

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

WEDNESDAY, 23rd MARCH 2022

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption	4
1. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - sixth amendment: Education Estates (P.36/2021 Amd.(6)) - resumption	4
1.1 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier:	4
2. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) – eighth amendment: Gas site, Tunnell Street, St. Helier (P.36/2021 Amd.(8))	8
2.1 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier:	8
2.1.1 Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier:	10
2.1.2 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier:	12
2.1.3 Deputy J.H. Young:	13
2.1.4 Deputy K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:	14
2.1.5 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:	15
2.1.6 Deputy S.M. Wickenden of St. Helier:	15
2.1.7 Deputy K.F. Morel:	16
2.1.8 Deputy G.C. Guida of St. Lawrence:	17
2.1.9 Deputy M.R. Higgins of St. Helier:	17
2.1.10 Deputy R. Labey of St. Helier:	18
2.1.11 Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré:	19
2.1.12 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	20
2.1.13 Deputy I. Gardiner:	22
2.1.14 Senator K.L. Moore:	23
2.1.15 Senator S.Y. Mézec:	23
2.1.16 Deputy S.G. Luce of St. Martin:	26
2.1.17 Deputy D. Johnson of St. Mary:	26
2.1.18 Senator S.W. Pallett:	26
2.1.19 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	27
2.1.20 Deputy R.J. Ward:	28
3. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - sixty-fourth amendment: Amendment to Policy CI2 (P.36/2021 Amd.(64))	32
3.1 Senator S.W. Pallett:	32
3.1.1 Deputy J.H. Young:	35
3.1.2 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:	37
3.1.3 Deputy R. Labey:	38
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED	38
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT	38
3.1.4 Deputy R.J. Renouf of St. Ouen:	38
3.1.5 The Deputy of St. Martin:	40

3.1.6	The Connétable of St. Brelade:.....	41
3.1.7	Deputy G.C. Guida:	41
3.1.8	Deputy M. Tadier:.....	42
3.1.9	Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier:.....	43
3.1.10	Senator S.W. Pallett:	43
4.	Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) – tenth amendment: Nelson Street Car Park (P.36/2021 Amd.(10))	47
4,1	Deputy R.J. Ward:	48
4.1.1	Deputy J.H. Young:	49
4.1.2	The Connétable of St. Saviour:.....	49
4.1.3	The Connétable of St. Helier:	49
4.1.4	Deputy M. Tadier:.....	50
4.1.5	Senator S.Y. Mézec:	51
4.1.6	Deputy G.C. Guida:	52
4.1.7	Deputy K.F. Morel:.....	52
4.1.8	Deputy R.J. Ward:	52
5.	Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - ninety-fifth amendment: Policy CI5 - Sports, Leisure and Cultural Facilities (P.36/2021 Amd.(95))	55
5.1	Deputy J.H. Young (The Minister for the Environment):	55
5.1.1	The Deputy of St. Martin:.....	56
5.1.2	The Connétable of St. Brelade:.....	56
5.1.3	Deputy J.H. Young:	57
6.	Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - seventy-third amendment: Use of Field MN727, St. Martin (P.36/2021 Amd.(73))	59
6.1	The Deputy of St. Martin:.....	59
6.1.1	Deputy K.G. Pamplin of St. Saviour:	60
6.1.2	The Connétable of St. Martin:	60
6.1.3	Deputy L.B.E. Ash of St. Clement:	61
6.1.4	Deputy S.M. Wickenden:.....	62
6.1.5	Deputy R. Labey:	63
6.1.6	Connétable A. Jehan of St. John:	63
6.1.7	Senator S.W. Pallett:.....	64
6.1.8	Deputy H.C. Raymond of Trinity:	65
6.1.9	Deputy K.F. Morel:.....	66
6.1.10	Deputy J.H. Young:.....	67
6.1.11	Deputy M. Tadier:	69
6.1.12	Senator L.J. Farnham:	71
6.1.13	Deputy G.P. Southern:	72
6.1.14	Deputy G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade:	72
6.1.15	Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:	72
6.1.16	Deputy M.R. Higgins:	73
6.1.17	The Deputy of St. Martin:	73
	Senator K.L. Moore:.....	77
	Deputy R.J. Ward:	78
	Deputy J.H. Young:.....	79
	Deputy G.P. Southern:	79
	Deputy M. Tadier:	79

ADJOURNMENT..... 79

[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) - sixth amendment: Education Estates (P.36/2021 Amd.(6)) - resumption

The Deputy Bailiff:

Last night I was asked to rule on a procedural matter, which I did by email communication to all Members, but as indicated I would publicly announce the ruling so that it was understood and on the record. I was asked to rule on whether the adoption of the 6th amendment precludes debate on the 8th amendment, having regard in particular to Standing Order 20, the relevant part of which says: “A proposition cannot be in the same or substantially the same terms as a proposition which the States have previously debated and voted upon unless at least 3 months have elapsed since that vote.” It is true that both amendments amend the same part of the draft bridging Island Plan, namely policy C11, education facilities, at page 222. The 8th amendment refers to specific premises to be added to a list of sites where developments other than for the purposes of education will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that they are no longer required for such purposes. Those premises are the Jersey Gas site at Tunnell Street. The 6th amendment is broader in scope and the relevant parts are (a) and (b), which I do not propose to read out. The purpose of the 6th amendment is to ensure that education needs are given the highest priority in respect of land, which has been identified by the responsible Minister, for the purpose of the needs of primary schools in St. Saviour and St. Helier. The amendment only extends to land owned by States or States-owned companies. Furthermore, both (a) and (b) say the proposals for the redevelopment of such land, where it lies within the vicinity of existing primary schools, must be able to demonstrate that they will not compromise the ability to address identified education needs. The relevant Minister has not, as I understand it, identified any publicly-owned land for the purposes of additional needs of the primary school estate in St. Helier and, if he has, has not identified the premises in Tunnell Street. Furthermore, those premises cannot be regarded as being within the vicinity of an existing primary school in St. Helier. Neither (a) or (b) of the 6th amendment identify specific premises. Accordingly, there is no overlap with the premises, which are the subject of the 8th amendment, and that amendment may be debated regardless of the outcome of the debate on the 6th amendment. Further, if the Tunnell Street premises are not currently publicly owned then there can be no overlap in any event. The 6th amendment only affects publicly-owned land. We now return to the debate on the 6th amendment. Does any Member wish to speak on this amendment? If no Member wishes to speak then I call upon the proposer, Deputy Gardiner, to reply.

1.1 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier:

I did not expect this, I have to be honest. Good morning, everyone. First, I would like to thank Members who contributed for this debate. Words matter, as they do. This amendment is allowing to bring education considerations as part of the decision-making process. When the Minister mentioned the overall capacity on the Island, last night I was thinking it means that he will not develop anything, he will not plan anything, he will not consider education estate, because it is not part of the bridging Island Plan until they got up to capacity across all Parishes and we will continue to drive children around the Parishes. I think it is wrong. We need to think in advance. We need to think to the future. Another thing that was mentioned, it is for the 3 years of bridging Island Plan. I would like Members to reflect, during the last 4 years that we are in this Assembly what has been done for the education estate in St. Helier and St. Saviour? If any of the Members will tell: “We have done this over the last 4 years. We have extra play space, we have modern buildings, we have this. We have made the decision that in the next 2 years the new school, which is answering modern standard, will be built in urban or suburban areas.” Three years. I think what this amendment gives,

and I am grateful for Senator Mézec, Deputy Ward, Constable of St. Helier, Deputy of St. Mary, that clearly recognise that this amendment is simply asking to take into consideration needs of the education estate. I would urge Deputy Ash to reflect on this because in the future we need to avoid situations that happened in St. Clement, where the houses were built but we do not have spaces in school and children need to travel. We really need to think. I am an advocate for free-market forces, finding natural solutions to the problems, and this is the reason that I did not include private developments but what I am asking, before we continue to build on public-owned land, if it is States-owned land or States-owned organisation, to have a consideration. Holistically is a great word, as this is all about words, again. I agree with the Minister for Housing and Communities and we have to look holistically and we must consult Andium and S.o.J.D.C. (States of Jersey Development Company). I think his argument to vote against this amendment is an argument to vote for this amendment because they were not consulted. I am not sure if Members have had time to read 2 recently published P.A.C. (Public Accounts Committee) reports, and I will not go into the P.A.C. report. One of them was about estate management and one of the findings clearly stated: “The continued piecemeal approach to engaging with states-owned entities and arm’s-length organisations, in terms of developing and implementing of a cohesive and comprehensive estate strategy linked to the overall corporate objectives, is not working.” The States strategy was published without including States-owned companies in the estate strategy. It is how we are working not holistically. When the Minister for the Environment is saying it is not for Planning to think about education estate, we need to think about the planning, and the Minister for Housing and Communities is saying: “We will build houses but I will not speak with the Minister for Children and Education” and when I am coming to Jersey Property Holdings, and I am asking Jersey Property Holdings: “So where are we building a school in St. Helier”, they are saying: “It is not us. It is in Education. They did not do their job.”

[9:45]

This amendment is simply asking that 4 Ministers, with all stakeholders, will be obliged to sit in one room and consider all necessary needs: housing, schools, schools can be community hubs, schools can use some of the parks safeguarded during the day and open for the public during the afternoon; there are lots of solutions that can be found. The only way to do this is to sit together, which did not happen and what I am trying to do. It is not to restrict, it is not to block, maybe enforce - and I wish I would not need to do this but the experience happened - to ensure that ... it is not anti-construction, it is not anti-free market, they are sitting together and allowing the next Government to say we cannot point to each other as Ministers, we need the Minister for Children and Education, the Minister for Infrastructure, the Minister for the Environment and the Minister for Housing and Communities to be in one room and we will decide how this or that site will be developed, and all States-owned companies will be consulted. They have great knowledge and they have to be part of this conversation. This amendment is asking for consideration in 3 policies: education estate, town centre and local centres. Please, I urge Members, not just talk, we need to be sure that we have provisions to develop our Island holistically, and I ask for the appel.

Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence:

Point of clarification please, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Will you accept a point of clarification, Deputy?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

Yes.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The first one is from the Chief Minister.

Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Mine is very minor. Would the rapporteur consider taking the vote in 3 parts rather than *en bloc*?

The Deputy Bailiff:

That is a matter for her. Do you want to take it 3 parts or one part?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

No.

The Deputy Bailiff:

One part?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

One part please, yes.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

In the Deputy's speech she referred to speaking with other Ministers, speaking with the Minister for Children and Education, I was wondering had Deputy Gardiner spoken to the Minister for Children and Education herself and did he take part in this debate?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

I was surprised the Minister for Children and Education did not take part in this debate. Personally, I have, almost on a monthly basis, engaged with the Minister for Children and Education in private conversations, sending emails. I went to the press I think since ... probably last year we had this engagement and I am not sure why the review has not been published, we will be in a different place. But it did not happen and we need to make sure that we have some framework in place for the future.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. Those joining the meeting in the Teams link are asked to cast their votes on 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 I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the amendment has been adopted.

POUR: 38		CONTRE: 9		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator I.J. Gorst		Connétable of St. Helier		
Senator L.J. Farnham		Deputy J.A. Martin (H)		
Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré		Deputy of Grouville		
Senator T.A. Vallois		Deputy of St. Ouen		
Senator K.L. Moore		Deputy R. Labey (H)		
Senator S.W. Pallett		Deputy J.H. Young (B)		
Senator S.Y. Mézec		Deputy L.B. Ash (C)		
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Deputy G.C.U. Guida (L)		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)		
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of Trinity				
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 G.P. Southern (H)				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy M. Tadier (B)				
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)				
Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet (S)				
Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)				
Deputy K.F. Morel (L)				
Deputy of St. Peter				
Deputy of Trinity				
Deputy of St. John				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)				
Deputy J.H. Perchard (S)				
Deputy R.J. Ward (H)				
Deputy C.S. Alves (H)				
Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)				
Deputy I. Gardiner (H)				

Deputy I. Gardiner:

I would like to thank Members and can I raise something with the Minister for the Environment please as a request? Not according to my amendment but I would like to raise something in the Assembly before we next to the time.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

Would it be possible from the Minister for the Environment team or from the Greffe to have all fields that we passed for development in one list, as the public also contacted me and requested it to be circulated between the Members and may be published, that we can consider before the final debate what is the final version of the fields?

The Deputy Bailiff:

A very helpful suggestion. I am sure that will be done. Will that be done, Minister?

Deputy J.H. Young of St. Brelade:

Yes. I think there are one or 2 propositions still to come which ... not on housing, I do not think, but when we have got to the point where we can produce a definitive list, that will be published and made public.

2. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) – eighth amendment: Gas site, Tunnell Street, St. Helier (P.36/2021 Amd.(8))

The Deputy Bailiff:

We now move to the 8th amendment lodged by Deputy Ward, 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) within Policy CI1, after the words ‘Part of field 782, St Ouen’ there should be inserted a new bullet point ‘Jersey Gas Site: Tunnell Street, St. Helier’. (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 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier:

I am going to keep this short to begin with so we can have a debate. It has been accepted by the Minister but the debate has been asked for. This amendment proposes the safeguarding of a specific site for education facilities, thus preventing the development of that site for any alternative use. Subsequently it means that the site cannot be used for housing developments. I will make a few key points about that. The development of a primary school would not mean a development of the site that was originally proposed by Andium, and this is what I have been looking at. This is the original proposition by Andium that was refused for planning and you can see that there was a development of a significant number of homes and an extension to the park. These will not be there. What I will say is that if you take just this section you can see still a significant increase to the size of the park from those original plans. Taking that section is a significantly large site for a primary school. I have not just come to this thinking that might be a nice little plan, I think we can have the best of both worlds here if we plan it carefully. The extension was widely supported by this Assembly but I will say that when you look closely at that part, and the reason I talk about that is there is a context to this. Very little of that development was for affordable housing, and we get back to that topic again. Most of it was for open market so it would have done very little. I initially thought the refusal of that is a bit of a nightmare but it is probably a very good thing that has happened and we have an opportunity now. This proposition, if used to build a school, would also mean an increase in the size of the park therefore, which is significantly higher than the increase in the park from those original plans. Those plans were accepted and voted for by this Assembly, so therefore we are seeing an increase in the park here. This site is central to developments in a new area. None of which considered where children would be going to school. This is from the Andium current situation. What you have is all of the sites around there, the Mayfair, the Ann Street Brewery, the regeneration of the brewery site and all of these arrows going to the new park. What I want Members to think about is if those arrows were going to a new park with a primary school at the end of that park not only would you have children going to school in a green area but you would have created, because of the work of Andium and the regeneration and the creation of walking pathways through that area, a way for our children to walk to school through a green park, into a green space smack bang in the centre of St. Helier. To me, the more I thought about this, and I have considered every angle, and I have spoken to colleagues not just with Reform but other colleague as well, sat here, had discussions, saying: “Look, am I thinking the right thing here? Tell me where I am wrong.” I can see a really good opportunity here. The link to the regeneration of Ann Street is vital and there is a walking pathway through there. There is another diagram here. However, that is in reverse and upside down so I am not going to try to use the mouse on this because it is all going to go wrong. I have just realised my error. But there is a pathway straight through to the park from the new regeneration area. A walkway that has been designed by Andium. Those homes in that area are going to have the

opportunity to get to that park and subsequently, if built, a school. I will make an important point here, what this proposition does is say nothing other than a school will be built in this area, however if other sites come through from the school sites review ... which I have to say again we have not seen, clearly the Minister for Housing and Communities seems to have said that he has not seen it and the Minister for the Environment seems to say that he has not seen it, so none of us have seen it. But if they come up with other sites that are more appropriate for schools it will get my support and then we will have a park. All of it can be made to parkland. What this proposition is saying is do not build homes, there is no more room for homes in that area. I think it is vital that as an Assembly we put a line in the sand when it comes to that area of St. Helier. I do recognise the problem for the Minister for the Environment, and I am pleased he has changed his mind and accepted this. I do recognise the problem that perhaps the Constable of St. Helier has in saying that we want this simply to be a park. We have not seen the school site review and we are not considering the schooling of our children in that area. I suggest to Members that they go to the schools in St. Helier, and I know many Members have, particularly St. Helier Members. I go to Springfield every week for the E.C.O.F. (Every Child Our Future) programme and I do an hour's reading. I have done it for the last few years and that is not something I mention politically, but it is important because I go into Springfield every week and I witness the miracles that those staff are working in the facilities that they have and that those children are dealing with. A concrete playground, a very small space of greenery. The head of the school, he is not actively trying to promote anything here but I know so I can speak because I represent people, outside the school there is an issue with traffic. It is really dangerous for the children crossing the road. Nothing is going to happen there for a year or so we have been told because the people that might be able to do something are quite busy. So again we are not prioritising our schools. We have a school there where the staff are working their socks off, the students are fantastic and working their socks off, parents and support workers and everyone there is trying to do the very best for those children in the wrong facilities. There is an opportunity here for us to say: "Right, during this Island Plan we are going to say that that big area in the middle of St. Helier, we can extend the park, we can put a school right on the edge of that park and we can have our children avoiding that danger of the road, being in a green space and having space to play." That is putting children first and it is a no brainer. There is also an issue that worries me. I would say extend the park if there were other school sites, fantastic. But I am concerned in the back of my mind, and I would be interested to see other Members' views on this, that by extending the park the way we have it has given an opportunity for developments to happen to say we can develop in this way but do not worry about green space because they can just go across the road to the park.

