments connected to the same fields at our Deputy meetings that we had and not have this, and we would be bringing to the States something more round as the St. Helier representatives. Because we would be able to consult with our parishioners and to understand what is their needs. I think it is not a surprise, I am generally against developing on the green fields. I do recognise how important it is to address the needs of the people with disability and this is the reason that I brought 4 amendments into the bridging Island Plan that were accepted by the Minister, and they are already part of the bridging Island Plan. I would like to bring Members' attention to my amendment that was accepted and it is already part of the bridging Island Plan, which is the 22nd. I hope this will be followed through all planning applications for all developments. What the amendment asked, and I hope it will be performed, that all homes will support independent living for those with disabilities and additional needs. Within policy H6 that the homes will be designed and adapted to special needs. In policy GD6 to achieve the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design having the regard to meet needs people with disabilities. I am not saying that

the suggestion from Deputy Ahier is wrong one, I do believe we need homes for people with disabilities. I just hope that more homes will adopt the amendment only in this place and on this half of the field the homes will be suitable for the people with disabilities. I hope these policies will follow through at other places. So, coming back to the Constable's amendment, because it is 2 amendments that are connected, we did not discuss what are the needs of the school. In other things we have proposed to have a neighbourhood filling, north of town, up from Rouge Bouillon, up to St. John, we do not have anything that connects this big part of the Island as a neighbourhood. Nowhere. If I need to meet parishioners they need to come to the Town Hall. I do not have any space for neighbourhood meeting, neighbourhood connection, neighbourhood activities. The youth club at La Pouquelaye almost lost their space just a month ago for various reasons. It is still under a big question mark if it would have space for the youth club at La Pouquelaye, which is very well attended. I do believe, if this field will go out from the agriculture, we need to have serious discussions about what are the needs of the area and obviously of the whole Island.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

May I ask a point to the A.G. (Attorney General)? It is very difficult not to link these 2 propositions together. But if the amendment is rejected and it goes into the sites, it will go towards a 50/50 affordable housing. I know it is the second amendment, but it is influencing the way people would vote. If the amendment from the Constable is rejected and this goes into the site, and I think we do need a ruling on this, would the next amendment, if accepted, mean that the provision of those homes for those with disabilities would go as affordable homes for those with disabilities or does it supersede the affordable homes amendment that we all agreed on, if that makes sense, which it may not. I am being looked at.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, it would supersede it in the sense that the proposition from the Connétable is asking the Assembly to agree that the field should be removed from the list of sites to be zoned for affordable homes. The proposition from the Deputy also asks for removal of the list of sites to be zoned affordable homes. In addition, it asks for the site to be specifically zoned for the provision of purpose-built fully-accessible homes for people with disabilities, so it will no longer be zoned for the purposes of affordable homes, but instead for purpose-built full-accessible homes for people with disabilities.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

From what you have just said, I cannot understand why the second proposition falls if they are removed from the sites for affordable homes. Because the first part of the second proposition is doing the same thing. That is my confusion.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, I was having the same discussion with the Greffier a moment ago, notwithstanding the ruling I have just given, which was consistent with the view that the Greffe had taken to date. I would just like to complete that discussion if I may now. On reflecting on the ruling that I gave earlier, to the effect that if the Connétable's amendment succeeded then the next amendment 78 could not be debated. I would like to rule afresh on that issue and say that part (a) of the 78th amendment could not be debated, but certainly parts (b), (c) and (d) can. Which means that, regardless of the outcome of this debate on whether or not ...

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Would it help if I propose the adjournment?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, perhaps it would. I do not want to close off the potential for Members to vote on this 78th amendment if it is at all possible to do so. But there has been previously a view that it is not possible

for the debate to proceed on Deputy Ahier's amendment if the Assembly adopts the amendment of the Connétable. So, I will reflect on that if I may over the adjournment if the adjournment is now proposed.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED

The Deputy Bailiff:

Seconded? [**Seconded**] We will adjourn until 2.15 p.m.

[12:30]

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

[14:16]

The Deputy Bailiff:

Members will recall, prior to the adjournment I indicated I was going to give a ruling in relation to the effect of the debate on the 12th amendment on the next amendment listed for debate, namely the 78th amendment. If amendment 12 is adopted, the effect will be that the field in question is no longer zoned for affordable housing. In those circumstances, my ruling is that amendment 78 may be debated but only as to parts (b), (c) and (d) of the proposition as (a) will have just been adopted by the Assembly. If amendment 12 is rejected, and the effect of which is that the field remains zoned for affordable housing, then amendment 78 may also be debated but must be voted on as a whole as it would offend Standing Order 20 to vote on part (a) separately. So, whatever the outcome of this debate, Members will be able to debate amendment 78. Does any other Member wish to speak on the current amendment, the 12th amendment? In that case I call upon the Connétable to reply.

3.1.4 The Connétable of St. Helier:

I understand that, following your ruling, Deputy Ahier, who spoke first, is now able to support this amendment, which means I can spare him the things I have written down to say about what he said. It is very good because what it means is that, if this field is spared development and we can move on to his amendment, we can of course hope to achieve full accessibility of the new affordable homes that are being built around the Island, which I must say I thought was happening anyway. I thought that in this day and age we were building fully-accessible homes and I thought we had been for some time. But I will absolutely get behind his amendment when we get to it. We also heard from Deputy Gardiner who mentioned our Deputies meetings, and it is true that we meet every month. It is true that not all of the 10 Deputies come. It is true that I am not always aware of their plans. I would like to think that I keep the Deputies fully abreast of what I am thinking about and certainly the Roads Committee, which, as I have said before, meets in open session, is very clear about what it believes is the right thing for the Parish. As I said in my opening remarks, the Roads Committee was fully supportive of keeping this field free from development. The Minister for the Environment made I thought an interesting speech, and we may perhaps have been talking at cross-purposes because we were discussing whether this development is sustainable or not and he said that it is sustainable because of course it is on a good bus route and it is next to a school and so on. I would still argue that building on the outskirts of a large town is unsustainable because you are essentially consigning residents of those homes to car dependency, even if there is a bus service, there will be ample provision for parking, ample opportunity for car use. However, he went on to say that I espoused the view that people can live in flats and do not need cars. As I will be explaining when we get to the parking policy of this plan, that is absolutely not what I believe. St. Helier residents do have as much right to enjoy the benefits of car ownership as everybody else in the Island. That is why I will continue to fight for adequate parking facilities for town residents. That was the main point I think that was raised. As I said, my point about his Assistant Minister, I did not mean to criticise him personally. I was simply raising the problem that we have as a small Island if we continue to lead people to believe that their aspiration in terms of home ownership should be for a 4-bedroom house

with front and back gardens in the countryside, because we cannot go on doing that for ever. That is why it is so important that we commend the benefits and pleasures of town living and, of course, that brings me back to the fact that if you live in town you feel you are going to have to give up your rather nice car. I was going to finish just by reading a quotation from an email I received coincidentally just a couple of days ago about this field. It is a subject that has been raised by other Members in speaking about the fields they are trying to save, but this person wrote to me about their concern: "... about the possible threat to a large mature oak tree on the edge of field H1219 immediately adjacent to the green lane. For this and other reasons in general I contest the inspector's view that field H1219 has no exceptional ecological value. I have personally picked elderflowers and blackberries from shrubs at the field edge. As I am sure you know, both of these plant species sustain large insect populations, which in turn support birdlife. The oak tree, of course, fulfils these functions too and provides essential canopy protection for both insect and bird populations as well as being as an important sequestrator of carbon and countering pollution from emissions. The destruction of such a large mature tree, quite unusual in Jersey and very unusual in St. Helier, would, in my view, be an outright tragedy as well as being contrary to the States expressed position on climate change and on preservation of biodiversity in the Island. I would like to see everything possible being done to preserve this tree, even perhaps especially if it does turn out that the field is to be lost to development." I would argue that this field, as well as being important for agriculture, as well as being important for the future of Haute Vallée School, is also important ecologically, particularly the hedgerow and the trees alongside it. In concluding, I have indicated already my shift away from an absolute refusal to support building on green fields where they occur in Parish centres and as I support my fellow Constables in their wish to build in their centres, I hope that my fellow Constables, if no one else in the Assembly, will support my wish and the wish of the Roads Committee and the wish of St. Helier parishioners not to see the boundaries of St. Helier pushed out further into the countryside. I would argue that if there is one field in the whole list that we are looking at today and next week that deserves the clemency of this Assembly it is field 1219. I maintain the proposition.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is the *appel* called for? The *appel* has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. Those joining the meeting via the Teams link are invited to cast their votes in the chat channel. I ask the Greffier to open the voting for Members in the Chamber.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Sir, I am afraid I have done it again. You can start calling me Deputy Alves, if you like. I have not voted on my ...

The Deputy Bailiff:

It is best if you vote in your own seat, Deputy Tadier.

Deputy M. Tadier:

I will do, Sir. You go away for 2 years, Sir, and then come back.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Apparently if you press the abstention vote for Deputy Alves that would be a good thing as well. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The amendment has been adopted.

POUR: 19	CONTRE: 18	ABSTAIN: 0
Senator S.Y. Mézec	Senator I.J. Gorst	
Connétable of St. Helier	Senator S.C. Ferguson	

Connétable of St. Lawrence		Senator K.L. Moore		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Connétable of St. Ouen		
Connétable of St. Brelade		Connétable of St. John		
Connétable of Grouville		Deputy of Grouville		
Connétable of St. Peter		Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)		
Connétable of St. Martin		Deputy of St. Martin		
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)		Deputy of St. Ouen		
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		Deputy R. Labey (H)		
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)		Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)		
Deputy M. Tadier (B)		Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)		
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)		Deputy J.H. Young (B)		
Deputy of St. Mary		Deputy L.B. Ash (C)		
Deputy K.F. Morel (L)		Deputy G.C.U. Guida (L)		
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)		Deputy of Trinity		
Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)		Deputy of St. John		
Deputy R.J. Ward (H)		Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)		
Deputy I. Gardiner (H)				

4. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - seventy-eighth amendment: Rezone Field H1219A for accessible homes (P.36/2021 Amd.(78))

The Deputy Bailiff:

We now move to the 78th amendment lodged by Deputy Ahier and I ask the Greffier to read the amendment but not part (a) of the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

After the words “the draft Island Plan 2022-25” insert the words “except that - (b) within Policy H6, after the first paragraph there should be inserted the following new paragraph - ‘The following site should be specifically zoned for the provision of purpose-built fully-accessible homes for people with disabilities, and its development for any other use will not be supported: Field H1219, La Grande Route de Mont a L’Abbé, St. Helier (1.20 hectares/6.6 vergées)’; (c) the draft Island Plan 2022-25 should be further amended in such respects as may be necessary consequent upon the adoption of (b); and (d) the Draft Bridging Island Plan Proposals Map Part A - Planning Zones should be amended to reflect the adoption of (b).”

4.1 Deputy S.M. Ahier:

We can now address my amendment to enable H1219 to be used for the provision of purpose-built, fully accessible homes for people with disabilities. In the Comptroller and Auditor General’s latest review the percentage of Jersey adults living in residential care settings was found to be considerably higher than that of England.

[14:30]

The review stated that the majority of long-term care scheme claimants from residential settings with occupancy levels in Jersey is significantly higher than comparative data for England. This is clearly outlined in exhibit 14, which demonstrates that the average number of occupied residential and nursing beds in Jersey is more than 3.5 times higher than in England. This seems to indicate that we are disproportionately dependent on residential care homes, which are extremely expensive to fund, and that a new direction needs to be taken. This is one of the primary reasons why I have brought

this amendment. Included in the report at paragraph 70 the Comptroller and Auditor General states that individual health and social care professionals are usually responsible for sourcing appropriate care settings. She explains that they do so “on the basis of the best information available to them at the time”. However, in the absence of any data reporting obligations for care homes, we have no way of knowing how many residential care providers might already be approaching full capacity. While individuals remain theoretically free to choose their own care setting, their choice might be in reality quite limited. This lack of availability will, in itself, increase the cost of such care over time and it is reasonable to assert that a new approach is needed if we are to limit any further increases to long-term care contribution. I believe that building more homes for people with disabilities is not only the right thing to do from a social perspective but that it will inevitably save the Island money in the long term. There are other aspects to this scheme that would be of benefit. For example, we must consider those who assist with domiciliary care such as Family Nursing and Home Care staff who do an excellent job but who currently spend a great deal of their own time driving around the Island from Parish to Parish. If 40 or so of the homes they had to visit were in the same area it would make their jobs that bit easier. The domiciliary care market remains underdeveloped on the Island following an historic emphasis on residential care provision. We can draw a comparison with the Office for National Statistics in England, which indicates that 66 per cent of care needs are delivered in the home. In Jersey the figure is 33 per cent of long-term care benefit cases. This is a statistic that needs to be corrected and I hope that this amendment is the first of many such developments in this direction. In the Minister’s comments paper he states that the housing needs of persons with disabilities needs to be better understood and prioritised where needs arise. I believe that there is a clear need and that we should address this now by ensuring that we allocate field H1219 to people with disabilities. I make the amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is the amendment seconded? [**Seconded**] Does anyone wish to speak on the amendment?