[10:00]

Around that area now we have 935 homes, units, call them what you will - I really dislike that word "units" but I understand why it is used because I suppose that is what they are - with families in them. I know they are one-bedroom places but there are people living there and they do not have space. I think there is a real risk, particularly with the bridging Island Plan and this opportunity for developers to say: "Well actually we can develop but there is not really the space for green space here, so we will have a little pay off and we will develop space somewhere else for you and that is the deal." That space unfortunately, if we are not careful, will become just that parkland. That park is not that large for the development that is going on in that area. What we need to do when we consider our green space, and what I would suggest that we do if this is accepted, is to look wider as to where that park space is. There is the notion of satellite parks or pocket parks, and I would go so far as to suggest if the school is built and it is Springfield that is repositioned into that school because it could be a much larger school, that Springfield area is not just more housing crammed in there but we create a pocket park for that area of town and change the nature of it with creativity so that the people in the Quarry Estate and the estates around there have a green space right next to them to go to. That is a way to create green space in the centre of town, not just concentrate on one area of the park but to pocket it around town. If you go to cities around the world much bigger than ours, that is what

happens. I grew up in London and there are beautiful small parks all over the place there. There was just space and room to breathe in that huge metropolis. I will finish soon and let people debate this but I wonder why it has taken so long to consider why the development in town. We have had so many regeneration groups north of town, south of town, middle of town, east of town, west of town, I do not know how many regeneration groups, underground, over ground ... I will not finish that one off as it is unparliamentary. We have had so many visions, I do think perhaps I should consult the Dean here because there has been vision after vision in St. Helier for what is going on, and more visions to come. But what we need is some decisions and some action to be taken. What I am proposing here today is that is what we do, we take an action and say: "Right, this area we are not going to build on. We need a school, we will identify it as a school space." If the school sites review does not come up with the goods we have a reserve in place. That is pragmatic, it is practical and is doable. I will leave it at that and I urge Members to support this amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff:

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

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

Can I start off by saying that I understand and share the frustration of both Deputy Ward in this amendment and Deputy Gardiner in her amendment over the States failure to act to alleviate the problems of Rouge Bouillon School? More recent Members of the Assembly may not realise that years ago the school was promised room to grow once the relocation of the States of Jersey Police Headquarters took place. The police station duly moved to the other side of the tunnel in what I still think is a splendid building, not everyone agrees with that, and we waited to see what Education and Home Affairs would do to allow Rouge Bouillon to expand. Then, lo and behold, the blue police signs outside the police station were changed to red signs and the fire service expanded into the space that the police service had left. At the same time it became very clear talking to Ministers that there was no intention to relocate the emergency services, which was going to be necessary to allow the school to develop into that part of the northern St. Helier, which is where it gets a lot of its students from. We have always talked about and we have had promised in countless questions the opportunity not only to grow the space for Rouge Bouillon School but to have some car parking for residents and some green space as well. That did not happen and Ministers closed ranks. So the problem of Rouge Bouillon School's improvement was simply kicked down the road. I give that history to Members because I think it is relevant and people need to remember that it has always been accepted that there is space in Rouge Bouillon to grow and that space is on the town side of its current premises. Members can be forgiven for not having read my proposition on extending the Millennium Town Park, P.67, which was due for debate at the last sitting of this Assembly but which will now fall away if this amendment is approved. Members will, I hope, have seen Andium's town park vision in the media and certainly, since lodging P.67, I have had lots of town residents, particularly people who live around the park, of course, telling me how excited they are about the prospect of the town park being doubled in size. One of them offered to get a petition started and I said we had this debate coming up this week so it was probably a bit late for a petition, but there is real excitement. I have been speaking particularly to mums and dads with children and I would remind Members that children need space, they need open space, not just when they are at school but pre-school children need open space and children who have left primary school need open space. People need open space as well outside the school day. One of the problems about placing a primary school on this site is that it will effectively seal off - because schools have to be sealed off for the safety of students - a part of the park, and I will return to the size of that park in a moment, but it will be sealed from the use of the public. Not just from you and me but it will be sealed off from the use by children. It will effectively be neutralised, accepting so far as some classes and activities may take place in the evenings and at weekends. So, Deputy Ward in his proposition talked about the school being ... if it has to come here being "right on the edge of the park", and that is quite a seductive proposition, this

idea that we can have a school and have a park extension and he made something of this, although he did then concede “the park is not that large”. It is a fact that the current Millennium Town Park, which residents and Islanders campaigned for many years to deliver following the petition of more than 16,000 signatures that I presented to the States 20 years ago, is really small and anyone who has visited it in the summer will know that there is barely room to swing a cat, let alone to swing a child around or do anything meaningful in terms exercise. In his speech Deputy Ward went on to talk about pocket parks being the way forward. I am afraid that is not the case. It is true that places like London and large cities do have pocket parks and, indeed, St. Helier has quite a few pocket parks as well, but pocket parks are not the same as the kind of parks of such size that our children can come back from run out of breath. The vision of Andium Homes is to create a significant area of open space with grass, trees, water features and facilities for children to play and it will be the sort of park that will begin to resemble the major town parks of European towns and cities. I am afraid if a school is allowed to take possibly a third of that space, we do not know yet how much it would be, then we are not going to get that sort of park, we are going to get a compromise. While compromise may be something we should always be ready to do, I believe that we have an opportunity here to do better than that. I would remind the many Members in this long debate who have spoken about Andium Homes and have said what a great job Andium Homes are doing, this is not my vision, this is the vision of Andium Homes. This is the vision of the social housing provider that Members have been so respectful of. It seems to me if we are going to commend Andium Homes for their work in improving our housing stock and adding to it then we have to give some credence to the fact that Andium Homes believe that this site should not be used for anything other than extending the park. I went to see them about the possibility of keeping the Jersey Gas showroom as a youth centre because I understood there might be difficulties with the youth centre they were proposing as part of the Jersey Brewery site. They said: “Yes, you could leave the Jersey Gas showroom there but it would seriously compromise the extent of the park.” I think Members to accept they cannot have their cake and eat it, they can either view this piece of land as a windfall site that could be used for a primary school, it could be used for emergency services, it could have any number of uses, it could be used for a big community hall that St. Helier lacks, but Andium Homes’ vision is to extend the town park across its whole extent. As Members are not going to have the opportunity, unless they reject this amendment, of debating projet 67, I am now going to make a few references - I am going to dip my toe into the projet, if I may. First of all, I am going to read the executive summary which I placed at the beginning of projet 67 because I thought it was a good idea to make the point fairly simply at the beginning. I quote from the beginning of the projet: “There has been a growing appreciation, especially in the years since the Millennium, of the importance of amenity space in the Island’s main town, and last year it was proposed by Andium Homes that the site of the former Jersey Gas company, between the Millennium Town Park and St Saviour’s Road, which had long been proposed for housing, should instead be used to double the size of the park with no other buildings upon it. Andium’s vision mirrors that of the early campaigners for the creation of the Millennium Town Park and it offers the Island its one and only chance to create a park of significant size in the heart of a growing capital which, if achieved, will maximise the benefit of the park for the community, especially for children, and which will in decades to come be regarded as the most important action towards urban regeneration taken by Jersey’s Government. As the Parishes of St Helier and St Saviour are increasingly being asked to take responsibility for the thousands of new homes required in Jersey it seems only right that the quantum of such critical infrastructure as parkland be increased, and that the unique and visionary opportunity offered to the Island by Andium Homes be supported by the States Assembly.” I could have used that as my final remarks in my contribution to this debate but I want instead to look further into P.67 where I referred to a recent - I say recent, it was 7 years ago - attempt to extend the town park and it was as part of an amendment to the Strategic Plan of 2015 in which I asked the States to agree that if housing was not going to go on the site then it be used for open space. There was considerable support from Members of the Assembly. I am just going to quote from a couple of the contributions. Former Deputy Jackie Hilton referred to the original vision of the proposers of the

town park and she said: “Standing outside the Odeon Cinema looking down the park right through to St. Saviour Road, a completely large unhindered space by development for the people of St. Helier.” The idea was also supported by St. Saviour Deputies, as you would expect, and I have already referred to that Parish. Former Deputy McLinton shared his vision: “Where the town park does indeed stretch the entire distance and is filled with happy children playing, people walking, having picnics. Inasmuch as I understand the cost of the project, I would not one day, in 25 years’ time maybe, be there with my grandchildren and stare at the buildings that have blocked this amazing park and regret the missed opportunity and we had to build this wonderful park and make it stretch right through.” The final quote is from Deputy Doublet who reminded the States: “We have signed up to the Convention on the Rights of the Child and Article 3 says that we have to think about the best interests of children when we are making policies so I will fight any way I can to get an extension to the town park because the children that live around that area in St. Helier and St. Saviour are being denied their rights. Article 31 says that children have a right to relax and play.” Those are just some of the contributions in that debate in 2015. It is not a new idea of making a much bigger town park and it is one that does indeed put children first. It puts them first not only, as I say, when they are at school but when they are out of school at weekends. Of course, it also benefits every age group who lives in town.

[10:15]

We clearly need to remember that ... we have talked about the loading of town with all these units that have been promised and I think the problem is that if we do not deliver the town park of Andium’s vision, if we compromise it with buildings upon it, then it is going to have a knock-on effect on how many other units can be provided. I will certainly not be nearly as supportive as I have been in the past of continuing to put housing in this part of town if the States does not support the idea of a proper town park. This regeneration project is simply too important to be buried in this long Island Plan debate. Members will know that I am passionate about parks, open space, green space and that is why I opposed so vigorously building on People’s Park, even though the new hospital had a good claim to be that important. I will continue to seek to protect St. Helier’s parks as long as I am in the Assembly. Not only to protect the green spaces that we have and to improve their quality but to increase the quantity of parkland in Jersey’s capital because that is the only way it will keep pace with the growing population. So I see this is as but the first skirmish in the latest battle to maximise the size of the town park. It has been going on for some time. If this amendment is successful it will clearly become a big election issue in that part of St. Helier and I will certainly be campaigning with all my might with the residents of Chevalier Road, Apsley Road, Oxford Road, Tunnell Street, St. Mark’s Road and all the roads around the town park who are so passionate, as I am, about the town park that there is still an opportunity to double its size. So if it is lost today I will, if re-elected, come back to the next Assembly with a rescindment motion and I will have that debate on P.67, which unfortunately I am not going to be able to have unless this amendment is rejected, which I urge Members to do.

2.1.2 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier:

My Constable is actually a very good man with words. He is a poet and he writes good prose too. When he talks about a vision I feel quite inspired by it but the fact is that it is not a vision that we want. We have a vision there now. We have a park with the blossom just coming out now, go there this lunch time and have a look, take it in. It is a beautiful space. It came about not because somebody had a vision, it came about because somebody found £10 million, put it in the pot and they said: “Right, now create your park. There is a funding.” What we have now is this false dichotomy that the Constable is proposing, saying it is either open space, green park or it is school. No, it is not. That is a false dichotomy and the Constable knows it because what we are proposing here, the Andium vision, let us just think about that for a minute, is this: Andium will give you a vision for whatever it is that you wish to do. As politicians, if you come along and say: “I want more space

there” Andium will give you a vision of how it might look. They will say: “You want less space there, you want a school there” Andium will show you how it might look. They will have a vision. They will have a vision in response to what politicians ask. That is what they are there for and they do it very well. The vision, the Andium vision, is, if you like, whatever you say it is. “Andium, give us a vision for this.” So all the options are possible. The key element here is that it is not school versus park, it is school plus park. School, one third of the space, green park has two-thirds. When we talk about my voters in St. Helier Central - I must keep practising saying St. Helier Central - in No. 2 District and the rest, once they know that this park will be increased and they have a school you can walk safely to in a beautiful green space then, of course, they will be in favour of that because that is not only something we can deliver, it is the best way forward. To keep harking back - and I will say this - to a perfect vision that we have seen some time in the past, and this we are talking about a nearly 20-year-old vision, most of you were not here, one or 2 of us were there, that said the park must go all the way across; £10 million did not let it go all the way across, £10 million only got that far. This proposal today says the vision is that we will build on that space, we will create a good park and we can do that. Actually I have a reputation of being a bit negative but the Constable, if you look at his record, is often negative. What he does is he looks for the perfect plan which ruins the good plan. Time and time again, we cannot have that because this is not perfect. It is time to say enough of that mentality, enough of that philosophy that says we cannot move, we cannot act, we cannot make a decision; we can. We have the opportunity today, we can do it and we can still have both. We can have our cake and eat it. I never thought I would quote Boris but here I am. We can have our cake and eat it. We can have an expanded park and we can have a school on this site. Apologies to Boris but there it is. I shall not be eating the cake because I obviously have to keep my figure.

2.1.3 Deputy J.H. Young:

Very passionate debate. Unfortunately, I fear not a necessary one because I think the point I would like to make, having looked through the Island Plan and looked at this carefully, the policy CI6, which is another policy in this plan, not this one that we are debating now, already safeguards this site for a park. The reason for that is that the States have passed a proposition back in 2017, P.114/2017 if you want to have a look. What that says is that actually ... it is quite a complex proposition. I have had to look it up, it was way before my time, I was not in the States then. It was a housing development with an underground car park and a park on top. Now, of course, that has not happened. Why has it not happened? Well, things change. So the Island Plan that we debating today has a policy, CI6, that maintains that safeguarding and Deputy Ward has brought in another proposition to amend it to include safeguarding for a school. Now, because you safeguard a school does not make a decision that it should be. It does not, as the Connétable says, prevent it happening. Now, maybe we did not have an amendment from the Constable because we already have it for the park. I do not see that the effect of this proposition is to bomb out the safeguarding on the park already. You know my feelings, we have not handled these property decisions terribly well. The notion that we here are in a position to make that judgment, of which it should be, on the information we have available is ridiculous. We do not. We do not even have a statement from our Minister for Children and Education that tells us what we need and of course that is what, in Deputy Gardiner’s proposition, we have just agreed to do. We do not have that. That is a pre-emptive. We have a statement of what they need. Now we all know there is a need there. We all know there is a need for a park. The Connétable has a proposition down which we are going to debate in a couple of weeks and he will be able to make his detailed case and States Members will decide. My guess would be that if the States do approve the Connétable’s proposition in a couple of weeks, then I think that will potentially allow a decision to depart from this particular safeguarding policy under CI1. Now why did I put “accept”? Well, on 1st March, we heard from the Minister for Housing and Communities that he has heard that C.Y.P.E.S. (Children, Young People, Education and Skills) preferred option for the school was this site. Now Members said in the questioning: “Are you sure?

Are you right?" We got confirmation that it absolutely was. So, on that basis, when I was preparing going through these propositions, I thought: "Well, Deputy Ward is proposing a safeguard" and of course, on 1st March, it was clearly reported to the States that that was the case. It is the only information I have to go on so, therefore, my view is that I believe that Members may not like this. Planning policies often deliver fairly messy solutions but I believe we can support this one. It does not bomb out the town park. That is a decision down for later. We have 2 safeguardings in there for different purposes and, through decision-making processes, both sides have to give their case to get us a decent argument with the facts and information sufficient to make that decision. I do not think we should wind ourselves up in a frazzle today and think we have to make this choice. We do not, in my view. We should just accept this, move on and accept the fact that, in the future, we need to do much better about how we deal with our property decisions. I think that is probably all I need to say, and I hope Members will accept, I have to say. If anybody doubts that I am right, maybe they can ask the Attorney General or something but that is the advice I have from the officers. Safeguarding does not prevent a decision being taken to do something else if there is a case and the need is justified. The planning system provides for that.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Minister. Will you accept a point of clarification from the Connétable of St. Helier?

Deputy J.H. Young:

Of course, Sir, absolutely.

The Connétable of St. Helier:

I am grateful. The Minister said a few moments ago that I had a proposition down which would be debated at the end of the session. Could he confirm that, in fact, if this amendment is accepted, my proposition P.67 will fall away and therefore will not be able to be debated by this Government?

Deputy J.H. Young:

Well, I apologise. I do not have the proposition in front of me and the wording of it but is that proposition on the Island Plan? If it is, and it talks about safeguarding in this policy, if that is down for debate on the Island Plan, yes. It is probably a conflicted proposition if it is down for debate on a separate occasion. I am sorry. I do not have that proposition in front of me.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Connétable, you are correct. I have not looked at P.67 but if it does fall foul of Standing Order 20, then it will not be debated at the next session.

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

I would be delighted if there was a primary school built on the end of the park. Education is not my specialist area obviously but it is something that I would approve. The sight of a school on the wrong side of that particular road would fill me with dread. I know people will blame me for the amount of traffic but that is the job. I would like everyone to be within walking distance. In the near future, we will be altering work that has progressed already. Work has started on Midvale Road making the pavements wider there and it would be a nice walking route to a new school. If people could walk through town and drop their children off at a new primary school in the area, I would be highly delighted. We always will need experts from outside of the Island but with all the things we have been doing this week regarding housing estates and schools, et cetera, the elephant in the room obviously is population.

[10:30]

If we do not get a grip on that, then all we are doing is sucking in more and more people. We have to look after our resident Island population that we have and, obviously, it goes without saying that

anything we say or do today cannot bind the hands of any future States Assembly. I will leave it there.

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

Listening to Deputy Southern's speech earlier reminds me of P.135 of 2009 and, for those of us who were there and who will recall his proposition called the Millennium Town Park Funding from the Stabilisation Fund, that was the ring binder vote which created or served to produce the finance which created the town park. I was privileged to be in the Ministerial seat at the time when it was constructed and experienced the remediation works which had to take place, which were significant to get it to where it is now. I do not know how much work has been done to identify how much decontamination will be necessary on the site which is being discussed at present. It was obviously a contentious debate at the time but I think with the passage of 12 years now and 13 almost, the town park has proved to be an outstanding success and an extension to it will be much appreciated and really necessary in that area of concentrated residential development. Having had the experience of planting the first trees with Deputy Lewis at the time, I feel that an extension needs to be prioritised at this point, notwithstanding the fact that I would support a school structure, but I do not feel the space available there is sufficient for what is being requested. On this occasion, I cannot support this proposition.

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

I guess we are in the dichotomy of being a small island and having conflicting demands, certainly on a site like this. The way we need to move forward with schools in Jersey is to try to get to a better position of bigger schools. They are less expensive. If we can take Les Quennevais School, which Princess Anne said was one of the best public schools she has ever been to, we can show exactly what we can do with a clean site that builds a new school rather than doing extensions to make education a gold standard in the Island. Now the challenge is that we have a need for building a school and trying to get to a better place. Let us get back to the argument of providing school meals in primary schools. A lot of the buildings are small. They were not built to have a servery or a kitchen in any way that would be able to serve food to children, which means extensions and planning applications to be able to do that kind of thing safely. Building a new school we will be able to help look at maybe freeing up some of the smaller schools, but building better facilities and using a clean site is the best way to go to get the best outcomes for the children of this Island in what we are doing. I have full sympathy with the Minister for Housing and Communities and the Constable and the residents in the area in that an extension to the park would be fantastic. I think we could reorganise Millennium Park so that there is more open space that is not taken up by massive planting areas to give more space in that area and maybe change the way that it is planted to create a bigger open space. We are in a dichotomy where we need to look at building better, bigger schools. This site is my preferred site. It has been my preferred site even before the Deputy lodged this amendment to the bridging Island Plan. I have been going through the school review. Unfortunately, there are a lot of stakeholders that need to be informed before it suddenly goes out public. We are working with those stakeholders. They are people that have to make the decision. It has to go through different groups before I can bring it forward, and those groups that I have been talking to have been raising such issues as seeing that this is one of the preferred sites for the first school and what the second site would be. They are not happy and there has been more information requested. I would have liked to have come out months ago to say what is going on but there have been stakeholders. We do not want to shock anyone by making broad statements where we have not consulted with the right people and causing distress and upset for people. We have to make sure we do this in the right way. I will be supporting this amendment because it will create a new, modern purpose-built school on a clean site that will really, really provide for the children of St. Helier and the Island.