4.1.1 Deputy D. Johnson of St. Mary:

I am grateful to Deputy Ahier for bringing this proposition, which opens up an area that I had not previously considered. Certainly, we do need to make as a priority provision of homes for those with disabilities of various kinds. The one aspect that troubles me somewhat is: is it right that these should all be in one particular area? All people, disabled or otherwise, are part of our general community and I am concerned that they should be restricted to one area when they should be enjoying the neighbourliness of those who are fully able-bodied. That is my strong reservation. My general question is, therefore, as to whether in the general application of providing affordable housing, regard is had by the various departments, whether that is Environment, Health, Social Security, to the needs of the disabled and whether that should be built into the equation without having to allocate a specific site.

4.1.2 Deputy R.J. Ward:

I follow the previous Deputy and I would say, yes, this sounds like a very good idea and there is certainly a need. The positioning near Mont à l’Alabbé School seems to be a good idea. I think as an Island we have moved towards a more inclusive society and that is a very good thing. I think that what we do need to have are regulations that as a matter of course include disability access for anyone who will be living there for now and for into the future and have some genuine consideration of the needs of people who may have physical challenges that are specific to them. Disabilities are only that if society puts obstacles in the way for many, and housing is one of those issues. So I think my only concern here is about the creation of areas of living that are specifically ... I would like to have seen a much wider inclusion of these building regulations across housing that will be built into the future, particularly affordable housing. It would be interesting to know how this fits into the affordable housing plan. I believe it does not now but it would be specifically created for this

purpose, which is a good idea in many ways. This is a difficult one because is it the right thing to do into the future and will this create more estate specifically built for disabilities and do we want that to be an excluding, if you like, of people or do we want to have a society where we all understand much more about what it is to be a person because we realise our differences as much as our similarities? That is a really important thing to me. I know my experience of schools that are inclusive of disabilities is extraordinarily good for children because they see that difference does not mean people are not exactly the same in that sort of strange juxtaposition of words. So I think it is a consideration I think we should have and I wonder if the Deputy could address that as well.

4.1.3 Deputy J.A. Martin:

Today it is going to be a pleasure to follow Deputy Ward, because I think he is nearly there. Do we actually need this? What we do not need is a small village for disabled people. We have Andium who since 2010 at least is building completely adaptable flats and homes. You have all the light sockets are wheelchair accessible; they are very low. The majority have a wet room. Some even have they call them 1½ bedrooms. They charge for 2 bedrooms but they call them 1½. So, if a person gets a disability they have the wet room, a small studded wall in between that can be taken down to the bedroom and the bathroom and then if you did need a carer to sleep over you have got the small half a bedroom if necessary. There are hundreds all over the place. Why would we put 40-something homes for disabilities? Again, there are so many disabilities. You would have to be building them or definitely refurbishing them for what a person needs. Sometimes as a person gets older there are different things that will be fine when they are 9 or 10 and when they are 14 or 15 they need another. You need something that works but also lots of people are not born with a disability. Something happens, they have an accident. It goes back to where were you brought up, where is your family, where are your friends? “We cannot get you one there. We have got a nice little house for you up there because that is where all the disabled people live, but you cannot stay in your community.” Especially for youngsters as well, youngsters like to play out in their communities. We have just been watching the disability Olympics. People do fantastic things now with disabilities. I think the Deputy is trying to do something good. I did not like the comment it is easier if you visit all the people in one area. No. Disability is supposed to be inclusive and we are not going to get it with this. I do understand that at the moment we are not achieving the right split of people being able to stay in their homes with disability. The majority of that is: have we got the workers? There are issues but this is not going to solve that. I am very against this for so many reasons. I think the sentiment was good but, no, I really cannot support it.

4.1.4 Deputy J.H. Young:

I think the Deputy’s amendment has caused me to have quite a rethink on this. I think my starting point is that the Deputy’s proposition now proposes to earmark a specific site under Policy H6. Policy H6 I think is worth reading. I was reading it through and there are quite a few words in there that really help, I think, which point towards the sort of facility it is and what the elements of it are and then I think that would help Members make a judgment on whether or not the approach being proposed on this site is correct. But the policy is called “Supported Housing” and it says: “New housing [that is all of it] must meet the diverse, specialised needs of people with disabilities, those requiring some degree of care and vulnerable people in order to ensure equal access to housing and equitable social outcomes.” Then they say: “These are best provided in those parts of the Island’s built-up area with best access and proximity to local services, facilities and public transport or where people are best able to remain connected to their existing support network of family and friends.” I think that is clearly an issue for spatially relating. Then it talks about the move that Jersey is making towards the Jersey Care Model, which moves away from the unsustainable institutional model of care into a modern community-based structure. Of course, the Deputy, in his proposition, did correctly refer to the very high degree of occupation that we currently have in our care homes, which I think are generally occupied by older persons but they are not exclusively so. There are people in care

homes with all sorts of supported needs. I was really quite shocked to find out the occupancy when I was told it was about 99 per cent, so we have very little flexibility in that. So then it talks about: “Extra care is a principle that can be applied to a broad range of housing and which typically offers self-contained living space with access to communal facilities”; there is an interesting element. That flags up questions in my mind: could you put a communal type of facility within such a development if you did it? “Or provide some form of support”, and yet the ethos is about providing an enabling environment. A lot of the policy is aimed at persons of my age and above. It does recognise that: “Supported housing can embrace the needs of other sectors of the community outside of the needs of elderly Islanders.” But then it goes on, and this is obviously true: “It is difficult to identify and predict the demand for other forms of supported housing.” So, in general, of course, it says this should be provided within the built-up area and so on. When you read Policy H6, it is very short and pretty narrow. Basically, it says: “We will not support this unless ...”

[14:45]

What I think Deputy Ahier’s proposition is doing is offering us, saying: “Let us have an example of where we might do this, maybe as an opportunity.” I would be very surprised if anybody at the moment can predict exactly what that development would look like, how it would be structured and so on. I see that as a downstream task, but if this proposition is approved, of course, this will effectively be in the Island Plan and, therefore, any negatives that come out of H6 as drafted will not apply. Of course, I have also heard what the Connétable said, I think earlier on, and other Members have said: “Well, we should.” I am told at the moment the argument I was asked or at least recommended to go with is that the Island’s building by-laws, which date from 2007, should be meaning that all homes constructed since that time enable occupants with disabilities to cope better with increased mobility and, therefore, all new homes that we build should be compatible with supported living. But of course, my guess is that the vast majority of homes in the Island where people are do not meet the 2007 building regulations. I would be very surprised if they do; new homes do but not existing ones. Of course, what I see in the policy as drafted before it is amended by Deputy Ahier is we can improve existing buildings to make them better and so on, which is good but this goes the extra mile. I think that does give me grounds to rethink the position. I think the officers’ advice to me is right, that we should be doing this anyway on every other site but here we are offered something that maybe, in my mind, helps us take a step in the Island Plan towards a more proactive position in this question of how we provide supported housing for different groups. That is the way I am seeing it at the moment and I personally would have thought a field that is bang on the edge of the area, if we are to lose that field, this seems to be a very positive argument for doing so.

4.1.5 Deputy M. Tadier:

On the face of it, it is compelling because I think there is nobody in the Assembly who wants to be seen to be voting against disabled people, as is maybe what is being suggested here. The questions I would ask, though, are a few of the following. First of all I think about future-proofing and I think about whether in fact we are setting up, maybe unintentionally, well-intentioned ... at the same time we have got a false dichotomy in the sense that we are saying: “This is an area where disabled people can live and these are areas where people without disabilities live.” What we need to be moving towards, I think, and this is why I mentioned future-proofing, is that you should not have homes that are for disabled people and homes that are for ordinarily able people, if we call them that, because people transition throughout their lives. You might have a temporary or a more permanent disability as you get older following an incident, an accident or just ordinary old age creeping in, which requires you to make amendments. So, the appearance of rooms either as wet rooms or which can suitably take wheelchair access because the doors are wide enough, because there are ramps in place, et cetera, should be hardwired into our planning process for new builds wherever we build them. I have certainly seen so many times in my casework over the years where people have applied for housing,

not because they do not have anywhere to live but because often the private rental that they have - and so I am obviously talking from a Les Quennevais, St. Brelade perspective - something has happened and they say: "We need ground floor access or we need lift access and we can only get it realistically in social housing in Andium." Of course, they apply for that and there is a waiting list and then they are told: "You are going to have to, in all likelihood, move out of the Parish and into St. Helier." They accept that but it is not their first point of call. I am concerned that this is going to happen again, that we might unintentionally create a ghetto, which I am sure is not the intention of Deputy Ahier and he can probably address that. The other point is that I am just worried that this is not the right location for it. Disability, as we know, can mean so many things and I am just putting myself in somebody else's shoes. I can imagine, for example, if I were wheelchair bound or needed to use a mobility scooter, where would I want to live? Would you want to live at the top of a hill at Queen's Road tucked away by a secondary school? I have looked at the map but I know the area fairly well anyway. What are you going to do? Are you going to go out in your mobility scooter, go round some of the tight bends there? Are you going to do your shopping at Morrisons at the little corner shop or are you going to have to go down roads which is permanently gridlocked and busy if you want to get into town, if you drive - you may not drive of course - if you want to be self-sufficient? Or do you go slightly up the hill? Where do you go if you go in the other direction? Where are your nearest shops? Are you going to go all the way up to the Co-op at Sion almost where there is that new development? I am not sure if this has been properly thought-out or how it is going to work. Have disabled rights groups been consulted in all of this? Is it something that they want? I think the other point is we want mixed neighbourhoods so that you should not simply say: "Okay, this is where the disabled people live in St. Helier. In fact, in a lot of the other Parishes who do not have enough housing, we will put them there as well, they can apply for that." I just think there are quite a few alarm bells for me but certainly the sentiment is right here, what has been flagged up here by the C. and A.G. (Comptroller and Auditor General) and others about we do not want to be shutting people away, forcing them into care settings when they do not need to be there. I do think of a family in St. Brelade in fact who are in a very strange situation, they are multigenerational, and they are having to rent in the private sector. They are quite happy to do that; in fact, they were putting an advert out saying: "We would like to find a private landlord who is willing for us to make adaptations to their house so that I can live there with my mother, my partner and our child." You think you are going to have a really tough job. Luckily, they have also applied for housing through the Gateway. They will probably have a lot more luck with the application through the Gateway to be able to live there because it was said to them: "Why do you not just put your mother in a home and then you can apply to live somewhere on your own in the Gateway? You probably qualify in your own right or indeed your mother might qualify in her own right for some assisted housing through Andium." But they are saying: "No, we want to all live together, we want to be able to ... my partner does not work. Her job is to be at home and she will look after the mother and our own child." You want to make things easy for people so I think it is the right thing to do in that sense but I think it needs a lot more thought as to what kind of communities we are potentially creating here and where we put them. That is a job, and I think a challenge, a gauntlet that the Deputy has laid down for this Government but of course for future Governments to pick up.