2.1.7 Deputy K.F. Morel:

I do find this an odd one because, from an outsider's perspective - I am not a St. Helier Deputy, I am not the Minister for Children and Education and I am not closely involved with this but I do love the Millennium Town Park - I find it hard to understand the real problem here because it feels like Deputy Ward's amendment is a superb compromise solution. The amendment still involves an extension to the Millennium Town Park. With this amendment, the Millennium Town Park will grow but it also says part of the area could be used for a school and should be used for a school, and I cannot help but agree with him. The schools we have in that area of town, the buildings are ageing. They are obviously, in many areas, on restricted sites as well, and I know this of course would be restricted as a site but as the Minister for Children and Education helpfully just said, it would give the Education Department the opportunity to plan, from scratch, a new school purpose-built to fully modern specifications. There is no doubt in my mind - and I am sure everyone in the Assembly agrees with me - we are putting a lot more housing provision in that area of town. Ann Street is being built today. Other sites are going to be developed in the near future. More and more people, but fundamentally important to that, more and more children will be living in that area. Those children and those people will need a park. With this amendment they will get a bigger park but those children also need schools and, with this amendment, they will get a better school. A slight aside here. Big schools might be okay but I do believe that, when it comes to primary schools, small class sizes are better than big class sizes. So when the Minister for Children and Education talks about a "big school", I hope he is not talking about big class sizes because one of the things we could do here is have a school which has smaller class sizes because it is purpose-built. That way, the children, at their youngest ages, get the attention that they need at the beginning of their lives. I apologise to the Connétable but, to me, this is a really good amendment that is a very, very good compromise. Regarding the type of school that can be built, if you look at designs around the world of primary schools, there are some unbelievably fantastic designs from an architectural perspective. A building could be built there which really does suit the park environment. We do not have to build in boxes anymore. If you look at the schools that are already in the area, they are boxes in the main, and they are old boxes so we do need to provide something else. I cannot see the problem with this amendment. I know the Connétable has tried to elucidate it but, from my perspective, to use that area solely for the park would be not to use it for the maximum public gain and I do believe that the school and the park extension together is maximising the public gain so I hope that helps States Members. I will certainly be supporting this amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Will you accept, Deputy, a point of clarification from Deputy Wickenden?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

Of course, Sir.

Deputy S.M. Wickenden:

Sir, do you mind if I do the point of clarification on my speech on the question of what Deputy Morel questioned on what I said? Is that allowed?

The Deputy Bailiff:

You can clarify something that you said that has been referred to by the Member that just spoke, yes.

Deputy S.M. Wickenden:

So when I said "larger schools", I meant 3 form entry rather than bigger classrooms. I just wanted to clarify that was my meaning.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, that is fine. Thank you very much.

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

I will be very happy to support this amendment. The Minister and I have been talking about this site for years already. It is something that we identified very early on but of course we had to wait for the Minister for Children and Education to consult with all the stakeholders and present his plans before we could do anything, but it is a site that made a lot of sense from the beginning. Of course, it has only become available reasonably recently so we could have a look at it again after the planning application was refused. Developing an estate like education is a little bit like this old Tower of Hanoi game. I do not know if anybody will remember it here where you have 3 rods and concentric discs that you have to move from one rod to another with specific rules and, basically, to move them around, you need an empty space. So here we have a number of schools that all need to be renewed and remember that, here, we are talking about decades. We are talking about a plan that will take 20 or 25 years. So we all need to modify them or to renew them and the best way is exactly what we did to Les Quennevais. We could never have built Les Quennevais if we had not had a completely free site next to it, so we built a completely new school and now, after we are done with it, we can erase the old one. We need to do the same with the town schools. Now we have this fresh site that will allow a completely new school which is not constrained by a site which is in use, we can make the best possible school and that will free other sites that can then be developed in the best way possible. This is exactly what we are trying to do with our sports and community facilities. We have the same problem. They are crumbling and they need to be renewed but the best way is to move them around. That is of course something that we have been trying to do with Fort Regent because it is the first facility that we want to renew. If you think about it, that is exactly what we are trying to do with the hospital. We tried extremely hard to refit the hospital where it was while it was being used and that was impossible. We had 2 planning applications that failed because there was no way in the world that you could replace it where it was and, yet, we are trying to do it with other things like schools. It is quite interesting that Deputy Southern mentioned the way that the Constable of St. Helier is trying to have everything absolutely perfect and, unfortunately, may sacrifice good things because he just tries to get it right. We do have to be a little bit more flexible than that. If we are to renew half of our estates in the next 25 years, we will have to sacrifice a few things. So all there is to say is that this is a very good idea. It is not set in stone. It can still be changed. It can still adapt to different requisites, especially if the Minister for Children and Education comes up with a different plan but I personally think that it is a very good idea.

2.1.9 Deputy M.R. Higgins of St. Helier:

Let me say first of all we are having this debate because of the failure of successive Governments to deal with the whole matter of St. Helier. St. Helier is used as the place to put people in and no real aforethought has been given to the school or to the park or any other amenities for the people who live in St. Helier. I get appalled when I think about the number of debates we have had and the number of times we have talked through these issues. I just think we are now faced with, obviously, difficult choices. I want to build better schools for St. Helier residents and for the children of St. Helier but I also want proper park facilities. Although it is talked of as a compromise, we have no idea of the size of the area that will be taken by the school and what will be put there. For example, Deputy Wickenden talked about Les Quennevais School and how it was appreciated by Princess Anne when she came to him and said how good it was. Well, how big a school and what sort of facilities are going to go in there?

[10:45]

We have no idea whatsoever. Why? Because this Government has not brought forward the plan for the school in the same way we have not had the census and we do not have a population policy. We

are making decisions which are going to affect the Island going forward on very limited information. Now Deputy Guida is obviously delighted and thinks this is an excellent site for it. Why? Because it will enable him to keep the former police station and fire station in the Home Affairs area of influence. So, in other words, Rouge Bouillon School will not be extended and will not be given better facilities if this school on the Millennium Park takes place. I want to see facilities not only for the children near Millennium Park but also near Rouge Bouillon, so no wonder Deputy Guida said he has been talking with the Minister for Children and Education for some time and they think this is a great site. They did not want Rouge Bouillon School to be extended at all and I really do believe that regarding the Reform Party, it is all politics coming up before the election. Although I agree, as I say, for better schools for our children and so on, they have latched on to this, but it will be at the expense of the children near Rouge Bouillon. I think, in the end, I may end up plumping for increasing the size of the park with the Constable. I think that is absolutely essential for all residents, not just children, and I think that we have to fight better for schools including Rouge Bouillon.

2.1.10 Deputy R. Labey of St. Helier:

I must say I do appreciate the consultations that Deputy Ward is making and did make during his proposal speech to keep the window open for more park. I guess what Deputy Ward is saying is that, if we approve his proposition today, it does not mean definitely that this site will not be a park. I would prefer, because I think it is safer, that we reject his proposition today but, at the same time, saying: "That does not mean it will not eventually be a school." I think that is the better position to be in because I cannot see, if this is passed, there would be any incentive for Education to look elsewhere. I have had one briefing with the team conducting the review and I had 2 important questions for them. One was: "If the planning application for housing on the Gas Place site had been approved, where would you put the school that you want to put there now?" They would not give me an answer to that one, but those sites have to exist because they could be building the housing now if it got passed. My second question was: "How much of the Gas Place site do you imagine the school occupying?" The eventual answer I managed to tease out of them was: "All of it." So I think the notion that we are going to get the school that Education wants and a park or more park that myself and the Constable wants is fantasy. The answer was very clear. They want to use all of the Gas Place site for this new primary school. There might be consultations going on with stakeholders that have not included the community around that area. I just cannot imagine the Constable of St. Lawrence or the Constable of St. John - who are 2 who immediately spring to my mind but of course there are many others too - bringing a proposition like this to the Assembly about their Parish without having had proper exhaustive meaningful consultation with the community to bring them onboard or find out what their opinions and preferences are. We have not had that. I know Deputy Ward is in a difficult position because he is the Deputy of the district and I am the Deputy of Tunnell Street and I fought of course the original plans for housing when I was first elected with the Tunnell Street residents which were quite dense. It was approved, I think, by the Planning Committee and we took it through a third-party appeal. We won that appeal and then subsequent redraws and redrafts came back and we all know where we are now. I am very clear on what the residents in my section of that would prefer. I have gone on about this ever since I have been asked about it, so the Assembly will know how important I feel doubling the size of this park is for all those housing developments that are going to be built and the existing residents too. So it does not surprise me that the Minister accepted this proposition. I cannot remember when the Planning and Environment Department came forward with plans for a park. We certainly fought tooth and nail when I was in, again, another fight in Green Street to ensure that the pocket park there was retained. The Assembly did back me and it went ahead anyway. I have had to listen to Members speaking in the Assembly and talking about the importance of green space and how we know St. Helier does not have anywhere near the percentage of green space that it should have for the amount of people living in it. So, it is not going to happen unless the Assembly takes the brave step to not just talk the talk but walk the walk because amenity is always pushed down. There is always something more important unless we say: "No, we are going

to take a stand.” I think we can find other places for Springfield School. There is a lot of movement in Springfield at the moment, there is a lot of potential, and I would really like to work on that with people who want to find the solution but I fear that that will be cut off with this and we will have to wait until the next Assembly. But back to my final point. What this really needs, if we are going to stand a chance of doubling the size of that park, is a strong message of political will which the Assembly could do today but please do not be fooled into thinking that this is a nice compromise because the school will only occupy a bit of Gas Place. No, the proposition, I was told, was for all of it. I think the Deputy, to be fair to him, is being reasonable here but it is all in the nuance and I would rather we retained the position of this could be a park and we would like this to be a park unless there is absolutely no other solution for the school.

2.1.11 Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I think the fact that I am speaking after the Minister for Housing and Communities and also Deputy Labey, who is wearing his Deputy hat for his district, illustrates the dilemmas and discussions that we have had and the difficult decisions we always face when we are dealing with these sites. So what I would like to do is just try to put a bit of context together and hopefully that will explain why I will be supporting Deputy Ward and indeed agree with quite a number of the comments that he has made. I would just remind Members that the site, in terms of decisions by the Assembly certainly from memory, has been approved for development. A previous Assembly took a decision to acquire the land on the basis that it was developed for housing and parking. Therefore, from my perspective, I do regard this particular proposition, which the Minister for the Environment has said is a safeguarding exercise, i.e. it safeguards the land, so it does not preclude a park but it does safeguard it as a top priority for education. I think it does also illustrate the dilemma sometimes, and Deputy Labey did refer to it in his discussions with Andium, about co-ordinating the different needs of the Island across the Government and the A.L.O.s (arm’s-length organisations). Obviously Andium will be very much focused around the provision of housing and have gone down other ways but obviously they will, in general, not particularly be focused, for example, on the provision of educational facilities. That is a matter for the Government and this Assembly. That co-ordination is something I have tasked the new C.E.O. (chief executive officer) with and I know she is very much working on that as we speak. I think just to clarify, where we are as of today is that I am expecting the work that has been going on for a number of months as part of the education review to be returning to the Regeneration Steering Group. My expectation now is in early April and my expectation is also that the work to that date will, in some shape or form, be published before the election. If Members would wish I am very happy to arrange a presentation as well to talk through the thinking on that. There are 2 phases to that work. Phase 1 does presently envisage the use of this site that we are debating for a primary school. My recollection is different to Deputy Labey’s, I have to say, because I have also asked the question and indeed I, to date, have been assured that they felt it was possible to treat the development as the provisional primary school and also an addition to the town park, and it is on that basis I would support this amendment. I think that is when we get into the difference between concepts and, as things evolve, so it will depend on who spoke to the officers at what point in time, and also, as I said, as these plans continue to evolve in what political direction is given to those officers. I will say that one of the reasons for the delay was not around phase 1, it was more around phase 2, and I certainly felt that there needed to be a further challenge in the overall estate around a slightly wider focus that needed to be applied. That is what officers have been doing and have, I believe, come up with some good solutions. I want to just address a couple of remarks that have been made around education but before I do that, I do absolutely understand the passion of the Connétable of St. Helier on this. Absolutely no question. I am hugely sympathetic to what he is trying to achieve. In terms of his passion for St. Helier, I have tried to support in a whole number of ways where we can but absolutely again - and I have said this a number of times - we have lost 2 years in what I would have liked to have done because of the pandemic. The amount of resource that was sucked out of the system to protect people lives and businesses and jobs really ... a number of Members

seem to have forgotten that. Even now Omicron is still prevalent and, indeed, Members of certain age groups are now getting their fourth vaccine even as we speak. I absolutely agree with the Connétable; I have made some suggestions to officers about future funding streams to be in place for future support in St. Helier and I hope that some of the schemes that we have finally started and/or have gone in for planning permission will at least move fractionally the improvement of St. Helier forward. Equally, as I have said, I very much look forward to, as I am informed is apparently still happening, seeing the hoppla bus arriving here at the end of next month. But the crucial thing on the education side, I do just want to address something that was said in either this debate or the previous debate about what had or had not been done on education, particularly in St. Helier. The crucial thing about the educational estate is obviously achieving both funding and sites. Obviously looking ahead I am sure Members will be aware that when they approved the Government Plan for 2022, it was approved before Christmas, we have approved something like a spend of £62 million over the next 4 years, which is investment into the estate.

[11:00]

Some of that is included for the reorganisation of the secondary schools, there is a substantial sum of money for a north of town St. Helier primary school and also funding for a south of St. Helier school, and also funding for a further educational campus. In other words, those are in the funding that this Assembly have indicated they support and which can be accommodated within our funding streams. Some of that work, for example, things on playing fields, 3G pitch replacements, Mont á L'abbé extension, things like that are scheduled to start during this year. Equally, and I appreciate somebody will say well that is looking forward, do not forget that in terms of the educational state - I accept it is not in St. Helier or St. Saviour - Les Quennevais was implemented, built and completed during these last 4 years. At a minor level the Haute Vallée school bus has been turned into a mobile library. We redid St. Mary's School at £6.5 million, there has been £100,000 on the redevelopment of La Sente, La Passerelle has been fully established as a service support youth provision. We have put various things in about 3G pitches. That has been reasonable sums of money taking place. What I would not want to do ... and I accept the point about the location from the person making the statement, is there has been rather a lot done around the schools' estate and there is always more to do. Obviously, I think Le Rocquier receives new funding, as does Mont á L'abbé, the redevelopment of green fields and the V.C.P. (Victoria College Prep) replacement school. Sometimes these things get said and sometimes things go off and gain credence. There has been, and is forecast to be, quite significant investment in the school estate as is right. So, for me this amendment is very much about safeguarding this site until that schools review is finalised. At this stage my information is that Phase 1 of that review is definitely identifying the site as a very high potential for a primary school, which would then release sites. I agree with Deputy Ward around pocket parks; one has to use that as a catalyst for improving facilities. It might also include the long-sought site for user provision and things like that. That overall brings benefits to all the individual communities it touches. On that basis, I have no hesitation in supporting this amendment and on the basis of the comments of the Minister for the Environment I would ask all other Members to do so.

2.1.12 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:

I hope Members will forgive me, I am still getting my thoughts together on this and I think it is fair to say I would usually support Deputy Ward. I am usually in agreement with the propositions that he brings but I am undecided on whether I can support this one today. My feelings stem from the hierarchy of what that land should be used for. I think it absolutely should not be used for housing and I am in total agreement there. If it was a choice between housing and a new school then school would be the way to go. I think the idea of building a school there at first glance does seem ... it appeals and in isolation it does seem like a good idea, a lovely new school on that beautiful park site but where I am hesitating ... firstly, I am a resident of that area and that area is on the St. Helier, St. Saviour border and I live very close to the town park. Nobody has asked the residents of that area

what they think about this. I am speaking today as a Deputy but also as a resident. My feeling about the use of that land is once that land is built on we cannot get it back and that opportunity to have open space is gone. Yes, schools are very important, certainly in that area it is more important that we have a new school than any new homes, but what is much more important than any type of building and what the resident children and adults of all ages desperately need in that area of town and, of course, the edge of St. Saviour is access to nature and open spaces. A previous speaker mentioned the Constable of St. Helier and his vision for having a park all the way through as being the perfect plan. Yes, why should we not go for that perfect plan? I think residents of the area are hoping for that perfect plan. Why should they not have it? Open space is in such short supply in the area as it is. Anyone who has used that park, especially on a sunny day will know that it is very, very well used. In fact, it is often mobbed. If you get sunshine on a sunny day at various times of the day, whether it is people on their lunch break or families after school, it is absolutely jampacked and there currently is not space for everybody who wants to use the park to use it for what they want to use it for. For example, you cannot go there and kick a ball around because there are families with small children on the grass and, likewise, if you are a family with a small child you are terrified of getting kicked by a football. The grass is literally packed with people sitting on blankets. The park is very small. It feels small. In terms of nature and green space in town, as a family we do not tend to use it very often because it is often really overcrowded. We tend to go out of town, we are lucky that we have a car in town and we make use of the resident's parking facilities in town. We are very lucky that we can do that but families who cannot go out of town, and that is their only option for the green space nearby, they are not getting that feeling of being in an open space, because often it is crammed. You go to that park, it is beautiful and it is becoming more beautiful as the plants and the trees mature, but you do not get that expansive feeling that we can get when we are further out of town perhaps on a beach or in one of the parks like Winston Churchill Park in St. Brelade. It feels hemmed in. Particularly that end of the park ... so the end of the park that we are talking about borders St. Saviour and I do not think enough is said about St. Saviour not having enough open space because I think St. Saviour is such a mixed bag in terms of we do have lots of open space in some areas but this area of St. Saviour, which is St. Saviour 2 District, of which I am a Deputy, residents have even less access to green space than town residents. There is a hill there. It is very overcrowded with housing and that green space specifically in that area that we are talking about is desperately needed by St. Saviour residents. Imagine if we were talking about building a school on the edge of Howard Davis Park on pre-existing parkland, we would never allow it, would we? I know it is not existing parkland but in the minds of many it should be parkland and in the minds of the residents in that area they are desperate for it to be parkland and they have been told about this masterplan and they are already gearing up for that. I think it will be crushing to many of the residents to be told that now it is not going to be. Previous speakers have mentioned that actually a school in that area would take up all of that extra parkland, and I think it would. Deputy Morel was asking about class sizes. I totally agree with him, smaller class sizes are optimal but you are more likely to get smaller class sizes with a bigger school. Where we have the 2-form entry school, where you have 2 receptions, 2 year 1, 2 year 2 classes you are more likely to have 2 smaller classes rather than one overcrowded class. I think if a school was allowed to be built there it would be a large school. Again, I do not think all of our town schools are fully subscribed. We do not have the data on that but, from my own personal experience recently in trying to enrol my child in a school that is appropriate for him, I do not think all the town schools are fully subscribed. Again, if we are thinking about what children need, if children live in the centre of town in a home without a garden I think in terms of the hierarchy of what they need, what they need more of is space to play near their home, adequate space to play. I think we perhaps need to think a bit differently about school provision because, yes, it is lovely to walk to school but not every parent who lives in town with their child wants their child to attend a school in town. I think the popularity of our private schools demonstrates that. A lot of our private schools have beautiful grounds, and I know anecdotally that parents often choose those private schools because of the outdoor facilities and they are willing to travel to those schools. This is why

I think consultation is important. Ideas such as having a decent school bus service to a new school perhaps just on the outskirts of town in a beautiful area rather than cramming it in to that tiny green space in the middle of town. I think there are other ways to provide the new school. The Chief Minister mentioned the passion of the Constable of St. Helier. That passion made me sit up because I think, more than anybody, the Constable of St. Helier is in touch with parishioners in that area and knows what is needed and what the residents want. I am just wondering, where is that passion from other Members, because it was that passion that Members used to protect People's Park from a hospital being built on it. I do not see that this is any different. We are talking about a school being built on potential parkland. I do not think I can support this. What I do perhaps need to hear more detail on is I am not 100 per cent sure in my mind about the risks involved with approving this or not approving this because I want to take action to make sure, as far as I can, that housing is not built on that land. I would like to know if I vote for or against this how that would impact the potential for housing to be built on that land. I will listen to the summing up.

2.1.13 Deputy I. Gardiner:

I could not resist speaking. I asked to speak during the Minister for Housing and Communities' speech because it just showed to the Assembly that the Minister for Housing and Communities does not agree with Minister for Children and Education. We heard from the Minister for the Environment, the Minister for Infrastructure, they are just going back to sit together. There are a lot of things that we are not agreeing with the Chief Minister but on this particular point I would like to support the Chief Minister and not my Constable. Why? I am passionate about the parks, I am passionate about green spaces and I am passionate about education. It has been stated clearly that the park can be extended and two-thirds of the space would go to the park. It will be a bigger park and it has been mentioned about the pocket parks. I agree with pocket parks, I cannot agree with pocket schools. We need to have proper schools. I have been approached by parishioners more than once asking how they can apply to schools outside of town, how they can get a space because they do not want to go to Springfield and not because the staff are not great there, they are doing amazing job, but because of the conditions. They want to have a green space. By the way, at Springfield School there is no space, it is up to capacity if people even want to apply, but there are other schools that do have spaces and the people would rather drive their child outside of town, not because of the quality of education, because of the state of the school. They are not fit for purpose. I cannot agree that we will need to have buses to drive children from the centre of town to other town schools, I cannot see ... because to catch buses it means that the child needs to wake up 30 minutes earlier to get on to the bus, to create extra expense, to create extra ... I mean, we need to have schools in safe walking distance. We have to have compromises. Consultation.

[11:15]

There will be consultation and I am sure there will be extensive consultation with all stakeholders because none of this development would go forward without consultation and I would suggest why the consultation ... I hope consultation was taken by the Government during the review and if the Minister for Housing and Communities does not know about consultation I am not sure what consultation has been done. The vision from Andium. Andium does an amazing job but it is not about the vision from Andium, it is about the vision from this States Assembly. It is about the vision from our common strategic priorities, corporate vision, that we need to communicate to Andium. It is not Andium's fault because they are trying to do as much as they can and meet the demanding and conflicting needs between all possible parties that communicate with them. I am not sure if Andium spoke to the Chief Minister, the Minister for Infrastructure and the Minister for Children and Education before they had gone out with the announcement that they are supporting the Constable's proposition. I have a big question mark, I am not sure who can answer that, maybe they did. What I am trying to bring back ... also families who cannot drive outside of town to enjoy the countryside cannot drive outside of town to enjoy country schools. It is parents and children who deserve more

than standard schools. We have so much ability to have a child's place and we will have an extended park. Personally, as a St. Helier Deputy I will not allow the space to be developed without increasing the park but I am sure that solutions can be found and we need to make compromises.

2.1.14 Senator K.L. Moore:

I will be brief because there have been a number of very helpful speeches since I turned my light on to speak. I think for me this debate has caused me to reflect back over the learning of the last couple of years, and particularly during the lockdowns we all spent considerable time feeling concerned for and thinking about those people who were living in cramped conditions in densely packed space in town where they struggled to get out and enjoy fresh air during that time. It must have been extremely difficult for all them. As Deputy Doublet said in her speech, the spaces, the green spaces that we do currently have in town are often very crowded and well used because there is a clear need in town for them. Throughout these debates I found it very helpful to look at maps and at satellite images that we can see. My basic calculations using the tip of my pen has led me to consider that the extended Millennium Park, taking in the gasworks site would still be only about the same size as Parade Gardens, which is just not a big space. It really is not. As the Constable of St. Helier said, parks need to be places where people can break into a sweat, where they can do some decent exercise. We cannot simply have pocket parks and pocket schools for them; we need to offer spaces, a space to breathe, a space to exercise. So, although I commend Deputy Ward for trying to bring a solution to schools, I have to say I have some sympathy with Deputy Higgins' cynicism over the siting and the potential to improve Rouge Bouillon School. I land on the fact that we simply should offer a greater amount of green space to our town dwellers.

2.1.15 Senator S.Y. Mézec:

I have been disappointed by some of the recent contributions in this debate, particularly that by Senator Moore and Deputy Doublet. In case she is listening outside the Chamber I am going to work very hard to try to convince Deputy Doublet to vote in favour of this amendment because, based on everything she says, I think she may not realise that she is, in opposing this amendment, making it more likely to get the worse outcome based on the things she considered to be a priority in improving access to green space and improving the quality of life for the children who live in that area. Like Deputy Doublet, I live very close to the Millennium Park, I am just a few doors down from it on Oxford Road. I walk through that park multiple times a day. It is extremely well-used, it is a desperately needed resource in that area for all of the people who live around it, adults and children alike, and thank goodness we have it there. It is a combination of extremely hard work from many people to get that passed the park in the first place, including Deputy Southern getting the financing for it, and with a bit of luck thrown in as well to get it. It could frankly have been much worse. The North of Town Masterplan had that whole part of the gasworks site down for housing. There was a planning application approved for housing on there for 300 homes, which I and others fought against, and throughout all of that myself as a then St. Helier Deputy and other St. Helier representatives said we wanted the park expanded over the whole site. In the beginning of 2018 we compromised on that because an option was presented to this Assembly to get an extended park and the cost of that would be to have some housing on that site as well. It is often forgotten about. We talk about the brilliant work that Andium does and the small print of that decision - people keep forgetting this - is that it was not to be social housing or first-time buyers, that was going to be open market housing because that was the only way they could see of getting the numbers up. We accepted it as a compromise because it was much better than the plan for 300 homes on the whole of it. As the course of this term has gone on, until the Minister for Children and Education spoke in this debate, we have not had the clarity that we have needed on what the plans are for improving the school estate in St. Helier. For those of us who live in and represent St. Helier that is extremely important to us because we know of many of the difficulties that our constituents have. Deputy Doublet talked about there being capacity in some of the town schools and I am sorry to say that she is wrong about that. There are many,

many children who live in this part of town who cannot go to the school that they live nearest to because it is full. They have to go elsewhere. In some parts of town they will get pushed out to St. Luke's but St. Luke's is a tiny school so if they cannot get there they might get pushed out to Plat Douet, if not there to Samarès, if not there to St. Clement. I know people who live literally a few doors down from me who send their children to Grouville Primary School and have to drive them out there and back every day. I know somebody who lives in Le Breton Lane whose child was in the catchment area for Springfield School and that is where she applied for her daughter to go but could not get a space so has to go to d'Auvergne instead. d'Auvergne is a fantastic school. She spends 45 minutes in the car in traffic every morning and she drives past 3 schools to get her daughter up that hill to d'Auvergne and she spends the whole journey absolutely paranoid that she is going to run into traffic jam that she could not have predicted and end up being late for work. That is not a good quality of life when an alternative would be to provide a decent, multi-form entry school in town that those parents can walk their children to. We can provide some urban regeneration for pathways to that school and Deputy Ward showed pictures of how that can look with some of the work that is going on at the brewery site. Deputy Doublet talked about how important it is for children to have access to nature. She is absolutely right but do you think they will be able to enjoy this open green space more or less if they are spending 45 minutes in the car there and back every day or if their school opens out on to green space within walking distance where their parents - instead of spending all that time in the car to drive them back afterwards - could take them to the park immediately right by the school, even if it is just for a short period of time, to calm down and relax before then taking them home. I think children will have more access to open green space if this is the option that is pursued. But - and this is the key point, this is why Deputy Doublet should vote for this amendment - this amendment does not stop the possibility of extending the park on the whole site if that is a realistic option. If it is the case that with a bit more work on that school estates review there can be an alternative site in the vicinity that is just as good or even better than this then I know that I and St. Helier representatives will happily support that and get an extended park as well. I would be delighted to see the park extended on the whole site and I would be delighted to vote in favour of that when and only when the question of where these kids will go to school has been answered. What Deputy Ward's amendment does ... it is kind of hard to tell from the wording of the amendment because the amendment refers to policy C11, you have to go to the Island Plan addendum to read what that says, so it is adding it to a list of sites where the policy will be - and I am reading it out here - "the alternative development of the sites will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that they are no longer required for educational purposes." If we can find other sites for it, great, but what this does do is it excludes the possibility of building homes on it. Not just building homes but building what were meant to be open market homes not affordable homes, which is what we prefer Andium to be spending their time and resources on. Several Members have used the phrase "have your cake and eat it" in this debate, which has always struck me as a strange phrase because that is the whole point of cake, you do want to eat it. But this amendment really does offer us that opportunity to safeguard that site from over-development and cramming of homes in what is already the most densely populated part of the Island, and leave it so there are only 2 possibilities for that site. Either fully extended park over the whole site, which would be brilliant, or extend the park on the majority of that site and provide a brilliant new built school, multi-form entry so that the quality of life for people in that area who have children can be improved and allow those children to walk to school. It will get cars off the road because you will not have people having to drive their children outside to out-of-town areas twice a day. That may not seem obvious if you are somebody who lives in the vicinity whose child does have a place in the local school that you are happy with or you are somebody without children but for those who have struggled to get places for their children in schools that would make a huge difference to them. It will make our town a nicer place to live, improve the quality of life and improve people's well-being as well because they will not have to face as much stress in the morning and school rush hours and it will alleviate pressure on the out-of-town schools as well as people are not pushed further out as there are more housing developments there. One point

that Deputy Higgins made about Reform Jersey's position on this, he described us as jumping on it. I would point out to him that here is no threat to Rouge Bouillon because of this and Reform Jersey was pleased to, on more than one occasion, back propositions brought by Deputy Gardiner to safeguard what is currently used by the fire service next to Rouge Bouillon School. I went with the local Reform Jersey Deputies to Rouge Bouillon School not too long ago to meet with the headteacher and walk around and see the facilities there, and see the miracles that Deputy Ward spoke about in his opening speech that they are talking about, that they deliver there. We noted for that amendment previously and Deputy Gardiner's amendment just now spoke about sites in the immediate vicinities of the school and safeguarding those. We have that safeguarding for Rouge Bouillon there as well. A good future for Rouge Bouillon School either on that site or whatever can be proposed we will wholeheartedly be behind, but Springfield needs some attention as well.

[11:30]

There are no options for Springfield School on its current site. The way it is sandwiched in between houses there, the fact it has only tarmac space outside, you just cannot do anything with it. So a freshly built school elsewhere is obviously the preferred option, and I am pleased that the Minister for Children and Education has revealed that. I think the only point I will make in closing is that it is a shame that these issues are coming out in the debate now. It would have been much better if we would have been able to have that open conversation about it in advance. I recall originally there was an intention by the Government to oppose this amendment and now that has changed and we were not notified properly about that and we had not had confirmation from the Minister for Children and Education until his speech in this debate that this is his preferred site. It is not ideal that we debate an Island Plan, debate building homes on this site or that site without much clearer indication of what the needs and potential plans would be for the schools on this site. But this amendment from Deputy Ward allows us to safeguard that site for either a park or for a school and prevents us from pursuing what would be the worst option, which is technically still on the table, which is homes for the whole site where they did get planning permission for it. To those who may have sympathy with Deputy Doublet's position that she adumbrated, I would say please do vote for this amendment because it prevents the worst options and still leaves those alternative good options perfectly open if a decent plan can come forward. I am voting in favour of this and I have visions of what this will do for the quality of life of the children who will get to enjoy greater open space in that area, who will get to enjoy much easier and nicer journeys to school and end up in a state-of-the-art brilliant school facility to receive their education, not to mention all of the stress that will alleviate for their parents as well, and all the pollution from the cars driving that we will not have as well. I see no down side to this amendment and I hope Members will support it.

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

A point of clarification, please? The speaker mentioned that housing might go on this site if we do not approve this amendment. I just wondered if he had any reason to believe that Andium want to build housing on there or any evidence that can back that up?

Senator S.Y. Mézec:

There is a planning application that has been approved for that site which predates Andium taking over the site and that is for around 300 homes and no extra green space. That was approved, that was appealed against, the appeal failed, that is still live so that is the default now. Andium had pursued alternative plans for it, which they were not able to acquire planning permission for, so that is the default at the moment for what can go on that site until it is rezoned, which is what this amendment seeks for it to do so it can only be a school or park otherwise it is still perfectly open for it to have more homes on it and that would be the worst option.

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

What is becoming apparent to me during this debate, and it is clear to me now, that it is not clear what will happen to this site. I was a little bit surprised by the Minister accepting this but I have gone away and done my research and spoken to people who know far better than I do and the Minister is right because we, in agreeing this proposition - which I think we probably will, and I think I am going to vote in favour of it - we will safeguard the site for education. But we must not forget that in the Island Plan there is another policy which safeguards this site for open space and then what should happen is that the planning process will take over and the balance that we always talk about when it comes to planning decisions will have to be made. If at that time the balance of educational need is greater than that for open space we will have a new school. If the balance comes out in favour of the need for green open space, we will have a school somewhere else. So I am content to vote for this amendment on the basis that the planning process will take over and the right decision will come out. It is a great shame that we do not have as Members the education report, which shows us what they ... I cannot believe that we have come into this debate and allowed that to happen. Somebody should have done whatever was necessary to say to Education: "This debate cannot happen until your review has been completed." That is a shame. The other advantage that we do have is that Andium are the owners of a number of sites here or thereabouts and other sites nearby are also in States ownership. There is a plan that needs to be hatched here. It may not be for a school on the site, it may be for a school somewhere else but for me I am not going to speak more. I am going to vote in favour and allow the planning process to do the right piece of work and come up with the right solution for this site sometime in the near future.

2.1.17 Deputy D. Johnson of St. Mary:

To a certain extent the previous speaker has stolen my words. I was about to say, and will say, that perhaps insufficient attention has been paid to the point made by the Minister for the Environment in his earlier address when he referred to policy CI6 entitled "Vision and Enhancement of Open Space" and I will read the relevant paragraph: "The following areas have been identified and safeguarded for provision of new open space and a development for other purpose will not be supported - (1) Part of Jersey Gas site, Tunnell Street: extension to Millennium Town Park, as specified by ..." so there is already a safe policy in force and I do not see that Deputy Ward's amendment in any way negates that. As far as I am concerned, his proposition effectively reinforces the intention that there shall be no development on that site unless it is for education. As the Deputy of St. Martin says, that is for a different day. I think between them the 2 propositions, or the policy as exists and the proposition, will ensure that park is not built upon and that is the main purpose of the exercise, yet at the same time flagging Deputy Ward's rightful concern as to lack of educational facilities in the area. I will be supporting his proposition.

2.1.18 Senator S.W. Pallett:

I only want to speak very briefly. I want to pick up on a point that Senator Mézec made. During my time as Assistant Minister for Education I dealt with a lot of appeals in regards parents wanting their children to go to specific schools and they were always quite difficult things to deal with. It was certainly distressing for parents and I am sure distressing for the children involved as well. After the point that Senator Mézec made about the distances children have to travel, that is clearly something that we need to avoid and something that we can do better on. I know we keep saying it but we do need to concentrate on ensuring that we give children the best possible start in life. That is something the majority of us have signed up to and it is something that I would like to think is at the forefront of our thinking. Children's well-being, both physical and mental, again should be at the forefront of our thoughts at all times. Many Members have talked about the need for a new school in this area for some time, certainly all the way through this political term. There are new homes being delivered as we speak. There are some that have been built over recent years and no doubt in the future we are going to see even more, and it is right, I think, that Deputy Ward is showing some forward thinking

in regards to planning for a new school in an area that I have no doubt will need it. Therefore I am going to support the amendment and I expect this site to provide the necessary school facilities, if required, and potentially any improvements to the town park that may be possible as well. Just more generally, the current primary schools in St. Helier - I know this from some of the work Jersey Sport were doing - all have issues around quality amenity space that I think potentially limits the physical development of students, and that is simply not good enough. We do need to do better and I think a new school in this area ... there is enough space there to ensure that we do not make the mistakes we have made in the past and improve on what we have delivered in the past. I think anybody that has visited Rouge Bouillon or Janvrin will see the very limited amenity space, the very limited play areas that children have to use in those schools and we just simply have to ensure that not only do we look after the academic development of young people, we also look after their physical development as well. Janvrin fortunately can use Springfield School but not all schools have the benefit of that. First Tower is another where I am sure the Members that represent that area know very well the limitations on the school and what they can deliver on within the ambience of their school. I know often they have to go to the beach to be able to do the things they need to but you cannot do that in the middle of winter. I am going to support this, like my fellow Progress Party Member, because I think it is the right thing to do.