4.1.6 Deputy K.F. Morel:

I think it is fair to say one of the main reasons I supported the Constable's preceding proposition was so that I could also support this amendment. I have listened to the arguments and most of them so far I have to admit kind of riled me a little bit. I feel like there are a lot of us talking from a position of ignorance and pretending we know what we are talking about. I will just take Deputy Tadier's there about the ghettoization, which I think is something I mentioned about over-55s living, and yet we voted through yesterday a patch of land in St. John precisely for over-55s sheltered housing, ghettoisation that Deputy Tadier is so strongly against. I have heard people speaking about disability as though disability means you own a mobility scooter and you cannot walk very far when disability

means so, so much more than that. Disability does not just have to be a physical disability, it could be a learning and developmental disability as well. For some people, disability means that they can operate out of relatively ordinary housing in mixed communities quite happily but for other people disability means that living in ordinary housing in mixed communities is really difficult. For some people disability means that they receive abuse from other people in the community and that living somewhere where they feel that they are among others who perhaps understand them a little more provides them with security. Please, Deputy Ahier, do correct me if I am wrong but I think that is part of what this is about, enabling people to have an independence of living in a community which can support them and provide them with security. It is interesting, I was reading about assisted-living communities and research about them in Ireland and it is fascinating. "Disability" is a really poor word, it is that simple. "Disability" is a shockingly bad word because it means so, so much that this one word cannot possibly cover everything that it means. In Ireland, in the research I was reading, people are saying: "I want to go out, I want to mix with people, but I am not allowed to. Even though I am an adult, my parents who are caring for me will not let me because they are too worried about me. I want to live on my own but again I cannot because we do not have the facilities to enable that. I do not want to live with my parents anymore. I am a 25 year-old adult and I want to be out in the community living by myself but until we have somewhere where my parents feel that they can enable me to live or allow me to live, I have to stay living with my parents." These are the sorts of responses that I was reading in this Irish research and it really did make me think about how we discuss this. It is really difficult, there is no easy way, do not get me wrong, but because of the word "disability" it feels like we are trying to class everyone into this one idea that perhaps each of us individually has about disabilities. I was really, really lucky. As a youngster I went to Bel Royal School in St. Lawrence; it opened I think the year after I was born so it was a really new school when I started in the reception class there. It is absolutely correct that one of the beauties of going to Bel Royal School was that I was being taught among children with all sorts of challenges which I was fortunate not to share those challenges. We had people who had developmental challenges in terms of learning, we had people with physical challenges and, as a result of that, I hope and I feel like I have grown up much more able to just see people as people regardless of what challenge they may face. I think Bel Royal was amazing for that and this was in the 1970s, so it was a long time ago; it was not all unenlightened back in those days. But there is also a reality that, as well as Bel Royal School, we also had to maintain Mont à l'Alabbé School, which was much more specialised on people who faced different challenges. That is because not everyone could go to Bel Royal School, not everyone could mix in that way, it just was not possible for everyone as well. I think we need to listen to those people who know a little bit more about this than us, and I do believe that the proposer here does know a little bit more about this than I do. When he says this would be a very useful facility in Jersey, I really believe he speaks from a position of an experience that I do not have. Well, I have a little experience through Bel Royal School, et cetera, I am blessed, I am lucky I do not suffer from all these challenges. I just think that rather than us saying: "No, it is not convenient right now. No, it is ghettoisation. No, it is not how I think of disability. It is not how I imagined disability should be dealt with" I think perhaps we just need to listen and think to ourselves: "Perhaps my idea of disability does not encompass what disability means and that this is a really good idea which will help people live more independent lives but in a secure and sheltered way that enables them to do so safely and with confidence."

[15:00]

Because at the end of the day, that is probably what most people want, just the confidence to be able to operate within our community and being able to go to a home that enables them to live either fully independently or assisted but something they can call their home and in which they can mix with other people who perhaps understand them better than I would or you would. It may be a really good thing and quite a step forward for Jersey.

The Connétable of St. Helier:

Sorry, could I raise a point of order? I have been considering your ruling on this matter and it does seem to me that what we are effectively doing is debating the same matter which will fall foul of Standing Order 20. We have effectively debated not developing field 1219 and we are now having a debate about developing it. Perhaps you could advise.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Well, I considered that point specifically in my ruling and we are not considering paragraph (a) but (b), (c) and (d) and my ruling remains the same.

The Connétable of St. Helier:

But we are still debating the development of the field that we just voted on a few minutes ago.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, but for a different purpose. The overall debate, in my judgment, is sufficiently different in its extent so as to not fall foul of that Standing Order.

4.1.7 Deputy I. Gardiner:

One important thing that I agree with the previous speaker, Deputy Morel, is that we need to know what people think. I was very disturbed before we had gone into the break. As you all know, I brought 4 amendments to address and to raise awareness about disability, so now I am grateful to Deputy Ahier to bring this amendment which caught me a bit unprepared because I think we do need to discuss it and it is a really, really important debate. But what I did during the lunch break, I reached out to people from different disability groups to understand their views because I cannot decide for them what is good for them because I do not know, I do not experience it. I cannot tell that I know 100 per cent because most of the people responded to me: "We have not been consulted. We do not know" and also the people who work with disability groups. It is an important point to debate and if I would have probably caught it a bit earlier, I apologise in advance that I did not bring an amendment. One of the things that people raised with me, they said: "It is a really good idea but we would like to have a percentage of the development. Can you bring an amendment that it will be a percentage of the field? Like, from 40 houses, 20 will be and 20 others, to have a mix." I said: "No, I cannot bring an amendment now, this is what we have in front of us" but it has been raised that the preference globally is the percentage of - and I was emailed - developments are accessible; not all disabled people in one area certainly will be something that people will feel strongly about and would like to be involved, people with disabilities, to have any say in where they live and what they look like rather than people talking about how they need to live. Interestingly, it was raised with me also that there are young generations in their 20s that are looking for the community feeling and they will embrace this type of development, maybe not 100 per cent but some of it, to have this community feeling to relate, to understand each other. There are a less younger generation that would like to have families and children and the children do not want to be seen especially from that estate, that it is a disabled-only estate. Again, I would not think about it but it was raised with me and showed me the difference in the age the Deputy completely rightly raised in his report and the Minister addressed its by-laws. Specific examples that I have been given around doorways, currently acceptable standards in Jersey are below best modern practice and guidance. The same with average chair widths without space for your hands on the wheels of a manual chair or space for larger electric chairs or for any other devices that people use, so different medical equipment. So, it is really important that our by-laws will comply with the modern standards, and this is one of the changes that has to be made. Something else was raised with me, it is about the transport. Now apparently it has engaged with LibertyBus as to how many wheelchairs can go on the bus and if, for example, we have people going at 9.00 a.m. from the same place to town and using the bus and will have 5 people who would like to go on the bus with the wheelchair at the same time, it is a challenge. Again, I would not think about it if

somebody did not raise it with me. Apparently, it has been changed. Much more needs to be discussed and sorted to make sure that future homes being considered are going to be right for people and inclusive. Deputy Morel raised some important points, it is not just really the wheelchairs, there are so many different types of disabilities - and I put it in my report - that need to be addressed. I am sure States Members remember the event from late 2021 when David Blunkett spoke about it, the needs, and how disabled people do not have all the same needs. Often people think of ramps and accessible toilets but again we need to understand. My question to the proposer was which disabled groups he consulted, any research any ... I could see what is in the report but it is more than this I think that needs to be done. It is important that we will do it, and it is important because we are having several new developments that we are approving; I would encourage the Minister to include this percentage. I wish I had brought an amendment but I did not. I think it is great that needs are being considered, disabled people need to be part of this discussion about what they need, how they want it and we need to continue to work with our disability strategy group, inclusion group. It is something that is important to discuss but I feel we need to look into all possible angles before we are making blanket decisions.

4.1.8 Deputy K.G. Pamplin of St. Saviour:

I want to start by thanking the Deputy for bringing such a thought-provoking amendment to the proceedings. I think with anybody who is listening who lives with a disability or cares for a disability will be grateful that we are discussing them during this long Island Plan debate. From my experience in working with the charities who support people either with a sudden disability through a head injury or a brain injury it is absolutely life-changing. I have seen families who have to completely change their way of life and dig into all sorts of savings accounts and borrow money with the goodwill of some great charities and also government support to provide the home that they need so they can keep their loved one at home with the family. It is where I want to focus my point, is on the carers. Anybody who knows people who cares for anybody with a severe disability, a physical disability that demands 24-hour care, it is an extraordinary feat of humanity that loved ones go through to keep their loved ones as close by and do all that they can for their loved one. Sometimes they have to make that difficult decision and find a care home so they can get the best care that they now cannot provide. Those moments can be as uplifting, that they know that they are going to get the care that they can, but also difficult to leave them behind. Over the generations and over the years I have come across many people who have had all sorts of experiences in care homes. Or people who have needed accommodation to meet their physicality disabilities or their mental disabilities, as Deputy Morel was quite right to point out. We have come a long way as this Island but we still have got a long way to go. During the last 4 years some of my constituency cases have been helping people who have had their lives changed through disabilities and their accommodation cannot support them any further. It is heart-breaking for carers to know the things that they need they just cannot do. As we all know with the housing crisis, finding suitable accommodation is not easy. There are waiting lists everywhere where everyone looks. But going back to the point of carers. Families, loved ones, husbands, wives who are looking after people with severe physical disabilities who deserve that care, they themselves need support and there is something in this amendment that jumps out at me. That is, whenever I have met or helped people before at my previous works, putting people together with shared experiences, can lean on each other like nobody else can. This will not be for everybody and I think, as Deputy Martin says, we should always strive for equality, but we should also try and provide choice. The mental health and the stress and the strain of anybody caring for anybody with a disability, be that mental or physical, cannot be underestimated. Just imagine what that must be like in an Island with a high cost of living, with people not knowing where their jobs are, going through a global pandemic and the uncertainty that faces all of us. Those people face the challenges that none of us could even possibly imagine but some of us do. The idea that people could live together, support each other strikes me as something that we could strive for. We are starting to see this change of thinking with things like dementia villages, very popular in places like Norway and

Sweden, forward-thinking European countries who are thinking instead of putting our loved ones into homes and places, why do we not create an environment where they have a normal sense of living, where they can see friendly faces, where people can lean on each other for support? There is something in this I think we are striving for and, hearing the Minister for the Environment, I think he senses it also. Many times in this Island Plan we get bogged down in the same rhetoric. This just gives us a little moment to step back and think: “Maybe this is a journey worth pursuing.” Let us talk to the people that everybody is referencing, make sure this is well-communicated, let us go through that journey and let us provide some people with a choice to create an environment on this Island where people can support each other and see each other, not be hidden away anywhere, and give those people the choice as we all strive for better quality. For those carers, the people I meet, I just think this speaks out to them and that is why I wanted to speak out today.

4.1.9 Senator S.C. Ferguson:

This is very interesting because when I first joined the States back in 2002 one of the places we went to look around were Terry Le Main’s new housing flats on the Albert Pier. One of the interesting things there was that they had a sort of largish flat with a number of bedrooms and they had set it aside for a group of people with Down Syndrome. In actual fact we are doing this sort of thing already. It is a bit like what they are planning to do with the hotel that they have just taken over. This is not a new thing but it is perhaps worth checking to see how successful it has been. I have not heard any more about it so I am assuming that it has been very successful, this business about being able to let them take part in the community but also have some sort of care in the community.

[15:15]

So perhaps when the Minister is looking at this, he would like to follow up on this and just see how they are going with their Albert Pier flats.