2.1.19 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

I will not speak for long because I think the debate has been had and it has been won. It seems that we are vehemently in agreement on this one. I do want to say, first of all, I am really saddened at the way that this is needed to be brought as an amendment because yet again we see that inner St. Helier school children for this Government have been an afterthought. I really enjoy listening to debates and admire the different Parish schemes that they have throughout the Island and the pride that the Parishes take in their local communities and the school. Even though I have not always agreed with all of the planning decisions, I really admire the sense of community that we have right across our Island. Of course, those communities are not just limited to the Parishes but they are limited to places which sometimes cross Parish boundaries or are within specific areas. I see the pride and also the way that the Constables in particular fight for their Parishes and the students. I can think of several great examples, whether it is St. Martin, what they have done with that village, the school and the green spaces there and also in St. John, which I am familiar with, and La Moye School in my own constituency, just to name a few. I remember you do not always appreciate it when you are growing up but my family house bordered and opened up right on to Les Quennevais playing fields and I remember the heaps of ground when the fields were either being constructed or resurfaced. I could just look out the window and if I saw some of my friends playing football there and I had not got my invite I would just go out the back door and start playing with them anyway and they did not mind. I could walk or cycle to La Moye School without needing to go on the road, I could go along the cycle track, on to the railway walk, which thanks to Deputy Truscott's amendment that is coming up will safeguard that area as special status and protect it for future generations. I could get to my primary school and come back safely. Then when I was at Les Quennevais School again I could walk there but I also benefited from the fact that although Les Quennevais was on a very small footprint it had a playing field right adjacent to it. I know looking at Springfield School you might think it has Springfield not so far away, but it is not adjacent at all. How many busy roads do you have to cross to get there? It is a shame that in this instance the Constable and the many Deputies who are fighting for this proper vision, and this deliverable realistic vision, for having a much bigger park ... it is not going to be Hyde Park, I feel I have to say to the Constable of St. Helier because he is not the Constable of London, he is not the Mayor of London, he is the Constable of St. Helier which includes inner St. Helier. We have to be a realistic, there was never a park there in the first place, it had to be fought for.

[11:45]

As an aside, I do not have the response yet because I only sent the email a few minutes, but I have asked my friends and colleagues at L'Office du Jèrriais to find out what the Jèrriais is for ring binder because that could be an interesting name for renaming the park when it is extended or indeed we could have a special ring binder corner somewhere in the park, which is a plinth and people could make speeches there. A bit like in Hyde Park. The Constable can deliver a little bit of Hyde Park to the centre of St. Helier but it might just have to be a little bit smaller. Think about how many more people, families will end up enjoying the park, being brought there specifically because they have a reason to go there. I think this is the whole issue around placemaking in Jersey. You can have great open spaces; I think of some of the things that have been done at the waterfront. You have this amazing sculpture, the dolphins with the swimmers, I think, if I am not wrong ... I do not think it is a Philip Jackson; I would have to watch what I am saying. I think it may well be but the point is it is a beautiful sculpture but unless you have a reason to go down to the waterfront you are not going to go there. You are certainly not going to go there for the haute cuisine and the Michelin stars of Le Frégate restaurant or to look at the amazing lifelike upturned ship that is down there. Again, a subjective viewpoint. But you will go to the Millennium Town Park or the new "Ring Binder Park" if you are dropping your children there or your grandchildren or if you are going to pick them up from after school activities there. You might well stay there on a June evening when you have long summer evenings, when there is some entertainment that is being put on because of the uplift in the funding in that there are more arts in the community going on in the centre of St. Helier. You may well stay there with your picnic, with your family and enjoy what is going on, whether you actually live in that particular part or whether you may live somewhere across the border. I think the vision that we are being sold here and we are talking about is already on the table. It is the vision that is shared by so many of the St. Helier Deputies, whether it is Deputy Gardiner, Deputy Ward or other representatives in this Assembly, and of course those who have gone before. You know what, the backstop is that if Ministers come forward and say: "We found a better site for the school, it is going to go somewhere else" Deputy Ward is open to that and the park will then be extended to its full capacity. What it will not be used for is to cram more and more housing into an area of town which is already oversubscribed. I think, and I would hope, that this proposition can be passed today, even by the Constable of St. Helier who I think would have listened to the debate and who can still buy into the vision that all of his Deputies, I think, or many of his Deputies have for that area.

The Deputy Bailiff:

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

2.1.20 Deputy R.J. Ward:

It was quite a long debate in the end. I always make notes on every speaker and I am now at 7 or 8 pages and I have to read my own handwriting again, which has become a constant challenge to me in the Assembly but we will see what we can do. I will try to go in order but I may have to flit around. The Constable of St. Helier, I know he opposes this and I am not going to be as trite as to say he is opposing adequate facilities for children in school because I am sure that is not the case. But when you oppose something you need to come up with a solution as to what you are going to do instead of it. Unfortunately, that solution has not been offered to us. I know it has not been offered by the school estates review and I share the concern of why that has not come to us. Deputy Luce was absolutely correct, I have no idea ... I will say to Deputy Luce the Education Scrutiny Panel have tried. We have tried on a number of occasions on a number of things and have not got anything either. I am afraid I cannot be responsible for that one. The Constable did raise a few things that I have to address. I think what we have here are some real strawman arguments that I have to take apart really. He talked about if a school was built on that site then it would be "excluded from the rest of people using it". Schools do not act like that anymore. Primary schools are open before school, after school, for school clubs, they are open in every single holiday for children and particularly during COVID they have certainly been used as hubs for all sorts of facilities that are

needed. This school, if built, would be smack bang in the centre of an area where that is much needed and by a park. The use of this facility could be much wider than that and will be because that is the way modern schools are used. I will jump directly to Deputy Morel's point because he made a very good point. I was boring him senselessly the other day, I was screening pictures of schools and we were talking about looking at schools around the world. There is a cracking school in somewhere called Croxteth in Liverpool where they have built smack bang in the middle of a park. It is about designing the right school for the right place and being sensitive to the area but he did make one point that I wrote down and I put a circle around, which was maximum public gain. I think that is what we need to think about with these sites smack bang in the centre of St. Helier, getting maximum public gain. Now I have looked also, and I talked to Senator Moore here about looking at the maps. I have done a little bit of that myself. I have tried to avoid because ... although I suppose Google Maps is in scale, if you look at the footprint of Springfield School, and that is the closest school to here, it really fits on to the end of the park and Springfield School is a sprawling school, it is spread out not spread up. I see no reason why you cannot build a little up with the school, 2 or 3 floors, and increase the size of the school. I will say to the Minister for Children and Education, thank you for your support but what I would say is I do not think it is helpful to talk about the largest school in that way. A primary school across this entire site would be an absolutely massive school. It will be a 6-form entry school, which is certainly not necessary, but I think you could build in a similar footprint to Springfield and build up more sensitively to the area, to have a 2 or 3 form entry and absolutely facilitate it. Modern building methods, modern building techniques and have access to the park, and a much larger park, which means you provide those facilities for people in the area. I think it was Senator Mézec who said, and others have said, this vision that we want to talk about - and I am going to come back to the Constable Crowcroft's vision in his proposition in a moment - of having a school where children walk through parkland to their school that looks out on parkland smack bang in the middle of the most built-up area on Jersey, not in St. Helier, in Jersey, that is where the building is going and it is happening now. My concern over the park being used to give credence to even more building in that area was summed up by the Constable of St. Helier when he said the knock-on effects on future sites of not building this park and that is a concern. We are in a strange position with this because if this loses then we can support a park and I still have the concerns about planning permissions that exist, particularly with the change to the Assembly that may come and if, in my view, the wrong people are elected we are going to get even more building in St. Helier without any thought whatsoever. But let us not go on with that at the moment. It is a real concern of mine and I think when the Constable said: "We have to think about future developments" there is a little clue there as to where we are going and another reason why this park might be supported for the wrong reasons. It cannot be the only green space in that area. We have to look wider than just that space. If we can build more park on that land and have a school in the right place that is fine. I talk to the Constable and say in terms of it being an election issue, I am more than happy to knock on the doors in that area and talk to people about why I believe that is the case. I say this about politics, I think there are 2 types of politics, you can either be a weathervane or you can be a signpost. I am not a weathervane, I am here to be a signpost to say to people: "This is leadership and this is the way we should be going forward. I believe this is the right thing to do and these are the reasons to do it." Too often people are weathervanes. "We think people think this so we will go with this and we will put some doubt in people's minds" and we never get anywhere. We do not move forward. I say to the Minister for Children and Housing, I did not understand what he said in his argument, to be honest. I do not think it was coherent in terms of what he was trying to do. To just say it is a fantasy, I think given what we have had in terms of our Government in the last few years and projects they have produced, speaking of fantasy is quite ironic because we have some fantasy projects which really are not ever going to happen or should not even happen. So I am sorry, I am not entirely sure what to address with that. Senator Moore, it was interesting for the Senator to be talking about densely packed; I would say to her, so are the schools. The schools are densely packed. The children do not have space to run about, they do not have places to go to play, and building in the facility that

we have will enable that. This is not simply about replacing this with pocket parks; this is about increasing green space in that area in St. Helier in general and changing the building. So rather than just saying: “We are going to build and build and build and build and build in those areas, let us create some green spaces with it” and I do have concerns about that. I would urge people to be signposts and not weathervanes, and think: “This might be popular, we might be able to put something up in the area” and just oppose this without thinking through the complexity of what this entails. This is not simple. The simplest thing to do is to say: “Build a park, it is lovely, it is nice and green, we will have more space to run about, it is great for the kids.” Yes, of course it is. But what is the alternative for their schooling? Where are they going to school? I say to the Constable of St. Helier: where are they going to school? Where are children going to school? Is the Constable of St. Helier really willing to say that the facilities we have for children in the centre of St. Helier are good enough for them to have the best possible education they can? I am afraid I know that they are not. In my time in this Assembly - and I would not assume I would be re-elected - I would do my best here, I have been true to my word while I have been here and I will continue to be true to my word. But whoever comes to this in future, you have got to look at the facilities for those children because they are more important than us, because they are the future, they will be paying my pension; I have to declare an interest. I want to see them massively highly paid so they pay their tax and they pay my pension, of course I do. Anyway, I digress. A couple of other people, Deputy Lewis, you are right about population, I agree. We need to address it but unfortunately the population has been concentrated in the centre of St. Helier and that is the reality of what is going on, so we need to provide those critical infrastructure. The most critical infrastructure is schooling. Schooling, health, of course it is. I really hope I can convince Deputy Doublet to support this for the simple reason that the busing of children out of town to schools I do not think is a constructive thing to do. I think walking to school ... and I am surprised, I may have got it wrong but I am surprised to not see that importance of being able to walk to your local school. It reminds me of something Deputy Young said yesterday about his schooling in London, and I went to primary school in London, I went to George Lansbury School, and then it became Old Ford School which was across the road from my house, smack bang in the middle of London by Roman Road. Yes, a real EastEnder, I know that. One of the most wonderful things about that school was they built a green space in the school for these little London urchins to run about it. I can still remember that and it was an absolute pleasure to go to it, and that is what we need to be doing in the centre of our towns; building schools with those green spaces. I urge you to go to Springfield if you vote against this and explain to them why you would not support it. The choice of sending your children to private schools, yes, absolutely, it is a choice many make, but if you are choosing to send them because there are green spaces then why are we not building a school by a green space? I am going to reiterate, I do not believe it will be the entire parking area. The Deputy of St. Mary and the Deputy of St. Martin made a point about planning. There is a process here, and if it comes back and you want to build a megalith of a school I will be opposing it, ironically, my own amendment, and I will be saying: “No, it has to be done subtly with the right balance between green space and schooling.” That needs to happen. I think I have covered everybody but I just want to say to people this is a protection, this is just simply saying: “You are not going to build on the park and the only thing possible will be a primary school with an extension to the park as well.”

[12:00]

I say to the residents in that area, please think carefully about this. Where are children going to go to school? What will happen if you have to bus your children out of that area is more traffic, more movement, there and back, more cars moving out of car parking spaces and trying to go back. Yes, you will have a bit more space but that is the only space you are going to have because we will not develop green space in other areas around that area because developers will not have to develop green space. So the complexity of this, the provision of schooling, the provision of more green space and the provision of other green space are the things that need to come together. That is what needs to

be co-ordinated. That is what needs a genuine plan, and that is why our politicians need to be signposts and not weathervanes. I urge you today, do not be a weathervane, be a signpost, lead the way and vote for what you know is right. Thank you, I ask 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 via the Teams link are asked to cast their votes in the chat channel. I invite 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 the amendment has been adopted.

POUR: 38		CONTRE: 8		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator S.C. Ferguson		Senator L.J. Farnham		
Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré		Connétable of St. Helier		
Senator T.A. Vallois		Connétable of Trinity		
Senator K.L. Moore		Deputy J.A. Martin (H)		
Senator S.W. Pallett		Deputy of Grouville		
Senator S.Y. Mézec		Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)		
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Deputy L.M.C. Doublet (S)		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Deputy R. Labey (H)		
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy M. Tadier (B)				
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 St. Peter				
Deputy of Trinity				
Deputy of St. John				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)				
Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)				

Deputy J.H. Perchard (S)				
Deputy R.J. Ward (H)				
Deputy C.S. Alves (H)				
Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)				
Deputy I. Gardiner (H)				

3. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - sixty-fourth amendment: Amendment to Policy CI2 (P.36/2021 Amd.(64))

The Deputy Bailiff:

The 64th amendment has been lodged by Senator Pallett 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 within Policy CI2 - (a) in the first paragraph there should be inserted after 3. the following - ‘4. within the site designated for a nursing facility, Field MN688, St. Martin (b) in the second paragraph after the words “a proven island”, there should be inserted the words “or Parish specific”; (c) in the second paragraph replace sub-paragraph a. with the following; “a. the development is essential to delivery and continuation of health and social care services, including where there is a specific local need arising within a Parish, and which cannot reasonably be met through alternative sites, service delivery arrangements or co-location with other services in a suitable location; and”; (d) in the second paragraph, sub-paragraph b. after the words “spatial strategy” there should be inserted the words “and any Parish-specific needs and (e) the draft Island Plan 2022-25 should be further amended in such respects as may be necessary consequent to the adoption of (a)-(e).”

3.1 Senator S.W. Pallett:

I want to say from the outset that this is a privately-owned site and the development will be a private development. Both Jersey’s overall population and the percentage of its population that are aged over 65 are rising. By 2036 one in 5 of the Island’s population will be aged over 65 compared with 17 per cent now. This will equate to over 28,000 senior citizens on the Island or a 57 per cent increase on the existing number in a little over 15 years’ time. The changing demographic brings significant challenges to the Island in the future, including housing and catering for the needs of the senior population, ensuring the provision of suitable residential care and non-acute bed space, ensuring the provision of adequate trained medical and care sector staff including G.P.s (general practitioners), care workers, care officers and nurses, and providing services and facilities tailored to suit the needs of the senior population, especially those that help to mitigate and delay the impact of age-related illnesses such as dementia, Alzheimer’s and mobility restricting illnesses by using social and physical activities in purpose built accommodation. Jersey’s challenge in meeting these needs is complicated further by several constraints that the Island must work with. Firstly Jersey has a limited land mass within which it must accommodate all of its future needs, therefore, spatial efficiency and utilisation of underused space for purposeful needs is paramount. Secondly, the Island has a given working population at any time. This working population is required to generate sufficient revenues in order to both ensure the Island’s households live prosperously, and support the Island’s public services through generation of tax and social security contributions. Jersey, therefore, needs to ensure its industries and employing organisations are fully utilised at all times. Thirdly, Jersey’s population has high expectations for and a great interest in the built environment and private sector service providers. The public will place great scrutiny on any next steps, and this will result in a rigorous challenge of emerging proposals. Jersey must commit to making sure it does indeed look after all of its societal needs. Jersey simply cannot walk away or banish the needs of those that it cannot provide for and expect other jurisdictions to cater for these requirements. All of the Island, including the

Government and the Parishes, and all of its residents, must play their part and accept responsibility to provide for all Members of its society now and in the future, regardless of their age or health. Do nothing and hope the challenge will fade away is no longer an available option. With Jersey's senior aged 65-and-over population, as I say, set to rise by 57 per cent, the Island needs to focus its attention on delivering facilities that will help meet the demand for senior living, including residential care facilities. The Government of Jersey's proposed Jersey Care Model envisages the greater use of private sector senior living, bed space to deliver care services from within the community at its point of need. The impact of the recent COVID-19 pandemic will also doubtless put further strain on the Government's funding of essential capital projects in the future. The development of field 688 in St. Martin gives the Parish of St. Martin and its close community an opportunity to meet these challenges at no cost to the Parish or to the taxpayer. From its present situation, as underutilised green zone land, this field could be developed into a purpose residential care home. The facility will be designed to accord with all the mandatory and statutory regulations and the principles of a contemporary, high quality residential care home. If approved, the development will be funded and developed by private sector companies and delivered by local designers and a local building contractor. The aims of all investment both upfront and during the operation of the facility will be to source with maximum possible positive local impact. The development will deliver not only much needed but also much desired modern, purpose-built senior living care accommodation which will be constructed to a high standard. The focus on the operation will centre on ensuring the needs of the residents, whatever their health, are individually catered for. The Government recognises this challenge and is seeking to address some of the issues that it presents within its proposed Jersey Care Model healthcare system that, when implemented, will replace the present public health service in Jersey. The Jersey Care Model envisions a future where Government, in co-operation with the independent sector: "Expands the use of supported living, domiciliary care, day care, and assisted technologies as alternatives to residential accommodation, focusing on rehabilitation and independent living." The Jersey Care Model is premised on a base assumption that the Island as a whole, including private, public and third sector organisations, must work together to meet the health and well-being challenges the Island faces in the future. The Government is, therefore, expecting and actively encouraging private sector providers to assist with offering non-acute and residential care home facilities that will provide wraparound care to seniors in the future. The Jersey Care Model also wants more care services to be provided as close to home as possible, thereby dispensing with the need for the Government to provide them directly at a cost to the taxpayer, and assuring the recipients of the care are catered for within the community. Fundamentally though, however, the Jersey Care Model assumes that care will be delivered in a way that seeks to preserve and protect the independence of the recipient. Medical professionals believe that this is the best way of helping to maintain the dignity and self-esteem of the recipient, and sustained cordiality among society through continued inclusion. Inclusivity and involvement are also key factors associated with delaying the onset of complicated medical conditions among the senior population. Future care of the elderly will, therefore, be delivered more in the community in new facilities that cater for a wide range of seniors requiring tailored support programmes for each resident. The facilities will need to be purpose-built and designed for optimal efficiency in operation in order to ensure the sustenance and reduce the cost to businesses that operate them. Currently around half of Jersey's population has at least one of 40 long-term health conditions with older people often having complex health needs to manage. This in turn requires more care and treatment. As the population profile continues to age the growing need for care and treatment could put our health system under significant strain if work is not done to address where and how we provide accessible and sustainable healthcare services. The implementation of the Jersey Care Model will lead to a significant change in how people engage and experience the full spectrum of health and social care services in Jersey and this change is to take place not only in service delivery but also in a physical sense with new and changing demand upon healthcare infrastructure. For those looking at the site, St. Martin's village lies to the east approximately 1 kilometre away. This particular care home would serve the north-eastern Parishes

of Trinity, St. Martin, Grouville and northern St. Saviour where there is under provision for care facilities at the current time.