4.1.10 Senator S.Y. Mézec:

I guess we are lucky that you did make the ruling you did on this because it has at least provided us with what has, I think, been a good opportunity to talk about these issues whichever position you ultimately hold on this amendment. I have listened intently to some of the contributions that have been made. I thought Deputy Gardiner and Deputy Morel, in particular, have made some very good points on this. For what it is worth, the philosophical approach I have on these issues is that I believe that the Government should be doing everything it can to create an environment in our community where everybody can meet their potential and thrive irrespective of their background and in particular irrespective of what disability they may have. Everybody who does have a disability should be able to thrive in our community, have access to the services that anybody else can benefit from and have opportunities to achieve and do what they want in life. When I looked at this amendment for the very first time, I had an inclination towards it because of its clearly good intention but the more I have thought about it the more I have moved away from it. I think that Deputy Ahier has, while he has attempted to do something good, kind of has not really gone far enough with it and has left us with something that it is not really clear ultimately what it would achieve. Deputy Morel in his speech, I picked up that he used the word “facility” a few times to describe what this would be. In actual fact it would not be a facility, from what I can work out in the wording of it and in the report, in that it would be what it says it would be, which is fully accessible homes for people with disabilities. It would not be a centre that provides services that people with disabilities could visit as and when they needed to and receive services, it would simply be where they live. I think that does move away from the thinking that we have been moving towards in recent years about inclusive communities, the aspiration in line with that principle of wanting everybody to reach their potential and thrive in their communities, to be able to offer to people with disabilities in Jersey the opportunity to live where they like and have just as good a chance in life as they would anywhere else. That is good, not just for them, but it is also good for the people who they will live around, because it will be good

for us all to live in neighbourhoods where we have people who live a few doors down who might have a disability and, well, that is just what our communities look like, what our neighbourhoods look like, because everybody is different in them. We get along with one another, we support one another irrespective of these things, and this does kind of move away from that. We have not really been presented with a case from people with disabilities, the people whose voice ought to be most important in something like this, or from the people who care for people with disabilities to say that this is a particular thing which is needed, rather than changes to our health system or changes to laws on access and building standards and that sort of thing. There does not appear to be a groundswell of grass-root support for this sort of thing. So, I then kind of come back to the same points that led me to vote in favour of the Constable of St. Helier's amendment previously, that we would still be taking valuable open greenspace to build houses on without a clear and demonstrable need for what those houses would really be for and where that would sit in the rest of the provision that is provided around the Island. I think in trying to create inclusive communities, it really should be the case that we move towards having all homes being fully accessible for people with disabilities so that if you are in a situation like what Deputy Tadier described, about somebody who lives happily in a home and then has something happen to them in their life that means they become disabled, which could be a very traumatic thing that happens to them to do that, that they would not then also have to go through the trauma of leaving their community and leaving their neighbourhood and moving somewhere else and being around people who they do not know. That they could remain in their home and have all the support that they need and will get closer to that point if from this point we are making sure that we future-proof the homes that we do build and that they can be accessible to anyone. Of course, you may not be a disabled person but want your friends or family who have got disabilities to be able to visit you in your home as well, not have to go to a specific facility or specific site for that. I just wanted to say that I think that the Deputy has clearly set about with good intentions here but I think it might on paper look like a bad thing to vote for something that has good intentions, but I think that we can probably do better than this and try to provide support in other more thought-through ways with consultation and engagement with the people who would be trying to benefit with something like this. So that all thrown in with the fact that it is still building on a green site, I would urge Members to oppose this amendment.

4.1.11 Deputy R.J. Renouf of St. Ouen:

I am pleased we are having this debate. I had not really expected it so I have been trying to marshal my thoughts and to calculate how I can respond because it is very clear that we do need to create homes which provide for the independence of people as they grow more frail or develop disabilities, and we should not rely on an institutional care sector when those people can still be sustained in their own home. Modern homes should do this, as the Minister said. Those built from, is it 2007, should be built with the building control requirements that would normally allow that to happen. So, I began by approaching this debate by thinking: "Well, this happens already, you do not need to designate a site specially for people with disabilities because we are building homes that would allow for that. Why should people with disabilities be housed together and not as part of our whole community?" So there is that side of it but thinking it further, sometimes extra facilities are needed in a home to accommodate well a person with disabilities. For example, Health and Community Services cares for a number of individuals with severe neurodevelopmental needs. They live in their own homes but we provide staff to take care of their needs. So that means that the individual needs all their living space but in addition staff - which can be a team; it is usually a team, not just one person - need some space for themselves and they need some space just to do the routine admin. The homes need to often have specialised alarm systems or adapted garden areas and outside space too because there is often an adapted vehicle parked at the property but there is also staff coming and going. So that needs to be something more than just a standard home, if there is such a thing. That wonderful charitable organisation Les Amis have a number of group homes in which they accommodate people with learning disabilities, many of whom love living in community with each other. Those are very

successful group homes but there are not many that are immediately available because if you take a home that was built, certainly before 2007, it would need heavy adaptation in most cases because those group homes are regulated by the Care Commission. There are all sorts of hoops to jump through, such as corridors need to be a certain width, doorways, all those sort of regulations to be passed as appropriate and safe to operate as a care facility which is also a home. So, it is difficult for Les Amis I know to find accommodation like that which does not need considerable adaptation. Then I think it was Deputy Pamplin who has spoken about the concept of dementia villages, which we are beginning to talk about in Jersey. They have been successful it seems in some European countries. I think we have got to work out in Jersey whether that is a path we want to take. Some people see disadvantages in it, that we are building a dementia strategy which should help us think through this area, but it may be that this amendment could fit for a dementia village. It is just that more work needs to be done to think this through. I think there are still lots of consideration that is needed but I thank Deputy Ahier for giving this impetus to the thinking. I would urge him to consult further with the Minister for Social Security who heads the disability strategy. I am sorry I had not understood the import of this amendment and come to speak with him before but I would be very willing to have that discussion. But meanwhile I think it is worthwhile supporting this amendment and reserving this site for, it is not yet too precise exactly what the need may be, but I discern that there is need there and it may well be appropriate to allocate a specific site; therefore, I will be pleased to support this amendment.

4.1.12 Connétable R.A. Buchanan of St. Ouen:

Firstly, I was pleased to hear the speech from Deputy Pamplin who always speaks well when he is talking about those people who are disadvantaged in life and who need an extra hand up. Indeed, in St. Ouen we, with our homes for the elderly, do our very best to accommodate people who need help in terms of disabilities and we like to think that we do our best for them. I think generally as an Island we are not that good about recognising people with disabilities. Having lost 2 parents to dementia, I am aware that the care that is available is at best patchy. It is not due to the lack of care from the people who provide it but it is just that we are not particularly well co-ordinated in that respect. On the face of it, Deputy Ahier's proposition has a lot of merit but I have to say, in my mind, there are 2 bars to me voting for this. Firstly, it is in St. Helier and, as I think is generally agreed, St. Helier has probably taken as much development as it can cope with. Although I have not agreed with the Constable of St. Helier on many things, on this particular point he and I are at one. I think the same goes for St. Clement and indeed St. Saviour. There is a limit to how much development you can put into any Parish while preserving the character of that Parish, and I think St. Helier has really reached the end of that limit. My final point for not voting for this proposition is of course the J.F.U. (Jersey Farmers' Union) report which quite clearly says that this field is a last resort and is good for agriculture. Now the Assembly has applied that principle when considering other sites and I suspect this applied to my site in St. Ouen where one could equally well argue that there were young people on my list who were perhaps poorly housed with a family who are desperate to get out of their situation and buy a first-time buyer's home.

[15:30]

So, although it is not a direct comparison, they would equally feel as upset at the loss of potential building sites as those people who are disabled who would like to move to this facility would. In conclusion, I feel that while my heart says this is a great proposal and should be supported, this is a planning debate and from a planning perspective it does not stack up because (a) it is in St. Helier and (b) the J.F.U. have made it very plain that this field is good for agriculture. It has been quite clear from the voting pattern so far that any field that is good for agriculture is not going to be supported by this Assembly. So, sadly I will not be able to support the proposal.

4.1.13 Senator S.W. Pallett:

I was not intending to speak in this debate, although I have spoken to Deputy Ahier about this issue, and I am supportive of what he is trying to do but there are a couple of issues here. There are 2 main issues here: one is the loss of the field and the field to agriculture and then there is the issue itself that is around providing disabled accommodation, and I really want to speak on the second part of that. Anybody that knows me knows I am a fairly private person and I very rarely speak about my family in public but I am going to do it today; I am going to make the one exception in the 10½ years I have been in the States. I think I have talked about my dog once but that is about the only time I have spoken about anything in terms of my private life. There has been a lot of comment around consultation with those that are disabled and those that maybe have experience of caring for a disabled person or maybe having a disability themselves. I want to talk a little bit about my own personal experience of which probably very few Members know, but I think it is important as I talk about why I believe this is an important amendment and an amendment that needs to be supported. My oldest son was 40 last week but he was born with a whole range of disabilities and it was a really frightening experience to go through at the time, one that we both weathered the storm, and we have had 2 other children as well. But my oldest son, I am going to name him because I think most people would know Ryan, especially those that have been in the care sector, he was an amazing young child but had a lot of issues that he had to get over all through his life, but those disabilities not only just affected him, it affected his siblings and it obviously affected us as parents. There were all sorts of attempts to school him here and look after him here. He attended school in the U.K. for a short period of time. He went to a Royal National Institute for the Blind school in the U.K. but it did not suit him because he missed his family, we missed him, and it was too far to travel on a regular basis and he came back. Fortunately, from a schooling point of view, we had Mont à l'Abbé and Mont a l'Abbé was a quite incredible place for him to go to school. He made an awful lot of friends. It was a great opportunity to see him engage with and make friends with other people with disabilities; all sorts of disabilities. When people say there are all sorts of disability, there are. Whether it is fortunate or not - but I think it is fortunate - I had the opportunity to go to Great Ormond Street several times. It is only when you go to somewhere like Great Ormond Street you realise how lucky you are and how unfortunate other people are because there are some quite awful disabilities that young people are born with and have to live the whole of their lives. Trying to find the right place for them is quite often extremely difficult. As time went on, it was becoming clear that Ryan needed the sort of care that it was very difficult for either of us or both of us together to be able to provide. Fortunately, in this Island we have probably, well, without doubt, the most caring community probably in the British Isles. We have an incredible third sector and part of that third sector is Les Amis - and the Deputy of St. Ouen just mentioned Les Amis - who do an incredible amount of work caring for young people and adults with a range of disabilities, not only just caring for them, but ensuring that they have a social life, that they have a normal a life as possible. As the Deputy of St. Ouen said, they provide a number of facilities, many of which are becoming dated, need investment, and I think it is absolutely incredible that Les Amis embarked on this journey in buying and refurbishing the Hampshire Hotel to provide accommodation for adults with all sorts of disabilities that will be able to live together, engage together, live in a community together. If anybody thinks that is the wrong thing to do, then I suggest you go and visit one of Les Amis' residential homes and you will realise what a vibrant place they are, what an enjoyable place they are to live, and how important that contact with others, sometimes with similar disabilities but not always, how well they get on together and what an enjoyable life they lead. We are going to have to show some support for Les Amis; they are going through a difficult time. That is not for today and it is not for debate today but nevertheless we are going to have to support them at some point because they provide a service second to none and we cannot afford to lose them in any way, shape or form and we do need to show our support for them. Moving on to this particular field, a lot of Members have said this amendment is full of good intentions. It is not full of good intentions, it is full of the right intentions, the right intentions to provide hopefully the right type of accommodation for those that have got a range of disabilities. As

I have said, there is nothing wrong with people that have got a range of disabilities living together. In terms of support it makes it much easier to some degree. We will carry on having problems and issues around getting enough care staff to be able to care for those that need it. It will not be just around disabilities, it will be around dementia and old age and just frailty and all the things that I have got to look forward to in my next hopefully 20 or 30 years, if I live that long. But let us not forget those that are in need of accommodation. There is a shortage, of that I have absolutely no doubt. Members will have to decide whether this is the right site for it but seeing where it is, I am quite comfortable that it can accommodate what it says it needs to do. I have a lot of sympathy for the Constable of St. Helier and his Deputies because St. Helier have taken the brunt of building and continue to over the next Assembly and probably onwards after that, but this is the right thing to do. I applaud Deputy Ahier for bringing this. I apologise for going and talking about my own personal experiences but it is important Members hear from somebody that has been through the journey. It has been an experience but we will come out of it, including Ryan, leading I think enjoyable lives. Ryan is an incredible young man who carries on surprising people, sometimes in the wrong ways, but generally in the right ways. We need to provide more accommodation for people like Ryan and his friends and others in the community that are going to need care over the decades to come. Care in the community is important, I do not want to play that down, but there are some that are simply too difficult to care for in the community and it makes much more sense to provide care in a sheltered environment where care can be offered in a much more holistic way and in a more efficient way as well. Not that that is the be-all and end-all, because it is not just about efficiency, it should be about providing the right care, but nevertheless this is the right thing to do. I implore Members to vote for this amendment because if we can do one thing, let us think of others that are less well-off than us. Just for once think about them and do something for them.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Connétable of St. Brelade, was that a point of clarification in relation to the speech made by Senator Pallett?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Yes, it was, if I may; I just wanted to understand. Senator Pallett I do not think picked up the point that had been made by previous speakers about the formation of a ghetto. I was not clear in his speech if he had alluded to that and what his thoughts were on that.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Well not just a point of clarification, that is asking him for an opinion on a matter that he may not have addressed, so I am not going to allow that point of clarification.

4.1.14 Deputy M.R. Higgins:

In the previous amendment I supported the Constable of St. Helier and the reason why I did was I felt that we have already got too many houses in this area and because especially of the impact on traffic on the existing road network. It is going to be exacerbated with the new hospital at Overdale. However, Deputy Ahier's amendment has much to commend it. I feel that we have failed the disabled in the past, and their carers, and I am aware of a number of people with disabilities, including a number of autistic children, who would thrive in this type of accommodation. I for one do not accept that it needs to be a ghetto. It is how it is implemented later and done but I believe that this location could be an ideal centre to deal with something that is much-needed. Now the youth and composition of these units and mix of disabilities that can be helped in this location can be looked at later. For those who suggest that we should wait longer is to kick the issue further down the road. Now we are all within 4 months of an election and not one of us in the Assembly, with the exception of perhaps the Constables, can guarantee they are going to be re-elected. Therefore, let us make a stand for the disabled and approve this proposition now. The exact details of specific provisions can be dealt with

by those who are in the Assembly after the election and all the consultation and engagement with all the various bodies can be done then. This development will not happen overnight, there is time for us to do it but let us designate this field for this use. Now for those who have mentioned that they do not want to lose agricultural land, I feel very similarly. I have voted in this sitting so far to save agricultural land. Now, what I would rather say on this particular issue is I put the less-advantaged in our society above land and I do not care if it is scrubland, agricultural land or whatever. We have a responsibility to our fellow citizens, especially those who are less-advantaged than we are. I really do believe that we should support Deputy Ahier's proposition, not kick it down the road, let us get it and agree the site and all the details can come later.

4.1.15 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:

I am pleased to follow Deputy Higgins and applaud his sentiment. I also applaud Senator Pallett for speaking about his personal experience, which cannot have been easy. The Deputy of St. Ouen, who also has experience, spoke very eloquently that there is indeed a need.

[15:45]

Something he said reminded me of growing up and my father helping to set up Maison des Landes and taking us to visit when I was at school. This is a specialist accessible hotel for those who, for whatever reason, find it far more accessible than other hotels. This is a different hotel but it is still inclusive and this would be a different housing situation but in its own way would be very inclusive. As we all know, there are so many different types of disability and some, sadly, need much more support than others. I see this as growing into a wonderful supportive community for those who really need it and I echo very much what Deputy Morel and Deputy Pamplin said so eloquently. I am certain that the proposer, Deputy Ahier, knows so much more about disability than most of us here sitting in this Assembly today and thus I really implore people to support Deputy Ahier.

The Connétable of St. Helier:

Yes, I did have my light on earlier but I think you missed it.

The Deputy Bailiff:

I saw it; I thought it was related to the point of order so I do apologise.

4.1.16 The Connétable of St. Helier:

No, the point of order has been lost and I am effectively having to, I am afraid, bore Members with the same speech I made a couple of hours ago. We have heard some wonderful speeches about the need for disabled fully-accessible accommodation and, as I said in my earlier speech, I thought we had already agreed that. But, like so much of what we agreed in the last Island Plan, it did not seem to make any difference but there we are. For the first time in my time in the States I am having to effectively fight the same battle twice which is, well it is novel, if nothing else. This is a debate about taking a field out of agriculture, it is not a debate about whether we should create an estate of fully-accessible homes. As I said, I am going to have to make the same speech I made before. This time of course I can include the section I left out before about Deputy Ahier; I was being nice to him. Deputy Ahier is a member of the St. Helier Deputy Group and we meet every month and we never had any indication that this amendment was going to come through. As I said in my first speech, to which I will allude more than once, we have open meetings of the St. Helier Roads Committee. The Roads Committee went out last summer and visited this field and were of the view that it should not be developed. Deputy Ahier was aware of that because, I must say, he is one of the most frequent attenders of our open meetings of the Roads Committee and I commend him for that even though, I have to say, that if he continues to attend the Roads Committee he may not get such a warm welcome as he had in previous months. That is supposed to be a joke, I am waiting for a little titter. It is, as I say, I think rather sad that we have, not just Deputy Ahier now, but clearly Deputy Higgins as well is going to go against the elected Roads Committee and their recommendation that St. Helier really

has lost enough of its agricultural fields and urban sprawl needs to be stopped and it needs to be stopped today. I mentioned earlier that my views about developing green fields have changed. Last time around, I was bitterly opposed to the loss of the field opposite the Trinity Pub with its sweeping views down from one of the highest points of the Island towards the south coast. I voted against it but now I recognise that that field in Trinity is an important part of what makes the village of Trinity work. It supports the shop, it supports the pub, it supports the church, even though I am not a churchgoer and do not go there very much. I hope Members are impressed with my ability to remember what I said before without any notes. I support the Parish Constables' wish to develop fields in their Parish hearts in order to sustain their Parishes and keep that Parish identity alive and that is why I have already indicated to my fellow Constables that I will be supporting their request for greenfield development where it is in the heart of the Parish. But I will not be supporting them when they are in far-flung areas which remain good agricultural fields, and I hope that may help to bring some of the Constables back on my side. As has been mentioned by many Members, and I am grateful to Senator Pallett, for example, for his sympathy, although sympathy is not going to help the oak tree which I referred to earlier when I read out from a parishioner's email concerned about the ecological damage that development of this field will create. St. Helier is taking the burden of housing for the Island, and St. Helier is doing that for very good reasons, because it protects the Island that St. Helier residents hold dear. It protects the countryside, it protects the coastline, it keeps it in good condition for us as townees to visit in the evenings and at weekends. St. Helier of course also benefits from people living in town, people choosing to bring up families in town as I have done because that is good for town. People are the lifeblood of a growing town and it means that particularly in the evenings when in the past we have seen a mass migration out into the countryside that in the future, as more people choose to live in St. Helier, town is going to become a really good place to live at all times of the day and night and at weekends. I am not going to embark on a long description of why I believe that urban dwelling is so important, but clearly it is sustainable. It means that people do not have to use their car for those journeys such as going to work and taking the children to school. That is why, of course, this field at the top of the Queen's Road, and Deputy Tadier made this point very well, it is really unsustainable because the only way the residents of this housing estate, if it is built, are going to be able to access services is by getting in their car and joining the gridlock on Queen's Road. It is simply not the place to be doing this. I would far rather see an amendment to the Island Plan - of course, it is in the previous Island Plan but we will pass on that - a commitment by this Assembly that every house that is built as a result of rezoning will be fully accessible for disabled use; job done. That gives us what we all want. It gives us fully disabled accessible homes, but it does not take away a field that has been marked as an important one for agriculture. It does not threaten the ecological value of this field. It does not take away a field of strategic importance for Haute Vallée School in the future. I think I have made more or less the same speech as I made before. I do not know if it is any better or any worse. The last debate was only won by one vote and I realise that is an uphill struggle, but I would urge Members to remember that if there is one field on this whole list that they should be protecting, it is the last field in St. Helier, field 1219, and I urge Members to reject the amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Connétable. Does any Member wish to speak on the amendment? I call upon Deputy Ahier to reply.

4.1.17 Deputy S.M. Ahier:

I thank all Members for their participation in the debate. I will just talk as briefly as possible about some of the comments made. The Deputy of St. Mary was concerned about isolation. It is unfortunately easy to be isolated when you are surrounded by able-bodied people, as it is when you are in a site where a lot of other people with other disabilities are situated. I know there were similar comments from Deputy Ward, but he did mention that there is a need and that there should not be

obstacles put in the way. He also said that it was a good idea in many ways but he was concerned about excluding people rather than being inclusive, and I do not believe that that is the objective of this amendment. Indeed, it is to be more inclusive and to give people more opportunity and more choice, which has been mentioned a few times. Of course, people with disabilities may not be excluded if they are still living with their families, so I would imagine that this site would be allocated to a number of families with children who have disabilities. As we said, there will be easy accessibility to Mont à L'Abbé School. Deputy Martin was mentioning about a lot of new properties having wet rooms and suchlike and that that should be suitable enough for some disabilities and, indeed, that is the case, but there are plenty of other people with disabilities who need serious structural rearrangements of those buildings. So, if we were building them from scratch they would be much more accessible to certain members of our community. Of course, the mention of carers sleeping over and having extra rooms, which would obviously be a necessity, but there may be a possibility of having staff permanently at the site, which would also assist with any need for emergencies. The proximity to the new hospital would be an advantage as well if, of course, it goes ahead, although Deputy Martin was very much against this proposal. The Minister mentioned about supported housing and that there is little flexibility in residential care homes, which is true, and that they are 90 per cent full, which is true, but again we have too many people in care homes and that needs to be changed. Obviously, people may well cope better in these new homes if they were built. He also mentioned existing buildings being adapted, but if you try to widen doors, widen corridors, install hoists and lifts and various other factors, it becomes a very expensive task and often one that cannot be achieved. Deputy Tadier mentioned old age creeping in. Obviously, this would not be solely for the elderly. In fact, I was presuming more that it would be for young people with families or, as was mentioned by another Member, it would be for young people who are disabled but want to leave their home to live independently. He was also concerned about it being the wrong site, but unfortunately there is no centre town availability for building a site in the middle of town close to all other amenities. He was concerned about consultation with disability groups. Well, aside from the disability groups that I am a member of, I have not had any other consultation. But this is all about choice for the individuals. If people do not wish to move to the new homes, if they are built, obviously they do not have to. It is totally unnecessary. Then we came to Deputy Morel, who gave an exceptional speech. He was mentioning about the over-55s building sites, which obviously we voted in yesterday at St. John, but we did not mention that they were going to be isolated in any sense. He also mentioned that some people with disabilities can obviously receive abuse. That is unfortunately a part of life and that may not be the case if they had a secure environment to live in. Allowing more people to lead independent lives, I think that is something that we would all vote for. Deputy Gardiner again was talking about we are not deciding what is good for them ... she wanted to know why people would be placed there. We are not placing anybody there. Obviously, it would be up to them to choose, and she suggested that she would have brought an amendment to only allow 50 per cent of disabled homes. Well, I can assure the Deputy that there is a demand, a great demand. If these homes are built, there will be a great demand and 100 per cent is absolutely necessary.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

A point of clarification, Sir?

The Deputy Bailiff:

A point of clarification. Are you prepared to give way?

Deputy S.M. Ahier:

Sorry, Sir, no, not at the moment. She also mentioned buses for the disabled. Well, there is already a project under way ...

[16:00]

The Deputy Bailiff:

There is a point of order now from Deputy Gardiner. A point of order?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

I stated in my speech that I do not know if it is 20, 50, and if it is in one or several developments. I did not suggest that we need to specifically do this.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, but you have dressed up a point of clarification as a point of order. Yes, please, Deputy Ahier.

Deputy S.M. Ahier:

Yes, she mentioned buses and the possibility of having too many disabled people getting on the buses. Obviously, put on more buses, as Deputy Ward would say. There is a project which is being progressed, which was raised at the Disability and Inclusion Advisory Group, to put all the small transportation vehicles that are available, try and collectively put them together and have a facility whereby people could phone up for this transport service and they would come straight to the door. So hopefully that will be in by the end of the year. Deputy Pamplin spoke about funding suitable accommodation, which is obviously not easy and that is what we are trying to address here. Of course, he mentioned that carers need greater support, which is something that we all understand but, of course, it is very difficult to get staff at the moment, a problem which is affecting all sectors. Senator Ferguson mentioned about the Hampshire Hotel revamp, as did Senator Pallett, and the wonderful work they are doing at Maison Les Amis. I believe they are looking for extra funding. I understand that they are short by a couple of million pounds to continue with the development, but hopefully that will be achievable. Of course, that will be solely for people with autism, so when people say that there is a degree of isolation, that is not necessarily the case and it has been very well encouraged and very well received. Senator Mézec was not clear what it would achieve. Well, I would say that it would stop institutionalisation, which is something that we want to avoid. There is no groundswell of support for this? I suppose once it is built you will realise the level of support but, of course, that is dependent on data, which is something that I will go into later. He also mentioned that all homes should be fully accessible, which I absolutely agree with, that is entirely right, but there is a good deal of cost there if you are adapting properties. The Deputy of St. Ouen started by talking about when people grow old, and obviously he mentioned the dementia village. This site would certainly not prevent people with dementia living there but I was hoping that, as I said previously, it would be for younger people and people with families. He also mentioned that extra facilities are needed, which I think is something that we can all accept. The Constable of St. Ouen, I understand his objections and it is very good that a Constable not from our Parish is concerned about overdevelopment in St. Helier, which is obviously very useful. Unfortunately, he said he cannot support me at this time. Then Senator Pallett gave a very emotive speech saying that this was from the right intentions. I thank him for that. Deputy Higgins said that this was something that is much needed and let us make a stand for the disabled, sentiments which I completely concur with. The Constable of St. Martin said that it was a wonderful, supportive community that could be created and I do tend to agree with her. Finally, of course, my Constable, who is doing his absolute best to protect agricultural fields from development. In the Minister's comments, he mentioned that there is insufficient data to know how many homes would be required for this purpose. There is a huge data gap locally when it comes to how many units would need to be built now to support the future needs of disabled children who would prefer to live at home or whose families would want them to remain at home for as long as possible. There is likewise no publicly available data on how many disabled people in Jersey are living in institutional settings because of a lack of specialist housing. It is not for politicians to provide this information. Rather, if the provision of this housing must be dependent on a needs assessment, then it is for the Government to order such an assessment. For the purposes of this amendment it should be assumed that any assessment undertaken will uncover a need for

proportionate provision of housing. The Minister accepts that more needs to be done to understand the housing needs of disabled Islanders. There are clearly 3 compelling reasons to set aside housing specifically for disabled people because the Island-wide housing shortage, acknowledged by the Island Plan, will more severely impact people with disabilities, because the needs of people with disabilities must and should be correctly prioritised by this Government, and because the Government has a responsibility to ensure equal access to housing and suitable social outcomes for people with disabilities as enshrined in the bridging Island Plan. I maintain the amendment and call for the appel.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy. The *appel* has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. Those joining the meeting by the Teams link are invited to cast their votes in the chat channel. I ask the Greffier to open the voting for Members in the Chamber. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the amendment has been adopted.