[12:15]

In terms of connectivity, a cycle and walking track from field MN688 has been discussed with relevant landowners in the Parish of St. Martin, which will provide a route to St. Martin's village for pedestrians and cyclists, which is only 4 fields away. There are bus stops within 100 metres of the site and a bus stop could be provided in a recess to the side of field MN688. All services are on-site. Any care home provided on field MN688 would be within convenient travelling distances for the Parishes of Trinity, St. Martin, Grouville and the northern end of St. Saviour, without having to travel to other parts of the Island or to St. Helier. Together these Parishes represent approximately 25 per cent of the Island's population. So what will the completed development deliver? I have got a few things here but the first one is the one thing that sticks out with me and that is worry-free living. Social engagement is crucial to later living as continued activity and human interaction provides both long-term mental acuity and helps combat the risk of isolation and loneliness. Communal and shared spaces provide neighbourly interaction and provide space for informed gatherings, planned events and activities. There are others; I am not going to go through these because I think they will come out in another section that I am going to cover in a second. What I do want to mention, because I know people will say this is another agricultural field - it is - the Jersey Farmers' Union have raised it as a 3 and I am not going to say it is any less important than anything else to agriculture without getting castigated but those are the words that are being used by the J.F.U. (Jersey Farmers' Union). It scored relatively highly in terms of suitability landscape, existing use, and we believe unfairly in terms of the spatial score, nevertheless it scored 15, which is a relatively high score. I just want to turn finally to the Minister's comments. Within his comments he states that the care model is clear that it seeks to move away from a culture of institutional care. I think it is important as we reach later life that we have an opportunity to choose where we live our later years, and there needs to be a balance in what is offered. Certainly, this will offer more choice to those that need supervised care. I was just thinking about this the other day; for those that live on their own as a single person there is a risk of isolation, although some people are quite happy to live on their own, supported, there are others that do need that company, do need that support, and this would offer increased opportunities within that sector. Isolation comes with all sorts of risks; risks to mental health, risks also to physical health if you are living on your own in later life. So I think there do need to be choices. There is a word I do not particularly like and that is "institutionalised". I am not sure what that means because I think it has got a dark history and it is not a word that I think should be used when considering residential care. I am sure and I would hope that the Constable of St. Brelade, when I mention Maison St. Brelade, would agree that I would not consider that to be institutionalised care. If it is then I am quite happy to live in institutionalised care when I get older. It is a warm, welcoming, friendly residential home where people lead full lives, lead very sociable lives, there is a lot of interaction between both staff and residents and for anybody that has visited there it is a joy to visit and it is a joy to talk to the residents that are there. There is a need, I think, to think forward. This development, if this field is passed, will not happen overnight. It will take several years to put into place and, as I say, I think the need in terms of the increased numbers of elderly senior citizens we are going to have over the next 15 years I think does prove the need for new improved facilities that can provide support to those that are in later life. So, I think the strategic need is proven. Does there maybe need to be more work on that need? Possibly, but I think that is work that can be done. But I think to rezone this site gives the opportunity to have it in the plan and, if necessary, can be used. The other comment that I think is worth commenting on is this site being remote from local services considered to be wholly appropriate for a nursing home. I just thought I would have a look at where all the other nursing homes in Jersey are sited, and we know there are quite a number but I am just going to mention a few: La Haule Care Home, Ronceray Care Home - that is opposite this site - Lakeside Care Home, Highlands Care Home in St. Saviour, Les Hoûmets in Gorey, and the last 2 in particular, Les

Charrières in St. Peter and Cheval Roc at Bonne Nuit. Well, if the site at St. Martin is remote I do not know what you call the ones at Cheval Roc and Les Charrières. They all function well as residential homes. I am sure the people that live within them are very happy with the accommodation and are happy that they are living in a way that suits their needs at that particular time in life. I get where the Minister is coming from about remote but it has been clear from those that want to develop this care home that they do want it to integrate into St. Martin's life, integrate into the community, integrate into St. Martin's very centre, and very much be part of life within that Parish and also support other Parishes that are nearby. I am looking at the time; I am going to stop now. I hope Members can support this. It is the only one around hospital facilities that is within the plan. I think we do need to be forward thinking and look forward as to some of the needs we may require in the future and support this. But I will be interested in Members comments but, like I say, I am hoping Members can support this. Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Senator. Is the amendment seconded? **[Seconded]** Will you accept a point of clarification, Senator?

Senator S.W. Pallett:

I will do my best but no doubt Deputy Morel is going to come with something very technical.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

No, not at all. It was just in his speech the Senator referred to one particular private developer. Is this an extension of the Ronceray Care Home opposite? Is that the private developer? Also, how do we know that that private developer is the best one, or could it be open to a tender or something?

Senator S.W. Pallett:

It is not connected to Ronceray, the one across the road. The owner of the field has been working with specialists in the field and also, I will be upfront, LV Care Home have been interested in developing it, although that has not been decided yet but they have shown some interest in it.

3.1.1 Deputy J.H. Young:

We have here an amendment to a policy, policy CI2, which seeks to set out a set of planning parameters for how planning applications for extended health and care facilities will be dealt with. There is nowhere in there that this specific site ... it is a set of planning rules because the Senator lists the number of care homes; there are obviously a very large number in the Island. The figures that I was given, there are approximately 1,000 spaces in current care homes and he is right that there is a very, very high level of occupation. I think the last lot of numbers I was given were about 24 vacancies. But the strange thing is that despite that, and our ageing community, the expert information which I have been given by the Minister for Health and Social Services' team - because I am not an expert in this field and nor are the planning officers, we rely entirely on our experts in the field to give us advice - and of course I did publish that way back in I think it was August in that big, fat document that I submitted to the planning inspector. This was a section called SV2, and I am going to read a couple of bits from it. But basically, the guts of it is - and this is the question - are the changes that the Senator proposes to the policies consistent with the approach that we are trying to do to increase independent living and try and help people in ageing communities maintain independent living, or are they going in the reverse direction? So, I think what we have here is a plan ... the amendment is basically in 2 parts. One part of it says that we need to focus on Parish needs, Parish-specific need. I thought we were trying to deal with the special needs of people in the highest level of dependency on an Island-wide basis because that is obviously a crucial thing. I draw a clear distinction here between the support which the Assembly has given already to the Parish of St. Martin for a very significant extension to over-55 residential homes under what we called supported living. That was sensible. I only abstained because I thought it raised issues of rezoning agricultural land,

but nonetheless I did accept the argument that such a facility where people get the support to maintain independent living in later years is a good thing because it ultimately reduces the amount of people that have to make that awful decision finally to go into long-term care. I cannot help feeling this would have been better, in effect, coming forward as a planning application because really, we have got a map on the back of it that says, here it is, it has a got a name of the developer on it, LV Care. It shows the layouts. Now, my view is the planning system would be perfectly capable of dealing with this as a planning application. The Senator says: "Well, that is the only one"; well of course because nobody else has done that. The planning policies can work, and policy CI2 does set out the facilities that where there are exceptional circumstances and where there is a proven need, where it can be demonstrated then permission will be given. It was not just me thinking that the proposal here really does not fit the model that we are seeking to achieve in how we look after older people. What it says is that the proposal, that is the one in the amendment, would provide local nursing home and dementia care. Is dementia care a Parish-based specific or are we talking specialist facilities? I have asked the Minister for Health and Social Services to speak later, and I am sure he will give us some guidance of where the boundaries are. I am going to read a couple of parts from the advice that I was given that I published, I referred to my SV2 document, this is the expert's advice, social worker's advice: "It is important to keep elderly people connected and independent at home as long as possible to avoid early admission to a care home."

[12:30]

It says: "Often loneliness and inability to cook or look after their home, i.e. cleaning and so on, are contributing reasons for choosing a care home. But these should be addressed differently, for example, community integration, lunch clubs, home care and cleaning services." Of course these services, they say, should be the focus before providing care home solutions. One of the things we are trying to do is to increase the domiciliary home care market to enable people to stay independently at home. If we are putting all our fund and finances and effort into building more dementia homes this may act to disincentivise the market because there is no question, care homes are hugely, hugely lucrative ventures. I would personally argue, with my financial hat on, what is the best choice: to put the money into domiciliary care and trying to support people in the community or is it best to pump all the money into promoting care? Now, where there are needs that are proven it does not need an amendment to this policy. It does not need it. It can be dealt with through the planning system. People often interpret these policies as a block. It means that people have got to go through hoops; they have got to present their cases perhaps rather more than sticking a drawing on the back and put it in as an appendix. Frankly this needs to go through the planning system. It also of course is the zoning. This is an agricultural field; it is a zoning. I think Members should be really careful about zoning a field in these circumstances for what is, I believe, a commercial venture. So, I am sorry to be quite so blunt but I think one has to spell it out. It is really important that the policies we have are right for the whole-Island approach, and we are early in this journey, if you like, of moving towards trying to do more independent care. It is a conundrum. We know that people end up in care homes, many prematurely, and somehow or other we cannot find the ways of giving that support. But I think that is where the policies and the direction of the plan should have, and if we modify this policy now I think what we will be getting is a whole lot of others. I have also asked, and I think one of the things, if I may read the conclusion, it says here, and this is the social worker expert: "Care home beds have been stable over the last 10 years and it is reasonable to assume that any near-term increase in demand will be moderate. It is expected that such increase in demand will be met through the redevelopment of land within the existing built-up areas, such as the development of old hotel stocks." I recently asked the Planning office as well that where we have those facilities outside the built-up area we should also be looking favourably on changes of use because they are existing buildings. We go back to the issue about rezoning land for things or whether we can reuse. The beauty of sites within the built areas is their close proximity to community facilities, and really they are better to take. So, I think what they are saying is in the absence of evidence to support significant

demand then I am advised that there is not considered to be sufficient evidence to rezone land in the countryside for the purpose in the plan. Had the evidence been different then there would have been proposals in there for such, and so I am sorry, I think I have got to put it out quite ... we have had a really big debate about agricultural land and I think the bar is high here. I think it was right to go with the over-55s accommodation but where I am having a real struggle is that what is providing a broader-based specialised care, of dementia care, of nursing care, that this is the right place for it. Staff would have to travel there. I presume it would have to be 24-hour care, so you have got day and night, 7 days a week. Does the bus go there all the time? I do not know. I think there are real implications in going for these proposals and I cannot recommend it to the Assembly.

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

There is a process that planning applications should follow and I think that this amendment should have gone through that proper planning process and not been included in the draft bridging Island Plan. It would also have been helpful if the Senator had spoken to the Parish about this amendment. But here we are. The potential path included with this amendment is a red herring. A safe path is something which the Parish has been looking at and working on and ideally we would like to bring a safe path through the fields to the village green, the centre of St. Martin, to fruition. A path is not dependent on building a care home. Having said all this, it may sound strange to say that I would like to be able to support this amendment and will if it can be guaranteed that this home would be solely for dementia patients, as is rumoured, or at least dementia would take up a large percentage of the home, but looking at the plans it does not appear to. I would like to be convinced and assured. I do wholeheartedly believe and know first-hand that the Island desperately needs more care beds, especially more specialised care beds in facilities. The Island is critically short of specialised care beds at the moment. We, the Parish, were told recently - and this is within the last 2 weeks - by health professionals in a government department that there are simply no suitable beds in the Island. This is from 2 parishioners that we have who desperately need to be in a care facility. Right now we have Islanders who desperately need to be cared for appropriately and with dignity. The Minister has just mentioned sheltered housing, and sheltered housing really is wonderful if you are not suffering from dementia and desperately need 24-hour care. Sadly, some of the residents become too ill to stay in sheltered housing and need specialised care, and sadly, we in the Parish know this only too well and are not in a position to be able to support with 24-hour care as much as we would like to. To support what I have just said, here are some quotes from parishioners from St. Martin and from Grouville who have family members suffering from dementia. These have been said to me in the last 10 days: "There is certainly a severe shortage of nursing home beds and staff available." "We are trying to place my mother, who has dementia, into a home but there are no places available, nor is there care staff available at care agencies to meet her needs at home." Yet another one: "More nursing beds are definitely needed." Another one: "Well I see some of the people who are in sheltered housing do actually need 24-hour care. There definitely is a desperate shortage." Yet another one: "No beds. What are we to do? There is no suitable care." Another one: "The need for care residential homes is becoming critical. At a Dementia Jersey meeting the talk was the woeful lack of suitable care facilities." As the amendment says, a dementia home would serve the needs of our neighbouring Parishes, Trinity, St. Saviour and Grouville, and the field is not highly rated for agriculture according to the Jersey Farmers' Union. I have really been torn on this and, as I have said, we in the Island - not just St. Martin - have a desperate, critical need for a dedicated dementia unit. I would appreciate the Senator expanding on whether this will purely be for dementia patients and, if not, what percentage of those suffering from this cruel illness of dementia will be catered for. I will be listening to the debate and to the Senator's summing up with great interest. I see the need daily, and the need for appropriate residential care facilities in the Island at the moment is absolutely critical.

3.1.3 Deputy R. Labey:

I am very pleased that the Minister for the Environment said what he did because I was sitting here listening to Senator Pallett's speech thinking I was back on the Planning Committee. This is a planning application, pure and simple. But we are determining an application and only hearing from one party; the applicant. We have absolutely no idea because there has been no site ... we have no idea of the strength of any objection locally to this. We have not the benefit of all the opinions of the statutory consultees that accompany planning applications. It has been said before and it will be said again that the States Assembly is not the place to determine planning applications, and this certainly is unsafe. So I am afraid I will not be supporting it.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED

The Deputy Bailiff:

The adjournment is proposed. Is the adjournment seconded? [**Seconded**] Does any Member wish to speak on the adjournment? The States stand adjourned until 2.15 p.m.

[12:41]

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

[14:16]

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

I think we have got 2 questions that we must be asking ourselves. First of all, can we be confident about the statements made for the need for this facility, and secondly, even if we are so confident, is this the right site, is this the only option for the Island? Deputy Russell Labey likened this to a specific planning application and I fear the Assembly is being asked to determine an application in that way, and we are not equipped at the moment with all the information we need. It is clearly the case that we have an ageing demographic; we have talked about it all through this political term and we must plan for that. Since the long-term care scheme was introduced claims have increased year on year from the beginning, but during that period of about 10 years there has been no real addition to the bed stock in residential or care homes. Instead, what has happened is that there have been new options for care that have come into play and we know that there are now many organisations in the Island offering home care. That has arisen because long-term care is available to meet the costs of that care. So I think that means that where somebody might once, 10 years ago or more, have felt it was becoming difficult for them to manage in their own home and when their only option at that time was residential care, now there are other options. Thank goodness, because that means that we would be asking people to move into residential care far too early when they can be looked after and specific help given to them in their own homes, maintaining their independence. That may be why the number of beds in institutionalised care, to use that phrase, has not really increased since the long-term care scheme came into being. But of course, for some people there may come a stage where they can no longer continue at home, despite what help has been made available to them, but that could come at a later stage in their pathway of care. Therefore, the residential and nursing homes have coped with the same number of beds. What they are doing is that people are moving into those beds at a later stage than they might otherwise have done previously. So can we say with certainty there is a lack of beds? I know that has been said but I am not sure that it is quite so simple as that because what we have seen recently is pressure, it is true, but that pressure is arising largely due to staffing issues. There are COVID issues. So many of the care homes and the organisations that are offering care in people's own homes have been affected by COVID. There are staff who are ill or who are direct contacts and they are coming under pressure to provide that care. That is on top of whatever has happened since Brexit when we know lots of people, principally from eastern Europe, have left the Island, and that includes people who worked in the care sector. We have not yet found a way of replacing that care, so it is obviously a consideration and important to do so. I am not sure that it is

a lack of beds that we are suffering from, because I do not think that would have been said pre-Brexit and pre-COVID. So we have got to work through, we have got to bring our staffing numbers up or work more efficiently to meet these needs, but do we need more beds in nursing? I do not think we are sure of that yet. Now, possibly we may need some specific dementia facilities, and that is a work in progress. I am very pleased that at last work is happening on a dementia strategy and that is being conducted under the Jersey Care Model as a workstream involving Dementia Jersey, Family Nursing, all those involved in dementia care, and that will be looking at how care is delivered. There will need to be some permanent beds, I am sure, but I feel sure the emphasis in that will be about looking after people where they are, where they are coming from rather than moving them straight into the homes. The company that has been mentioned by Senator Pallett worked very well with H.C.S. (Health and Community Services) and other care providers in all this planning but I am not aware they have come to H.C.S. to say that they proposed the specific site in St. Martin for any particular purpose. Some time ago it came as quite a surprise to me when I learnt that as a proportion of our population we have greater numbers of people in care homes than the U.K. (United Kingdom). There is no hard and fast evidence of why that should be but I suspect it could well be because the industry providing a care home in Jersey can be quite a lucrative business for companies who are sometimes local, sometimes based in the U.K. That may be because there is greater wealth in Jersey than some other parts of the U.K. and, therefore, becomes affordable for a section of the population. Then, of course, we have got a long-term care scheme whereas the U.K. is still struggling to introduce its scheme. So we do have that greater proportion in institutionalised care. I am not sure it is the best thing and it suggests we could do more to keep people independently in the community, and there would not be a need for people to go into care to address loneliness or to address their basic needs, because we should be able to do that in the community and I think we are doing in many cases, and that will increase. In that respect the Parishes have a key role in supporting independent living for their parishioners and we see that happening in the accommodation that some Parishes provide, in the community support whether it is formalised as a community support group or simply the help that comes from the Parish Hall, because the Parish Halls are excellent in knowing their parishioners. So they have got that key role and I am really pleased that our Parish system supports that, but I do not think the Parishes have a defined role in residential and nursing home care because that is mostly provided on a commercial basis. So, for example, I do not think St. Martin should be supporting the plans of this particular provider without having established first that there is a positive Parish benefit coming their way. Even if there is a positive Parish benefit to build a care home on that specific site, the opportunity should be given to all providers to provide that benefit rather than a proposal being brought forward by only one, and perhaps other sites might be put forward that are more suitable. This amendment would seek to introduce the words “Parish specific” and “a specific local need arising within a Parish”. I do question whether the need to provide residential or nursing care should be addressed Parish by Parish. It seems odd to me. The Minister’s policy in the draft bridging Island Plan is that there should be a “proven island” need, and that seems to me to be the right approach. Let us look at this across our small Island. Now, it is true St. Helier and St. Brelade have residential homes that are Parish-based or they are funded by the Parish, they have been built by the Parish, but those Parishes are large centres of population and those homes are not there for their parishioners only. If a bed is free in those homes I understand it is offered to those in greatest need on an Island-wide view. It would be much more difficult for rural Parishes to offer a Parish facility. If a bed becomes free in a nursing home, the economics of that home require that it be occupied as soon as possible because it costs money to provide that bed and it cannot be left vacant for too long without the business losing money. So, the business or the Parish, if it was involved, would not start by saying: “We will wait until a parishioner needs that bed or is ready to enter the home” when there is somebody else in another Parish who does not get that opportunity to occupy that bed. That is not the way it works. The way we look at things, the way the sector works, is that it looks at Island-wide needs, and that is how we organise the care. So I regret I cannot really understand what “Parish specific” means in this amendment. If the providers have an idea of what “Parish specific” might

mean then I think they need to consult first with Government and Parishes to work out how that might happen, what their vision is and to see if that is a better way of organising this care, but I do not think they have done that consultation yet. The Connétable of St. Martin has said that she was not consulted over the plans. This is a bridging Island Plan so if Parish-specific ways of working have merit in this area then let the owners of land or the providers of care come forward and discuss it, put the evidence out there, and then it can come forward in the next Island Plan insofar as it is necessary, although we could work out a policy that, as the Minister has said, could be developed within the current policies of the Island Plan. So I regret to say to the Senator that I do not see that it is appropriate to rezone this specific site for a need that I do not believe we can yet be certain about. So I would caution Members about adopting this amendment but will remain willing to work with providers if there are better ways of providing this care.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Deputy, will you accept a point of clarification from Deputy Gardiner?