POUR: 28	CONTRE: 10	ABSTAIN: 1
Senator I.J. Gorst	Senator S.Y. Mézec	Connétable of St. Ouen
Senator L.J. Farnham	Connétable of St. Helier	
Senator S.C. Ferguson	Connétable of St. Saviour	
Senator K.L. Moore	Connétable of St. Brelade	
Senator S.W. Pallett	Deputy J.A. Martin (H)	
Connétable of Grouville	Deputy G.P. Southern (H)	
Connétable of St. Peter	Deputy M. Tadier (B)	
Connétable of St. Mary	Deputy of St. Mary	
Connétable of St. Martin	Deputy R.J. Ward (H)	
Connétable of St. John	Deputy I. Gardiner (H)	
Deputy of Grouville		
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)		
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)		
Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)		
Deputy of St. Martin		
Deputy of St. Ouen		
Deputy R. Labey (H)		
Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)		
Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)		
Deputy J.H. Young (B)		
Deputy L.B. Ash (C)		
Deputy K.F. Morel (L)		
Deputy G.C.U. Guida (L)		
Deputy of Trinity		
Deputy of St. John		
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)		
Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)		
Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)		

5. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - sixteenth amendment: Field MN410, St. Martin (P.36/2021 Amd.(16))

The Deputy Bailiff:

The next amendment is the 16th, lodged by the Deputy of St. Martin, and I ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

After the words “the draft Island Plan 2022-25” insert the words: “except that – (a) the following should be removed from the list of sites to be zoned for affordable homes in Policy H5 – Provision of affordable homes – 2. Field MN410 St. Martin (0.75 hectares/4.2 vergées); (b) within Policy H6 – ‘Supported housing’, after the words “proposals for the development of supported homes including,” there should be inserted the words “age-restricted homes (for people over 55),”; (c) within Policy H6, after the first paragraph there should be inserted the following new paragraph – “To support the provision of homes that help meet the needs of an ageing society the following sites are specifically zoned for the provision of age-restricted over-55 homes, and their development for any other use will not be supported: 1. Field MN410, La Rue des Buttes St Martin (0.75 hectares/4.2 vergées), to provide retirement homes for rent and purchase, to be administered by the Sir David Kirch Charitable Trust in conjunction with the Parish of St Martin.”; (d) the draft Island Plan 2022-25 should be further amended in such respects as may be necessary consequent upon the adoption of (a), (b) and (c); and (e) the Draft Bridging Island Plan Proposals Map Part A – Planning Zones should be amended to reflect the adoption of (a), (b) and (c).”

5.1 Deputy S.G. Luce of St. Martin:

As Members will see from the Order Paper, it is my intention to withdraw this amendment, but I just want to say a few words first. That may be why there are so few of us in the Chamber at the moment. I just want to say to Members that field 410 in St. Martin has been a field that has been up for development for many decades now, but a more recent change of ownership has led to a new initiative to attempt to develop this field. Initially, we had plans for a Parish-led retirement scheme on the site, but following the independent inspector’s report and the Minister’s initiative it has now also been brought forward as a site for affordable homes. To be clear, St. Martin as a Parish takes its responsibility for the whole of the Island and to the whole of the Island seriously. We want to do more for housing. We want to do our bit and we want to do what is right. We can if we move retirement homes to other sites do both here, retirement and affordable. The Parish has a clear and present need for retirement homes, but there is also a desperate need, as we know, for affordable family homes, homes for people to live in for their lives. We recognise that housing is probably the most discussed subject among Islanders at the moment and we realise here that we have an opportunity, as I have just said, to do both. So I will later in this debate come back to the Assembly with an amendment for retirement homes, but in order to clear the way and provide some affordable homes in St. Martin that are desperately needed, I now withdraw this proposition.

6. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - second amendment: Removal of St. Saviour Fields (P.36/2021 Amd.(2))

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy. The next is the 2nd amendment, lodged by Deputy Lewis, and I ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

After the words “the draft Island Plan 2022-25” insert the words “except that – (a) the following should be removed from the list of sites to be zoned for affordable homes at Policy H5 – Provision

of affordable homes – (i) 10. Field S413 St. Saviour (0.70 hectares/3.9 vergées); 11. Field S415 St. Saviour (0.45 hectares/2.5 vergées); (ii) 14. Field S530 St. Saviour (0.80 hectares/4.4 vergées).

[16:15]

(iii) 15. Field S729 St. Saviour (0.45 hectares/2.5 vergées); (b) the draft Island Plan 2022-25 should be further amended in such respects as may be necessary consequent upon the adoption of paragraph (a); and (c) the Draft Bridging Island Plan Proposals Map Part A – Planning Zones should be amended to reflect the adoption of paragraph (a).”.

6.1 Deputy K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:

The Parish of St. Saviour is already heavily built up and suffers from increasing levels of traffic. With 11 schools in and around the Parish, the morning rush hour is already causing bumper to bumper traffic, especially in the area around the Five Oaks roundabout. With a large development listed just north of the roundabout and the old St. Saviour’s Hospital due for redevelopment, in the not-too-distant future this part of St. Saviour will grind to a halt. Fields 470, S413, S415 and S415A: this site would be an extension to the Les Cinq Chênes estate. The area to the west of the site of the old *Jersey Evening Post* building is already being redeveloped. On the main road this would lead south to the overloaded Five Oaks roundabout. On top of this, we have Les Cinq Chênes being redeveloped in the not-too-distant future and there is no mention of this in the bridging Island Plan. This is all within one square mile of the fields highlighted for development. I am not just being N.I.M.B.Y., I know we need more housing for first-time buyers, but just leave us field S413 and S415 undeveloped on this site. Using all the fields here would still produce 68 to 102 houses. St. Saviour’s Hospital in the future will also provide another 200 homes, again not covered in the plan. Field S530, behind Le Clos Paumelle, this field should be removed altogether from the schedule for affordable housing. It represents a green lung in St. Saviour with a single-track access, which exits on to Princes Tower Road to the Five Oaks roundabout. Both field and valley have historic importance to the green infrastructure of the area, the amendment we have seen on map 2 and map 4. The site is listed as providing between 60 to 90 houses. The proposed access would be down a narrow lane, which would be intolerable for residents and would destroy this unique field and valley. There is a brook that runs through this meadow towards Swiss Valley, which in turn runs all the way down to the rear of Longueville Manor. This field, S530, must be preserved as a valuable branch of Swiss Valley. I will just do a few illustrations. I would mention there is a single-track access to Princes Tower Road and to the Five Oaks roundabout. The access on the right, looking east of the lamppost, during the morning peak traffic, queues build up to a point past the access to St. Michael’s School, where drop-offs add to the congestion. The additional traffic movements arising from a further 45-plus family dwellings would simply worsen an already unacceptable situation in the area. On potentially exiting this particular site and turning left towards the Five Oaks roundabout, I did send Members an email earlier on with maps and pictures of the area. If one goes as far as the crossing on the left, there is insufficient room for anyone to pass and there is no room to put in additional pavements. There is a small paved area there. In fact, if Members would touch their thumbs together and splay their hands, that would be the width of the pavement in the area. I have mentioned this to the Minister for the Environment, who says he may be able to find alternate routes, but people are like water, they will find the shortest route to wherever they are going. Also, if one approaches the Five Oaks roundabout on Bagatelle Road, directly to the left there are 4 cottages plus one further down. We have had to install what we call orcas in the area. Orcas are a thick slab of rubber painted black and white which deflect the vehicles from taking away the drainpipes from the buildings as they pass. There is nowhere to go and we cannot widen the road any more. I ask Members to reject the 2 sites for affordable housing to prevent St. Saviour from developing in an unsustainable manner. It should also be noted that development of affordable housing on these sites, without the necessary infrastructure to provide safe travel for children to school, would cause road safety issues and further difficulties for all children accessing the school in the area. My Department of Infrastructure have

been working with the Parish of St. Saviour to provide as many safer routes to school as we can but are being hampered by overpopulation and traffic. St. Saviour has taken the brunt of much of the Island's housing in recent years. For the last 10 years I have been maintaining the clock and chiming bells of St. Saviour's Church. From the top of the tower I always take 5 minutes out to admire the wonderful view over the Parish and it never ceases to shock me to look out at the Parish and see the building and infilling that has taken place and to see all the fields that have disappeared. There has been so much infilling of late that many people do not know where St. Helier ends and St. Saviour begins. If the good people of Jersey have the new telephone directory handy, 2021-22, the map on pages 73 and 75 has most of the Parish of St. Saviour with "St. Helier" stamped on it in big black letters right across it. Even the Planning Department are referring to it now as "greater St. Helier". Not while I am still a Member. I make the amendment and look forward to Members' comments.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy. Is the amendment seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the amendment?

6.1.1 Deputy K.G. Pamplin:

I thought I would get in to support my fellow Deputy. There is a bit of an echo here. I will just turn down my speaker just in case. Yes, no surprise a St. Saviour Deputy getting up to talk and support his fellow Deputy in this proposition, this amendment. So far, of course, we have heard a great deal of other parts of the Island, St. Brelade for a few days, St. John and now St. Helier, and now St. Saviour, the peril, I guess, of doing the process this way. However, this is really important because, as the Deputy just said, there can be no doubt whatsoever that St. Saviour has helped the Island so much over time with providing all sorts of accommodation. Of course, we could always do more and we will always try and do more, but anybody who travels to any one of the schools, the private school, secondary schools, the colleges, or even comes into work, goes through some of the main arteries of this Island and that is into St. Saviour. We all know the roads I am talking about here, and especially, as the Deputy alludes to, Five Oaks. The Island, as well as increasing and helping and supporting the Island needs in terms of housing, houses the Island's colleges, secondary schools and primary schools. I want to particularly focus on the primary schools because this is an issue I am sure I will come forward and talk about again. We have a problem, as everybody else but especially in our Parish, with the burden of providing school spaces for families in the Parish. But equally some of the primary schools in our Parish have some of the most dangerous roads right outside of them. I am thinking of 3 particularly in the district I represent currently, before we all support in the next election the entire Parish, but particularly in my district I am thinking about St. Luke's, I am thinking about Plat Douet. Equally, the St. Saviour primary school just up the road, closer to Five Oaks. I went on a walk with some of the teachers and some of the parents and did the morning walk to school one morning. We did it from both ends. Seeing the amount of traffic flow come through and cars coming up Les Varines on that crossroad - I am sure we have all been there at some stage - you are seeing young families having to step on to the road and having to really hurry on to the other side of the road. We are seeing that down in St Luke's as well and other parts of the Island. I know other primary schools across the Island probably have the same problem. This is an issue and I do not want it to become a Parish versus Parish issue but we cannot deny it. This part of the Island has taken more than its fair share. I do worry about the quality of life for people in the area. Les Cinq Chênes is due to be expanded. We can see the work that is going on in the former newspaper site as well. It is an ever-growing and populated area. But I think this particular ... and the Deputy spoke really well about the green lungs in the Parish. We hear a lot about this in St. Helier as well. This issue that is creeping out about St. Saviour being greater St. Helier is concerning because all I have heard over the last 4 years of being a privileged Member of this Assembly is everybody worried about the loss of Parish identity, the loss of the Parish through ... when we go back a couple of years and we were debating elections and the loss of the Constables, we were all talking about the concern. Well, when

I start to read and hear these things about St. Saviour being greater St. Helier, they are our great neighbours and obviously it is very urban and very populated, but this is one of the moments as an Assembly we can see the issues growing here. We have to make tough choices. I have been making tough choices. You will see my voting record. But I think the obvious answer is right here in front of us. I look forward, as ever, to hearing the Minister for the Environment, who so far I give him a lot of credit for doing this. It cannot be easy, but I really hope Members will support us in this.