The Deputy of St. Ouen:

Yes, Sir.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

First of all I would like to say thank you to the Minister for his speech. It was very helpful for me to understand the situation. I would like to ask if the Minister can clarify if he understands if this provider will engage with H.C.S. and together you would find out if this particular site can address specific needs? Would it be possible to make this move during the next 3 years without us adopting this amendment?

The Deputy of St. Ouen:

I understand from remarks made by the Minister for the Environment that that would be possible. It would be possible for an application to be made in the normal planning application process and if a need is proven a site could be designated and it might possibly be this site. So, I think all of that work could be carried forward down the line.

[14:30]

3.1.5 The Deputy of St. Martin:

The Minister for the Environment will know, because I have told him a number of times, that I was disappointed with this draft bridging Island Plan. I was disappointed because I did not feel there was enough reference to older people, whether that is older people who are well or older people who are not so well. I feel that there is a need, and I am grateful to the Assembly for agreeing with me yesterday that the retirement homes in St. Martin are going to be a fantastic asset to our Parish, but I think there should have been more in this plan for retirement homes. With this specific amendment I think we need to realise that there is more need for residential homes, for care homes, for nursing homes, and we have not, to my mind, addressed that. We know that the ageing population is coming down the track at a rate of knots. The people over 65 in the Island, the numbers are going to double in a very short space of time. By the mid-2030s we will have a massive requirement for people to need care homes, residential homes. We know there is a need for this particular type of facility. It is my understanding, certainly at the moment, that we do not have that specialist type facility that can take people when their problems start to get to the point where they cannot be coped with at home or they cannot be coped with in retirement or sheltered accommodation. The Minister for Health and Social Services says is this the only option and if it is the only option, do we need the only option? I was disappointed with that because it was sounding like we are only going to need one of these facilities on the Island, and I would say to him that I think in the coming years we are going to need more than one and we need to start planning for it because the problem is coming down the track at

us. The Minister for Health and Social Services also picked up on the word “Parish” and he made it sound a little bit like this is a Parish scheme. Well, it is not and I would point Members to the amendment in part (b) where it says: “After the words ‘a proven island’ should be inserted ‘or Parish specific’.” The important word in that sentence is the smallest one, “or”. This is not specifically for the Parish. It could be but I would point out that this is an Island scheme. It is not a Parish scheme, it is an Island scheme and it really is needed. There may be more suitable sites, and I agree with the Minister on that, but this is a good site. It is not easily seen from the road, it is off the road, it is a little bit detached. You would not see it from the main road and I think as sites go it is not bad at all. So, just in conclusion - I am not going to speak long - I think we need this facility. I think the Island needs this type of facility. I think it is a good site and I am going to support the application.

3.1.6 The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I first of all stand and mention, like the proposer of the amendment, Senator Pallett, that I have experience of being on the management committee of a residential home in St. Brelade and, to clarify the point made by the Minister for Health and Social Services, it is owned by the Parish but not Parish funded. It is self-funded. No profit is taken but the net profit contributes to a loan that was taken out in around 2010 to fund an essential modernisation, which really was taken at the point where a decision had to be made whether to continue with the home as it was. It was popular in the Parish but it was a situation where there were 50 residents with no en suite facilities and these rooms were no longer lettable. So it makes a point that these facilities of a residential home do need to be modern. It is not the resident that chooses, very often, but the children of the resident and I can assure Members they can be quite fussy as to where their parents might go, quite clearly. I would also add at the time we had absolutely no support from the States in financing the operation, and that was a great disappointment. Things may have moved on now. I am aware that care needs continually change and there is a greater need for dementia care given that those coming in the home will very often be in their 90s and, quite bluntly, beyond living at home. Leaving one’s own home is far from easy and I applaud the staff who work with new residents to make it a home from home. It is a wrench, there is no question about that, and no one wishes to leave their comfortable surroundings unless it is absolutely necessary. Indications are quite clear there is demand for this sort of accommodation. I am concerned, however, over the staffing implications of a new residential care home and I wonder where the staff may come from. The staff-to-resident ratio is prescribed by the Care Commission and I am sure the Minister for Health and Social Services could tell us the numbers, but I know in Maison St. Brelade we employ 60 or 70 people, so if this is proposed to be a larger home I can see 100 staff members being necessary. So where will they come from? Is there an intention to import staff with the sanction of the Economic Development Department or is there an expectation they will be drawn from existing businesses? If that is the case, the result very often, of course, is driving the price up because every business has to look after their staff and generally the way of doing that is by remuneration. I think that is a risk that we have to be aware of from a governmental point of view. I am interested to hear the Senator’s summing up before indicating which way I shall vote on that but I am a little bit torn. I am aware that there is a need. I do not like agricultural land being used for such a project but it could be an adjunct to St. Martin and maybe it should be done through the proper planning processes. So, there are some questions to be answered.

3.1.7 Deputy G.C. Guida:

I think the idea of this project in general is reasonably good and I will not argue whether such a facility is needed or not. I think the Minister for Health and Social Services was eloquent enough on that subject. However, I do have a problem is that what we are making is the Island Plan. The Island Plan is a policy document, what you look at when you are trying to determine a planning application. Well, you have a planning application, it is precise, it is very, very described and then you found out in there whether it fits the policy that the whole Assembly has decided, and because we are a very small place this policy can be reasonably precise. An hour ago we decided that a piece of land should

be used exclusively for a school or a park, or was it housing, but we make policy and we can be precise. The problem with this particular amendment is that it is much more precise than policy. It is actually a planning application: a specific field owned by a specific enterprise developed by a specific enterprise, visual aspect and drawings. What we are asking to do now is to determine it as a planning application and that is really straying too far. If we were going to do that then why do we bother with policy? We could have taken every field in Jersey one by one and decided what we wanted on them. Again, as much as this might or might not be needed, this is straying way too far into the field of determining a planning application.

3.1.8 Deputy M. Tadier:

I always listen carefully when I hear arguments saying that this is a planning application, because it is slightly more nuanced than that. I can see from the perspective of those who would want to support either this specific application or just generally having a care home on this particular field is that the reality is that if they genuinely want that to happen they know that the odds were vastly stacked against a planning application being successful because it is a green field and there is a presumption against development in any green field unless you can make an exceptional circumstance. Of course it is not clear what that exceptional circumstance would be. That is what I understand the case to be, but that is probably where my support for this stops, because I am not in support of it for the following reasons. I think if we were to decide as an Assembly or indeed if the Government were to decide as a Government that they wished this field to be developed for a care home, the correct process would be then to go out to tender and say we want to accept tenders to build a care home on this and we will accept tenders from the Parish, we will accept tenders from the charitable sector and we will accept tenders from presumably private investors. I put the interested party in that last category, incidentally. I want to be careful not to abuse parliamentary privilege but at the same time ... let me finish my first point. The first point is that it seems to me if we pass this today we would not just indirectly be supporting one particular developer, we would be supporting them directly because, of course, they are the ones who are up and ready to go. So as soon as we make this decision, the paperwork will go in, the planning application will be put on the table and then the presumption is no longer against this, with a case having to be made by them for the exceptional circumstances. The presumption is in favour because we want somebody to build a home on it and because they are the first ones in the queue, nobody else has put an application in, then you would decide on the merits of the application itself rather than if there was a better application on the table. I do have to say this, and I am not one that believes in fate or even necessarily in synchronicity, but it so happens that I have direct experience of Lavender Villa, LV Group as they are, because it is the group that took over Little Sisters of the Poor. I will simply say 2 things. The first is that I know what Little Sisters was like when it was run by the Little Sisters; I knew what their ethos was and the community spirit there and I know what the people who were either in the home, who worked in the home and who also lived on the grounds on the home in the flats as independent living but nonetheless felt that that was a community that they could rely on ... I know that that is completely different to the ethos that is there now. When I talk about synchronicity, when I went into town for lunch today I got some lunch on my own, which I have no problem with. It is nice to have some down time. I was served by somebody who I recognised the face of and I said: "You are not at Little Sisters anymore? You are not at the care home?" He said: "No, I left." I do not want to go into too much detail because I do not want to identify him but he simply said: "Yes, I left because, first of all, they wanted me to work weekends and bank holidays and they wanted to cut my holiday entitlement by 2 weeks." That is just factual. Obviously, that is what he told me. So the concern I have here is twofold. First of all, is this the right process by which if we did want to build a new care home on this field, is that the right way to do it? I do not think it is the right process. Secondly, if we did want to do that, do we automatically want to give it to this particular company to build that facility? Certainly, for my part, no, I would not want to give it to this particular company to do that, especially when I have not heard from other applicants who might wish to build something arguably more suitable on that site.

3.1.9 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier:

Over the last week or so Members will be very clear that I have voted for little or no sites in relation to green fields. This is graded as a 3, so that is slightly more liveable. However, having looked at the plans - and this is the concern I have and I have had this discussion with hoteliers as well - we are proposing to build a residential care home on the site. It is a known fact that the Island has no care home staff to look after people, so what does that mean? That means, potentially, we will have to bring people into the Island to look after those individuals. Where are those people going to live? We already have a housing crisis, as we have discussed in the last 10 days, so from my perspective, I do sit on the Planning Committee, I would hope in the future that people who bring forward plans to build residential care homes, people who bring plans forward to build hotels, et cetera, or if people are bringing in staff to work on farms, were considering where the staff are going to live if we know that we do not have them locally. I will leave it at that.

[14:45]

The Deputy Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak on this amendment? Then I call upon Senator Pallett to reply.

3.1.10 Senator S.W. Pallett:

Can I firstly thank everybody that has spoken? I think there have been some really interesting comments made, although I think I need to right a few of the wrongs here. The first thing I am going to say is the countless comments made about this is a planning application in front of the States Assembly or words to that effect. This is not a planning application in front of the Assembly. It is what it says in the proposition. It is a rezoning of a site for a nursing facility. It does not say what type of facility. It has not got the plans in. If I had not given Assembly Members some indication of what might go on the site, I would have been asked: "What is going to go on the site?" So, I cannot win one way or the other, so I have given people some indication of what the opportunities might be on that site. So, although I have written down "planning application, planning application, planning application" about 10 times on this piece of paper, it is not a planning application. It is what it says on the tin. It is to rezone a field, a green zone field, for a nursing facility. Before I go into any individual comments, another comment I am going to make is how long are we going to bury our heads in the sand and admit that there is not a problem coming down the line? The problem is not just a small problem. It is a tsunami and I am one of the people that are going to reach retirement age and are going to need facilities such as this at some point. I cannot stress again, 57 per cent more people are over the age of 65. Now, are we going to wait around until we find out what services we need or are we going to be a bit more proactive? Proactive does not seem to be a strong word in this particular political term but I am going to use it: we need to be more proactive. The Minister, I am not surprised, is unresponsive. I agree with some of what he said but I do not agree with a lot of what he said. He said there are 1,000 beds in total and I do not think there is any denial of that, yet there is only capacity for another 24, with a space of 24 people at the moment. That for me says there is a need, and that is without any more people coming online potentially needing these facilities. The issue around that as well is that whether you care for them in a residential facility or you care for them at home, you are still going to need people to care for them. They are still going to need support but there are some people that will require the sort of residential care that is best suited to being provided in a residential home, and those numbers are going to increase. Can we get it into our heads that that number is going to increase and the quicker we get ahead ... the care model is not going to deal with this. We can dream all we want about the care model this, the care model that; it is not going to deal with the number of people that are coming down the line and the differences and the nuances of the care that is going to be needed, whether we like it or not. The Minister did say that he liked the over-55s homes, and I am glad he said that because in many ways this is a sort of a follow-on from over-55s. I was quite keen when I was involved with Maison St. Brelade many,

many years ago - and again I agree with everything the Constable said around Maison St. Brelade - there was capacity around that site to have it as more of a facility where some over-55s homes could be built, and it led on to finally being to a point where you could get longer-term care or more acute care within Maison St. Brelade later on in life, but that has never appeared. But that type of living where there are facilities that you could potentially move into if needed, if you need that extra care nearby, within the Parish, I think is something that we should be seriously considering. The Minister mentioned dementia care and the Minister mentioned dementia strategy. We have dragged our heels with a dementia strategy and thank goodness we are finally getting it off the ground. I met with the chair and C.E.O. of the dementia care charity only 2 weeks ago and they are quite clear about what is coming down the line and the importance of Government taking this seriously in terms of how we are going to deal with those, the extra numbers of people that are going to suffer with dementia in future. It is an awful disease. I have had people that I know suffer from it; I am sure we all have. It is important that we have a strategy and we have a clear direction of how we are going to deal with the extra numbers in future. I am going to come on in a little bit about dementia care when I talk about the Constable of St. Martin's speech in a second. The Minister for the Environment mentioned it is a lucrative venture. It is a private venture on a private site. What do you mean by lucrative? Does it have to make money? Well, unfortunately they do because it is a private site. When and if it is rezoned, when and if they have got planning application and it is approved, the answer is it would be lucrative. It will have to be a profitable venture otherwise the business will go under. I have got a feeling with the Minister that he has got something against private investment or private investment in infrastructure that this Island may need, and that is wrong. Whether it is in health or whether it is in sport, the Government cannot provide everything. It can provide some things but it cannot provide everything and it is only right, I think, that we take what is on offer from private investors and the private investment seriously. He mentioned evidence of need. Again, whether you look at it long term, holistically, strategically there is going to be need. Do we have to do more work around need? Absolutely, and if there is a planning application at some point then that is the point where we will have to provide evidence of need. I think the developer, the owner knows that. I am going to move on to the Constable of St. Martin's speech, which I think was supportive but she asked a few questions, and I am going to try to answer them. I had an opportunity at lunch to phone the developer, the agent for the developer, and talk to them a little bit about what this could offer. Now, there is nothing set in stone here. There is nothing in terms of what they have drawn up that is set in stone and cannot be changed. I mentioned to them about dementia, dementia strategy. It is very much part of this scheme. It is something that they very much see as part of this scheme, but I mentioned to them could this be Jersey's first dementia village. Before anybody says, that is not a ghetto. It is where people with dementia live, and I know the Constable of St. Brelade mentioned it before. But there is an opportunity with dementia to ensure that those that suffer unfortunately from that can get the care that they need in surroundings that are suitable. So, the answer is, yes, I think there is very much an opportunity to provide something different, something special for those that are suffering from dementia in the Island. I hope that answers the Constable's question around dementia. Deputy Russell Labey mentioned around again a planning application. This is not. This is about rezoning. It is not around a planning application. If it was a planning application, we would not even be talking about it here. The Minister for Health and Social Services again for me tried to muddy the water a little bit. I do not mean that in a disrespectful way, but imagine later on in life there are going to be extra numbers here, whether he likes it or not, and we are going to have to deal with that. He mentioned the long-term care scheme. The long-term care scheme, unless I am wrong, does not just cover people in residential homes. It potentially will cover people that are living at home. Am I incorrect? So there is going to be a cost one way or the other. Whether it is in a residential home or whether we are covering people at home, still that cost is going to be there. Again, he mentioned about lucrative. I do not think the Minister for Health and Social Services is against private investment, as maybe some are. He will remember, and I was going to mention it when I got to Deputy Tadier around LV. Now, I am not going to go into the individual cases with LV. Personally,

I think it is wrong to do that, but at the end of the day LV provided the Listening Lounge. I think they have done an incredible job with that. Had we not had that, we would have been in all sorts of problems during lockdown, during the pandemic, and they have been a shining example, I think, of what private investment can bring. In terms of providing staff - and it will answer another question, I think, that Deputy Le Hegarat had - as a private company it is much easier for private companies to access staff and be able to recruit staff than it is through government, and that is unfortunate. The question is quite right - and the Constable of St. Brelade mentioned it - is this going to draw from other businesses? Well, the answer is it might, but at the end of the day we are going to have to recruit, train, skill up more people to work in our social sector. If we do not do that, we are never going to be able to support people living in the community, living in residential homes. We have got a problem now and we are beginning to deal with it. I think the Minister would agree, we are beginning to put training in place to provide more carers, to provide more skills that will provide for businesses such as this in future. So whether it is in a private residential home or whether it is in government-run services that support people in their homes, we are still going to have to provide that support. Again I get back to the point, this is about rezoning a field for a nursing facility. Let us be clear, this is not a government site, so this is not government money. This is a private site that somebody wants to put private money into to take some of the burden away from Government in terms of some of the support it will provide. Are there people here that can afford to pay for that? I think we are fortunate that there are people in the Island that can afford to pay for their own residential care needs. It is an affluent Island; we are lucky in that way. Let us not baulk at that because it takes away some of the cost and allows us to spend money on those that are less well off. So let us not baulk at that. I think we have got to make the most of that. Sorry, I am getting too passionate with this. The Deputy of St. Martin, I agree with him, I think there is little or no reference in the draft bridging Island Plan around older people and that is unfortunate because they are a huge ... well, we are just going to go into an election and we are soon going to find out how big a part older people play in Island life, and they should have played a bigger part in this bridging Island Plan. Again, the Deputy of St. Martin mentioned there might be more suitable sites but, as he said, this is not a bad site, but it is a site for rezoning. This is not a planning application. There may be a planning application but there is not a planning application at the moment. This is about rezoning a site for what I believe and others believe is a much-needed residential facility on the east of the Island. Again, I am not going to repeat with Deputy Guida because, again, it is not a planning application. Deputy Tadier said this is a more nuanced amendment. I agree with him but it is something that to get to the point of a planning application - and I cannot remember which Member mentioned it - unless you rezone it, it is going to go up against the current Island Plan policy, so it is going to fail. It needs to be rezoned so that we can get to the point where a planning application has got at least an opportunity to be taken forward. It is up to States Member to decide whether it is right to rezone this field as we have had to make some really difficult decisions about a lot of other fields for a lot of other reasons, most of them housing. I think I have covered most of what ... I thank Deputy Le Hegarat. She brought up some important points but I think they will be dealt with over a period of time.