6.1.2 Connétable S.A. Le Sueur-Rennard of St. Saviour:

This is very sad and I do hope that most of the Members in the Assembly will support the Parish of St. Saviour and allow these fields to be withdrawn. St. Saviour is at saturation point. We have nearly all the schools so the traffic is so heavy at times that the parishioners cannot even open their windows because of the exhaust fumes. They are the ones, my ratepayers, who are paying to keep the Parish in good order. Let me start with field 530 and 530A. It is a beautiful meadow. If you pass there now, you will see there are cows grazing in it. There are bales of silage which have been made and they are stored in the field. I was talking to people who live and overlook it and they have had some potatoes growing in it. It is absolutely fabulous. The entrance to the field is very, very narrow and there are rumours that this field is obviously going to have to be filled in to make it okay to build on. So, the people who are already established in these houses that the track runs down are going to have lorries rumbling up and down, up and down, throwing waste in, heaven knows what, and they are going to have the houses covered in dust. Again, the other side are going to have their houses covered in dust. It is totally unnecessary. This is an absolutely wonderful meadow. It has all sorts in it. It has the stream, as we have already heard. It has a lot of diversity in it, a lot of animals and bits and pieces. I have spoken to a family member and although the people are wanting to sell, they quite understand that there would be difficulties in building and I think they have been thinking again about having it all filled in. You do not fill in a beautiful meadow like there is there. So I would like the Assembly to think very, very hard about this. Like you have already heard, when you come out of that road you are going to go to the left-hand side out of Welton Farm that was, you are going to hit the roundabout and the Morrisons supermarket - and I know there are other supermarkets - and you are going to be in a bit of a quandary.

[16:30]

So I reiterate that this beautiful green lung is everything that is needed in built-up St. Saviour because we need land. Once land is gone, it is gone. It is cemented and concreted over and you do not get it back. Field 415, I know the owner is not willing to sell because it is a member of my family. 470, the original owner was willing to sell but has since passed away and I would think that the family who live away and maybe have inherited it will be willing to sell, but again you have someone who does not live in the Parish. These 2 fields, and if you want to know where they are and you have not been around on the site, opposite to where the Co-op is being built, and there are other supermarkets, there are 2 beautiful fields which have just been ploughed and they look absolutely fantastic. These are the 2 fields in question. There are Jersey Royal potatoes in them and at the end of last season they grew wild flowers. If you pass there, the butterflies that were on that field were absolutely incredible. The wildlife and diversity there was fabulous and it just showed that the farmers were being very, very sensitive. They were not just extracting everything from the land and putting nothing back. So, these 2 fields are very, very important and they are good agricultural ground. We have 3 farmers in St. Saviour, 3 dairy farmers; I am one of them. These fields are nothing to do with me. I do not rent these fields. They are rented by the other 2 farmers. But to take these away for homes would be absolutely dreadful. But not only that, because they are agricultural land it would head us towards Maufant. We have a lot of building in between time so then when we get to Maufant we would be built up. Then you have beyond Maufant and then we are almost in St. Martin. I really think these fields need to be saved. If they were derelict, I would be the first one to say: "No, let them go because we need accommodation for everybody." I have an amendment for one of the fields

to say that I am prepared to allow and go with the flow and say yes, if it was for first-time buyers, but if it is not for first-time buyers I will stop. But to be honest with you, I think we have enough in my Parish. You have already heard that there are all sorts in the plans for St. Saviour's Hospital. When Senator Mézec was Minister for Housing he and I had conversations and he was very good, he came to speak to me. I said I can understand that that is going to have to be built on, it has been derelict for so long - and I still think it was the best place for the hospital, but then I digress - but you are going to have a pincer feeling because that is going to be coming through and you are going to have bits and pieces there. Now, I did say to Senator Mézec: "If you have to build on there, fine, but you must put everything that is needed in that area there." You need a primary school. You are going to need some shops because we do not want people to be gravitating down to Five Oaks because the idea is to try and keep everybody up in that corner unless they really need ... senior schools is totally different but a primary school would be ideal there. There is not a mention of any schools on any of the fields anywhere on this Island as you are in this Island Plan, and it just beggars belief where you can put houses and people and families and not even consider having a school, but that is where we are. As I say, St. Saviour's Hospital will have to be built on, that is quite obvious. It will not be in my time because I am stepping down. I do feel that the people who live in that area need to have some sort of support and it is not fair with what is being ... I have to be honest, and I do not think this is parliamentary language in the end, but I was very upset when I heard that St. Clement was full so they did not have to be in on the plan. I made my staff laugh here because I said: "I would like to know who I can sleep with to get St. Saviour off the plan." Because we have had enough. Sorry, I can see you smiling and I know it was not parliamentary language, but we have enough. St. Saviour is saturated. We are full to the brim. The people who live here need a quality of life. St. Saviour has 15 to 16 schools. The over-55s, we have 209 homes for the over-55s. This surprised me when I asked my staff. Housing estates, we have 66. So, to be honest with you, Sir, and to the Assembly, I think St. Saviour has done enough to help here and I think that if I could ask all of you to please seriously think and let us get away with something this time round, please.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Can I have a clarification, please, Sir?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, Connétable, a point of clarification?

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Yes, no problem.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Before we get to that, Connétable, your language was unparliamentary in that respect and I think that should be withdrawn.

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Yes, I apologise.

Deputy J.H. Young:

The Connétable mentioned field S530 at Princes Tower Road, that is the field south of Five Oaks, the other one is to the north. The Connétable mentioned that there are cows in that field so could the Connétable definitely confirm that they were in 530 and not in field 528, which is immediately on the northern fringe of that field where it is definitely grazed by cows? I could go on more but could the Connétable confirm that she has that right?

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Yes, I went the day before yesterday with my foreman. I am lying, sorry, I went before we started this, I went last week and there were bales of silage.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Obviously, the site visit where the Members went on Friday, were they there then?

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

I did not go to the site visit. I had my own farm to run, I was too busy.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Thank you, I have the confirmation.

6.1.3 The Connétable of St. Ouen:

I had to stop chuckling after the Constable of St. Saviour's unparliamentary remark but we will skip that. I want to speak in support of the Constable of St. Saviour. Some Members might be surprised because I have been consistently supporting the development of first-time buyer homes. As I said before, St. Saviour and St. Helier, to be blunt, have taken more than their fair share of development and frankly, in my view, fall very firmly into the same camp as tenants. If we are going to build first-time buyer houses then we should look elsewhere rather than try and cram it all into 3 sites, because at the end of the day we will end up with 3 Parishes that are completely concreted over and will become less desirable for people to live in. Every Parish needs to have a green lung, every Parish needs to have green spaces for people to walk through and not necessarily have to use their cars to get to them. The Constable of St. Saviour and Deputy Lewis make very good points in this respect. Reluctantly, because I really do not like to lose first-time buyer homes, we have lost an awful lot in the course of this debate, considerably more than I feel should have happened and it is getting to the stage where this plan is becoming unsupportable because we have lost so many first-time buyer homes, but in this instance I very reluctantly entirely agree with the Constable of St. Saviour and, indeed, Deputy Lewis and will therefore be supporting them in this matter.

6.1.4 Deputy G.C. Guida:

Uncharacteristically I will have to not follow my Minister for this part of the amendment and there is a special reason. I have emailed all the Members about one aspect that was quite overlooked in all this bridging Island Plan, which is ecology and biodiversity. Especially in the site selection, one of the primary concerns - and it has been talked about at length in this Assembly - was how suitable land was for agriculture. Interestingly, it is inversely proportional to how suitable land is for biodiversity and ecology in general. I would like to speak especially about field S530 and it has been published on the chat channel in Teams so Members can have a look at it or they can look it up on the internet or on the Island Plan. But this is a perfect example of field which is absolutely unsuitable for agriculture unless you are trying to grow rice, but really good for biodiversity. Indeed, it is quite essential that we keep some of those, we are not going to have farmers fighting for them because they are of very little use to them but are absolutely essential to the wildlife that we have in the Island. It does not matter that there are gardens around, it does not matter if there are a fruit trees scattered around, once in a while we need land that is undisturbed and left to itself. It does not look good, it is messy, looks full of rambles, it looks full of unidentifiable plants but that is biodiversity and that is something that is absolutely essential to the ecosystem of the Island. As I have requested in my letter I hope that Members will think about that when they look at fields. There is another very important one, I do not think unfortunately it will be debated unusually but J1109 is absolutely essential to the maternity roost of grey long-haired bats and basically if that field was built on we would lose the rooster, and that is about one third of the population of the grey longhaired bats in the Island. Those are extremely rare in the U.K. and people come from the U.K. to Jersey to see them. Yes, in this case

field S530 is one of the really important fields in St. Saviour for biodiversity. I hope you will take that into account.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

Point of clarification. It was on the Deputy's comment about J1109. I really wish that had been mentioned before because J1109 I believe was allocated for housing in the Minister's consolidated amendment at the beginning of this debate and that would certainly have changed my views on that. Thank you for that information. Do you realise that has already been done?

Deputy G.C. Guida:

Absolutely, I tried to pick up the point where it was discussed, where it was debated, but I could not find it. I think the field was accepted without a debate.

6.1.5 Deputy J.H. Young:

I think I would like to follow the ecological line because I absolutely agree with Deputy Guida on the importance of biodiversity, but somehow that does not quite match with the arguments on the agricultural value we heard earlier of these fields. When I first visited these fields they were fallow. They were very, very overgrown. This is S530 which is very overgrown and sloping, absolutely no sign of any agriculture past and present. Now, also when I visited recently I saw no cows. I accept the fact that cows could be put on there yesterday, I have no idea, but I know when the site visit took place on Friday, the Members and the officers reported to me that there were no cows there. That is one thing. Of course, the cows are to the further north in S528. Bales of hay, I am not sure that sits with the biodiversity, they are unspoilt, as I have seen. When you start taking the hay cut I think you start to manage the field. I certainly did not see any signs. Obviously that issue cannot be resolved but I would personally question that particular part of it, the agricultural value. In fact the J.F.U. say that this S530 is less important to agriculture. So I think if we are going to dismiss these fields that at least we should be clear on them and the reasons we are doing so. I am not going to argue against biodiversity, I bow to Deputy Guida's knowledge if there is an in-depth assessment. I am aware the mention was made of J1109.

[16:45]

When I researched into that report - like all other Members, I saw that report of impact on biodiversity - in particular mention was made of bats. The information that reached me was that the bats are located in the Methodist Church, which is to the north of that, which is something which they obviously, in designing that conversion to residency and the former Methodist chapel at Sion, have accommodated the bats and that is wonderful news. So, of course, in any development one can establish the landscaping, one can retain natural features, when there are a lot of things that can be done to mitigate. Deputy Guida is right, it would be mitigation. The best biodiversity is to leave it alone. What we have is we have 2, there is no question, very, very significant agricultural fields immediately north of Cinq Chênes, which is S413 and S415 and we have a field which I personally do not consider ... none of the evidence available to me is it is in agriculture or has been. We have the 2. The third element of the proposition has already gone anyway, that is S729 because that fell away. I agreed to accept that coming out in amendment 91 that we dealt with. Of course, these fields ... why did these come out? I think Members have already made their feelings known about development close to the urban areas. I accept that so I am not ... what I am trying to do is articulate the arguments for them going around the urban areas. Rather like the Connétable, I shall maintain that. They were first proposed in April last year, they have been through very lengthy procedures, and it is absolutely right there has been objections particularly to field S530, Princes Tower Road. The residents around that area have made their views very plain because if one goes on the site one is immediately approached and had that drawn to your attention. Nonetheless the owner did put them forward and they did come forward as being one of the ones that we were suitable for housing. That

is why they have come through. The planning inspector considered all the arguments. This was not one of these Johnny-come-lately sites as Members have said; this has always been there. I am absolutely not going to argue against, at all, this issue about the whole amount of development that is happening and may happen in the Five Oaks area. It absolutely needs what we are seeking to do in other parts of the Island. I have lodged a late amendment, which Members have not yet obviously had a chance to read, let alone agree that it gets discussed. My intention is to maintain that, whether or not these fields get zoned or not, because Deputy Lewis has showed me the pictures of the traffic network in the area. There are no pavements. That immediately is an issue that arises about S530. If one is developing housing, children need to be able to get to St. Saviour School. They do not need to walk around the dangerous road, the main road, there needs to be a pedestrian access, there needs to be a decent pedestrian access for people to walk across to St. Saviour Road. That, at the moment, does not exist but if it does get developed it will be for the developer and the owner because it will be locked in via a planning obligation agreement to require and to do so. They will probably have to buy some land. They will probably have to negotiate some agreements but unless they do that would never, ever get developed. We cannot have that without proper access to that field. That is why sometimes these fields take 10 years to happen, I hope it does not, if it gets zoned. Now, the masterplan, obviously we have already got, whatever happens, a major development going on the Five Oaks site. What has happened there is we have - I am not sure what it is called - a supermarket or what sort of market it is and they have these industrial units there. All that is going on and, of course, what are Andium going to do with Cinq Chênes. I am told - I have not seen the scheme - it is going to be major intensification there. Major intensification. Now, I do not know what Andium's intentions are. The Minister for Housing and Communities might be able to tell us but I thought that Cinq Chênes is a wholly social rented estate. What I am a bit puzzled about is that later on we have another amendment from the Connétable, amendment 21, that says on field S415A and field S470 we should have first-time buyer homes. I am very puzzled, are we saying do not develop these fields at all or what? I have a difficulty. If Deputy Lewis when he comes back in his summing up could explain that. It seems to be quite a valid question. It seems to me that if the Connétable is saying: "Let us have first-time buyers", I can see why that might help make a balanced community. We have a very large social rented estate to the south and then immediately to the north some first-time buyer homes. These 2 fields back right up to green fields. I really do not know what the future is of that, I will bow to my Ministerial colleagues as to what is likely to go on there. This whole area is going to see a lot of activity. What might happen? I do not know, we have the whole Norman site, we have all that industrial area, what is likely to happen there. We have a terrible junction. What I am proposing to bring, it is not dependent on these being zoned, is a masterplan. That means it puts it on the same category as the work we are going to do for St. Brelade. I asked the question to my officers: "Why are we having a masterplan for the west? Why is this area not having one?" We have to look at traffic. We have to look at road links. We have to look at buses. This is not a question of let us have some bus shelters, this is about doing it properly because we need to find ways in which we can manage and do better. That should meet the need for public open space and community facilities in that area. It may well be that as part of that masterplan, because if these are zoned then these would feature in a masterplan, we would have lots of public open space within these sites, but if we close the door to anything that happens now, then I think that just rules it out. I absolutely agree with the Constable and the Deputy that there needs to be greater recognition of how we improve and try and make the urban environment better. But, in the end, of course it comes down to homes. The reason why these are featured in the list of affordable homes is because it is right on the edge of the existing build area. We need homes, people work in the area, we have transport links, we have all those things and that is why the proposal came through the Island Plan to put it there. Obviously, I think Members have to make that judgment. I do not think in the case of S530 it is on agricultural, it is about impacts on the neighbourhood, the pedestrian issues and the points Deputy Guida raised. It is not an agricultural issue. On the other 2 it is. But equally you have to think about what goes on next door with Cinq Chênes because I think there is going to be major intensification there; major.

So I think we need to look at that whole area. In the end, as Minister, I am in the hands of the Assembly and those are the factors that I ask Members to weigh in your decision.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

Apologies, a point of clarification if you do not mind. Sorry, it is probably because I missed part of the debate. The Minister said that Cinq Chênes is doing major intensification, could the Minister clarify what that intensification is?

Deputy J.H. Young:

I apologise, I am not the Minister for Housing and Communities and I am not involved with Andium, I am not allowed anywhere near them because they are developer and I am the regulator. I cannot tell you, but all my officers can tell you there is going to be a big intensification there.

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Could I help with that, Sir?

The Deputy Bailiff:

No, sorry. I am sure you will be delighted to do so but under Standing Orders you cannot. Does any other Member wish to speak on this amendment? If no other Members wish to speak, I call upon Deputy Lewis to reply.

6.1.6 Deputy K.C. Lewis:

I would like to thank all Members that have spoken. I would like to thank Deputy Pamplin for his support. I would like to thank the Constable of St. Saviour who put everything in a nutshell. We have a wonderful meadow there with a little brook running down through it. Why anybody would want to fill that in and build houses on it is totally beyond me. As I say, it forms the top end of Swiss Valley, which runs all the way down to Longueville Manor which is not quite the length of the Parish but very close. It is a wonderful meadow and S530 really needs to be preserved. Just to avoid any confusion, to the north off La Grande Route de St. Martin there are 4 fields and basically being pragmatic because we want young people in the Parish too, we have young people in the Parish who would like housing, there are 4 fields. Basically, what I have said is if the Minister for the Environment could reduce that to 2 fields then that is more manageable, it is something we can cope with. Directly opposite on the old J.T. (Jersey Telecom) site there is development there. There is going to be, I believe, a supermarket there and as a planning obligation we could put in a proper crossing there to make sure everybody is safe. As I say, regarding field 530, that is just something that needs to be preserved at all costs and regarding the other fields to the north, the ones we want to keep, I have had parishioners sending me videos, which will probably please Deputy Guida, of some quite rare butterflies up there, which will be really nice. But, as I say, I am in the hands of Members. I am happy to take it in 2 bites if you are in agreement, Sir, or I can take them all together. I am in the hands of Members.

The Deputy Bailiff:

That is a matter for you, Deputy. By 2 bites do you mean (a)(i) and (a)(ii)? So (a)(i) would be fields 413 and 415 and (a)(ii) would be field 530?

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Indeed, Sir. Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, that is in order.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

I make the proposition and ask for the *appel*.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The *appel* has been called for. It is in 2 parts and Members are first considering (a)(i), which relates to removing fields S413 and S415 from the list of sites to be zoned for affordable homes. Members are invited to return to their seats. Those joining the meeting via Teams are invited to cast their votes in the chat channel and I ask the Greffier to open the voting to Members in the Chamber. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting.

[17:00]

I can announce that the amendment has been adopted.

POUR: 20		CONTRE: 16		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator S.C. Ferguson		Senator I.J. Gorst		
Senator S.Y. Mézec		Senator L.J. Farnham		
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Senator K.L. Moore		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Senator S.W. Pallett		
Connétable of St. Brelade		Connétable of St. Mary		
Connétable of Grouville		Connétable of St. John		
Connétable of St. Peter		Deputy J.A. Martin (H)		
Connétable of St. Ouen		Deputy of Grouville		
Connétable of St. Martin		Deputy of St. Martin		
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		Deputy of St. Ouen		
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)		Deputy R. Labey (H)		
Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)		Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)		
Deputy of St. Mary		Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)		
Deputy K.F. Morel (L)		Deputy J.H. Young (B)		
Deputy of Trinity		Deputy G.C.U. Guida (L)		
Deputy M.R. Le Hégarat (H)		Deputy of St. John		
Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)				
Deputy R.J. Ward (H)				
Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)				
Deputy I. Gardiner (H)				

The Deputy Bailiff:

We now move to the second part of the vote, which is in respect of (a)(ii) field S530 and I invite Members to cast their votes either in the chat channel or in the usual way for Members in the Chamber. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to ask the voting. I can announce that (a)(ii) has been adopted.

POUR: 28		CONTRE: 10		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator S.C. Ferguson		Senator I.J. Gorst		
Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré		Senator L.J. Farnham		
Senator S.Y. Mézec		Senator K.L. Moore		
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Senator S.W. Pallett		

Connétable of St. Saviour		Connétable of St. Mary		
Connétable of St. Brelade		Deputy J.A. Martin (H)		
Connétable of Grouville		Deputy of Grouville		
Connétable of St. Peter		Deputy of St. Martin		
Connétable of St. Ouen		Deputy of St. Ouen		
Connétable of St. Martin		Deputy J.H. Young (B)		
Connétable of St. John				
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)				
Deputy R. Labey (H)				
Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)				
Deputy L.B. Ash (C)				
Deputy K.F. Morel (L)				
Deputy G.C.U. Guida (L)				
Deputy of Trinity				
Deputy of St. John				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)				
Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)				
Deputy R.J. Ward (H)				
Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)				
Deputy I. Gardiner (H)				

Deputy Lewis, do you now propose (b) and (c) of your amendment? Thank you very much. I ask Members to cast their votes. Those via the Teams link are invited to cast their votes in the chat channel and I ask the Greffier to open the voting for Members in the Chamber in respect of subparagraphs (b) and (c) of this amendment. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that parts (b) and (c) of the amendment have been adopted.

POUR: 30		CONTRE: 4		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator L.J. Farnham		Senator I.J. Gorst		
Senator S.C. Ferguson		Senator S.W. Pallett		
Senator K.L. Moore		Connétable of St. Mary		
Senator S.Y. Mézec		Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)		
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Martin				

Connétable of St. John				
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)				
Deputy of Grouville				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)				
Deputy of St. Ouen				
Deputy R. Labey (H)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)				
Deputy L.B. Ash (C)				
Deputy K.F. Morel (L)				
Deputy G.C.U. Guida (L)				
Deputy of Trinity				
Deputy of St. John				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)				
Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)				
Deputy R.J. Ward (H)				
Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)				
Deputy I. Gardiner (H)				

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

May I thank Members for their support, Sir.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Sir, can I raise a point of order, please?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes.

Deputy J.H. Young:

I wonder if you could rule either now or before the adjournment what effect that decision has on amendment 29, which is due to follow, not immediately but a little while later, on field S415A. The other point to say, and apologies to Members, but I do have to leave promptly at 5.30 p.m. tonight and I see we are coming up to 5.10 p.m. and we are just about to start another field. So I just want to make it plain that I will have to leave and I will leave it open to Members if any Member thinks we should adjourn early.

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Could I say, Sir, seeing as both fields have been accepted that they are not going to be built on, I would like to withdraw my proposition? Is that possible or not?

The Deputy Bailiff:

You want to withdraw the 29th amendment?

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Yes, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

You are entitled to withdraw your amendment if you wish to do so, yes.

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Then there is no confusion. It will just fall away and the fields stay as they are; is that correct?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Absolutely, yes. Does that answer your question, Minister? Presumably it does.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Thank you for the clarification.

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I am just wondering, it seems unlikely that we will start a debate and finish it and it has been a long week. I would like to test the mood of the Assembly and propose the adjournment.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is that seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on that?

The Deputy of St. Martin:

It has been a very long week but next week is going to be even longer. I think we should be using the 22 minutes left to best effect. **[Approbation]**

The Deputy Bailiff:

Unless anyone wishes to speak, which they are absolutely entitled to, on this matter, we can go straight to the vote. Deputy Pamplin, do you really want to speak on this? It is a matter for you.

Deputy K.G. Pamplin:

Yes, very quickly, Sir. Is it possible before we make this decision, very quickly, to have a state of play of where we are in proceedings?

The Deputy Bailiff:

I think that is quite complicated. **[Laughter]**

Senator L.J. Farnham:

There is still quite a long way to go, Sir, if that helps.

The Deputy Bailiff:

We would all have different ideas of how far we have got, I think. There might be 50 answers to that question. The Minister might give us an update on Monday morning. So the *appel* has been called for. The proposition is in relation to adjourning now or carrying on and I invite Members who wish to adjourn now to vote *pour* in the chat channel or in the Chamber in the usual way or *contre* if they want to press on to 5.30 p.m.

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Sir, by the time we do all this we have passed the time anyway.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Well, that is why we are trying to do it quickly. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. On the proposition that the Assembly adjourns, there were 19 votes *pour* and 18 votes *contre*. So, the proposition succeeded. Unless any other

Member wishes to raise anything else, the Assembly will be adjourned now until 9.30 a.m. on Monday morning.

ADJOURNMENT

[17:12]