[15:00]

There are issues that we are going to have to deal with whether we like it or not because we are going to have more older people living in the Island. We know that, the population policy says that. We know from a skills point of view that we are going to have to deal with that. Our working population is going to reduce, so we know we have got to deal with that. But this is purely about rezoning this particular field and I would much prefer we just concentrate on that, just for a couple of minutes so that we can, I hope, come to the right decision on this. Finally, I am going to say, something I wanted to add, that those that do go into residential homes do it for all sorts of reasons, some because they are lonely, some because they need the support, but when they do that they often free up their home that can be used either by a family member or it goes back on the open market and it frees up a home.

Over a period of time I do not know how many people will live within this particular residential home when and if it is built, but it will free up homes and it might only be 20 homes, 15 homes, but it is 15 homes that will be back into the open market or back being used by younger families. It is a small point but I think it is an important point. I am going to finish just by saying please forget planning application. This is not a planning application. This is around rezoning a field for a nursing facility, as it says in the amendment. I hope Members can support it. We are going to have to get our heads around, in various aspects of Island life and future Governments, engaging with and making the most of the opportunities of private investment. It does not matter whether it is a nursing home or it is the refurbishment or the redevelopment of Fort Regent, we are going to have to try to deal with and work with private investors to take some of the burden of cost away from the taxpayer because the taxpayer cannot pay for everything. So, again, I hope Members can support this. Can I ask for the appel, please?

Deputy J.H. Young:

Sir, a clarification, please, if I may?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Will you take a point of clarification from the Minister?

Senator S.W. Pallett:

I certainly will, yes, Sir.

Deputy J.H. Young:

The Senator I think either said or suggested, whichever way you look at it, that unless we pass this a subsequent planning application would be turned down. Will he not accept what I did say was that the policy CI2, which he is seeking to amend, would allow, where there is need, it to be passed? Would he not accept that and also accept that I also said that I was completely opposed to all private investment when he said it was reasonable to judge it against the benefit when we are altering a policy like this?

Senator S.W. Pallett:

On the first point, I think what I was meaning to say is I think it would make it more difficult for it to be passed. I think having it rezoned for a specific nursing facility under the Island Plan would make it easier.

Deputy J.H. Young:

I accept the clarification, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are asked 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. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce the amendment has been rejected.

POUR: 9		CONTRE: 36		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator K.L. Moore		Senator I.J. Gorst		
Senator S.W. Pallett		Senator L.J. Farnham		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Senator S.C. Ferguson		
Connétable of St. Brelade		Senator T.A. Vallois		
Connétable of St. Mary		Senator S.Y. Mézec		
Deputy of St. Martin		Connétable of St. Helier		

Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)		Connétable of St. Lawrence		
Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)		Connétable of Grouville		
Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)		Connétable of Trinity		
		Connétable of St. Peter		
		Connétable of St. Ouen		
		Connétable of St. Martin		
		Connétable of St. John		
		Connétable of St. Clement		
		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. Ouen		
		Deputy L.M.C. Doublet (S)		
		Deputy R. Labey (H)		
		Deputy of St. Mary		
		Deputy J.H. Young (B)		
		Deputy L.B. Ash (C)		
		Deputy K.F. Morel (L)		
		Deputy G.C.U. Guida (L)		
		Deputy of St. Peter		
		Deputy of St. John		
		Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)		
		Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)		
		Deputy J.H. Perchard (S)		
		Deputy R.J. Ward (H)		
		Deputy C.S. Alves (H)		
		Deputy I. Gardiner (H)		

4. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) – tenth amendment: Nelson Street Car Park (P.36/2021 Amd.(10))

The Deputy Bailiff:

We will move on to the 10th amendment, lodged by Deputy Ward, and I ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

After the words “the draft Island Plan 2022-25” should be inserted the words “except that - (a) within Policy CI4, after the words ‘existing community facilities’ there should be inserted the following new paragraph - ‘To address specific deficiencies in the provision of youth facilities, the following site is safeguarded for use as a youth facility. The alternative development of this site will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that it is no longer required for this purpose: Nelson Street Car Park /The Old Fire Station site: Nelson Street, St. Helier’; (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).”

4.1 Deputy R.J. Ward:

I promise to be as quick as I can with the opening bit, because we have heard enough and I think we are all a bit jaded. This is again an amendment that is to protect an area from other development in the area in central St. Helier. Three and a half years ago now, in the Common Strategic Policy, this Assembly voted for, I think almost unanimously - I was searching for the actual proposition vote but I ran out of time - to allocate money for a youth facility for the north of town and that has still not been built. This amendment is as read to prevent the site around Nelson Street Car Park and the Old Fire Station in Nelson Street from being developed for anything else other than a youth facility, but there is an important part to that. If an alternative site for a youth facility is found then that takes away the need for that Nelson Street site and it can be used. So what I am saying is this is a step to say we desperately need a youth facility in that area, the money is available. The money has been available for 3 years but what I want to do is to make sure at least that there is one site available that is not taken away so that this facility can be produced. There is a definite need for this facility in the north of St. Helier, particularly again as we build more and more homes in that area and young people have to have somewhere to go. It is no good complaining about young people's behaviour and saying: "They are wandering the streets in groups and they are making a noise." Young people do tend to be a bit noisy but it is because they are young and vibrant and that is okay. But what the Youth Service do is provide opportunity and activities and support and direction for young people in an astounding way on this Island, and the fact that the youth facility is not a statutory body is even more astounding. We will come to that at another time, but they still provide those fantastic opportunities. What they need in the north of St. Helier is a state-of-the-art facility to do that in. The money is there; we just need the site. Over the last few years I have seen plans for at least 4 sites and all of them have been lost for one reason or another because of the same sort of complexity as we have had with schools. The Education Department sites, the Constable, Jersey Development Corporation - I lose track of who they are, to be quite frank - all had plans and there has been plan after plan but we have not seen the outcome. I have seen plans. I went to speak to Andium colleagues, and we have seen the plans for the brewery site. If those plans go ahead and that is built, fantastic, I absolutely support it, then this site will not be needed. But if we do not have that site built and we do not put some sort of protection on other sites we will end up with nothing. We are developing - I was going to say "brewing" but that was too corny - a real problem in the centre of St. Helier with no facilities as we pack more and more people in. As you put in young families, the reality is that young people grow, they turn into teenagers and then they want stuff to do, and it is different from simply running around in the park. We have to provide opportunities for them. I recognise that it will mean a few parking spaces but there is a huge amount of parking being developed at the Ann Street site, which is nearby and is being built as we speak. So that can easily be dealt with and we have to make some sort of use of it. I recognise that it is a place for the Honorary Police, but this is the point I will make. The Honorary Police will have an increasingly difficult problem in the centre of St. Helier with young people in groups if we do not provide facilities. There are other places that the Honorary Police can move to and it is not going to happen overnight. This is going to take a couple of years, I know that. If I am lucky enough to be re-elected I really hope it happens in the first couple of years of the new term so that we see this facility come to life. I was naïve enough to believe that because this was agreed in the common strategic plan it would be done by now, but that was obviously naïve. Unless we address the issues now early on and we are proactive in addressing those issues, it will not get any better. I am absolutely convinced by that argument and those consultations, and another place can be found for the Honorary Police from that site, because, to be honest, it needs refurbishing anyway. It is a really old building and we need to make steps forward and we all need to pay our contribution in the centre of St. Helier to making change. That is

effectively it. The plans exist. I have seen plans for Nelson Street and the site. They exist. They have been worked upon as well as the plans for the brewery site, but what this does is it puts into the Island Plan you cannot develop anything else there, only a youth facility. The money is there, the site is there; we just need the backing, as from before, from this Assembly. So I urge Members to support this amendment and I look forward to the debate.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is the amendment seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on this amendment?

4.1.1 Deputy J.H. Young:

Just to say I support this and hopefully the debate can be over quite quickly so we can move on. **[Laughter]**

The Deputy Bailiff:

Well, you never know.

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

May I ask a question of clarification from the speaker, please?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Which speaker?

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Deputy Ward.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Well, it is a bit late now because he had finished speaking and someone else spoke. If you want to make a short speech in which you ask a question, that is a way of doing it and he will respond in his closing address.

4.1.2 The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Yes, if I may, Sir. I am very interested to find out that the brewery is quite prepared to have a youth department there but I have a feeling that the Youth Service has turned it down. Maybe Deputy Ward can reassure me that if we do vote on this there will be a youth department at the brewery.

4.1.3 The Connétable of St. Helier:

I have discussed this proposition with the Deputy in the past. In fact I passed on his request to the St. Helier Honorary Police and just sounded them out about how they would feel about relinquishing their use of the building. That, after all, is the most important thing we are debating today. I got a fairly uncompromising “no” from the Honorary Police who moved out of the Town Hall for a number of good reasons into the Old Fire Station, as we call it, when it was vacated following the transfer of welfare to the States. It is a building that they have developed and improved and it works extremely well for Parish Hall Inquiries because it is not nearly as exposed and public a building for people going to a Parish Hall Inquiry to get to, as used to be the case when they had to go to the Town Hall, although interestingly people still turn up at the Town Hall some - I do not know how many years it is - 15 years later asking where the Parish Hall Inquiry is being held.

[15:15]

But that aside, Nelson Street, the Old Fire Station, is the home of the St. Helier Honorary Police and I was a bit disappointed, having conveyed that back to the Deputy, to find this amendment in the bridging Island Plan. Clearly, and I am sure my fellow Constables would agree with this, before one takes a proposition to the States Assembly, which affects or could affect one’s Honorary Police force,

one at the very least, I think, would hold a Parish Assembly to make sure that these matters are fully aired and that the feedback of honorary officers is fully heard. I think that is particularly important as we come out of a pandemic in which St. Helier's Honorary Police has, by all accounts, performed incredibly well and I know that 4 centeniers in particular have taken on board the charging for the whole Island. That is 4 St. Helier centeniers have shouldered that burden during the pandemic while other officers have done an enormous amount of work, unpaid of course, out in the community in anti-social hours. My concern about this proposition is that it does not send a very good message to the St. Helier Honorary Police that the States Assembly, with the backing of the Minister for the Environment now, is saying: "Well, if there is nowhere else we will potentially take their building away from them." I think although Deputy Ward says it is not likely to happen, I think in that case putting it into the Island Plan could cause unnecessary concern to a force that, as I say, deserves really nothing other than our wholehearted support of the States Assembly. My second concern about the proposition is Deputy Ward referred to, and I quote, "a few parking spaces". There are 35 public parking spaces in Nelson Street Car Park and they are extremely contested spaces. There are often queues of residents trying to park in there. Local residents have lost a lot of parking facilities and the ones that the Deputy referred to that are coming onstream at Ann Court will merely replace the ones that were on that site before the development by Andium Homes took place. I think St. Helier can ill-afford to lose these spaces for locals but also for shoppers, for visitors, people going to the town park, people indeed attending the Honorary Police Parish Inquiries. I would expect there to be a fairly packed Parish Assembly. If this had been taken to a Parish Assembly I think it would make Grouville's recent requete assembly look like a walk in the park. I would expect a very strong opposition indeed from St. Helier residents that the idea that they might lose Nelson Street Car Park was to be endorsed in the Island Plan. For those 2 reasons, although I understand the frustration of the Deputy waiting for these youth facilities, I really cannot endorse this amendment and I urge other Members to reflect before they vote on the impression it may well give to the St. Helier Honorary Police if they were to back it.

4.1.4 Deputy M. Tadier:

I have never considered myself an expert, so apologies but I have looked around the Assembly at the body language of some of the Constable's fellow Connétables and I find it slightly difficult to read but maybe some puzzled faces. But for my part I remember coming into the Assembly early on this term signing a pledge which said putting children first. I do not remember ever signing a pledge saying putting the St. Helier Honorary Police first. I do not mean that to be glib but the Honorary Police are at the leisure and under the guidance, if not direct leadership of the Constable the last time I checked, and it should not be that difficult for a Parish with a Constable and 10 Deputies to coordinate on issues like this. It also seems to me that the very named Parish Hall Inquiry, the clue is kind of in the name, is it not, the Parish Hall Inquiry? I have not been to all of the 12 Parish Halls to be at a Parish Hall Inquiry, I have maybe been at one or 2 and they tend to, by and large, be at the Parish Hall. I am not sure if that is strange or if that is radical but it is not called a Former Fire Station Inquiry. This very strange argument that it is more private there because you go round the back, there is a car park and then you go in there. Of course you sit in a big room a bit like this but probably smaller, with lots of other people and you are thinking, what are you here for? I have just come to see the centenier, I have done nothing wrong, I am an advocate, I have come to represent this poor young person who was speeding. That is another side issue, which I do not think we should be discussing here, but there are key issues of confidentiality which the Constable and indeed other Parishes may wish to address about data protection, et cetera. Because I still believe in innocent until proven guilty and when you are sitting in a big room with people like that, if confidentiality is genuinely the Constable's prime concern then I think he might need to go down one day and have a look. But I would hope that any of the serving officers there and ... again this is another "if" by Deputy Ward. He is saying that, yes - and he will address this in summing up, I believe - of course he has had conversations with the Youth Service and they would like to use that but he is aware that

if another site magically appears, which is better suited for the Youth Service to come up with, and for me it seems an obvious place - it is right across from the park in the centre of town - then of course it can be freed up at a later date if necessary. But I just think the protestations from the Constable of St. Helier on this particular one just ring slightly untrue to my ears.

4.1.5 Senator S.Y. Mézec:

I think a point that is worth making is that this amendment has, I think, been born out of frustration in that Deputy Ward has been extremely active since his election to the Assembly and since in the very early days of it he won his amendment to the Common Strategic Policy to secure a new youth and community centre for the north of St. Helier, something which is desperately needed. I live in that area and especially through lockdown and seeing other services being closed and people kind of stuck with things to do, it is, I think, been felt to an even greater extent that there does need to be something for young people in that area so that they can benefit from Youth Service support. But here we are almost at the very end of this term and we still have not agreed to a site for it. As we can see with the hospital debate, you really do need to get over that first hurdle before you can do other things and it really leaves things in limbo until then. We have seen different iterations of different versions of a youth and community centre. I have sat in Andium's offices with Deputy Ward on numerous occasions to be presented with different options for that, the most recent one being the brewery one, which is great. That will be fantastic if that goes ahead; so brilliant. Other versions included the Sans Souci building on the other end of the brewery site, which has since been allocated for a different purpose; that may well have been a good opportunity but was lost. I worry that the longer time goes on the more opportunities will be lost and we will keep running round in circles and not commit ourselves to something or a good idea strikes us but because it has not fallen in the right part of the planning process, because we have got another part of the bridging Island Plan to come in a few years as well, that a potential good idea will not be possible. Again, what Deputy Ward has come up with here is to safeguard the site in case it is needed because it would be a very good youth and community centre if it was there, fantastic location for it, the space is big enough. We have seen concept drawings, those of us in the area, that look like it could be a good idea. In terms of the supposed downsides from it, the car park has been mentioned. Until I was gratefully accepted on to the St. Helier Residents Parking, which took me a significant amount of time to get on to it, I did occasionally try to secure a space in the Nelson Street Car Park, as it was relatively close to where I live and it often is difficult to get a space there. It does have to be said that the ones who are queuing up round about 5.00 p.m. do tend to be the white vans, as opposed to residents in the area who are just trying to find a space for their car. I think that car park could be lost because of the new spaces which are coming online underneath and caught. That was part of the benefit of the Ann Court proposals, was that there were going to be a significant number of parking spaces delivered there, so people will be able to park their cars just a short distance from that site and it is a much greater number than those that are being lost, that could, theoretically, be lost at Nelson Street. As Deputy Tadier has very well-explained, that there are other ways which you can find facilities for the Honorary Police in St. Helier. The Constable says he has spoken to them and they were very clearly against moving. Of course they would be, why would they want to move unless it was necessary? But if that becomes a necessary option, well that would just be the democratic process. I do not share the Constable's assumption that if this were proposed there would be some mass unrest in St. Helier over it. I think he is misjudging people's appetite there. I do not really think that many people in the community that I am a resident of would be so opposed to having Parish Hall Inquiries held at the Parish Hall. I think many would be extremely pleased to see a youth and community provision provided there because the people who live in that area know how desperately it is needed and can often see, as they are walking around the area, how bored many of the young people often are and at a loose end, rather than benefiting from Youth Service provision, which is what they could be doing. This does not tie our hands to providing this facility on the Nelson Street site but it just leaves it open

in case we need it. What is the problem? It sounds all right to me. I hope Members will support the amendment.

4.1.6 Deputy G.C. Guida:

Yes, sorry, I just have one question for the proposer because I really do not understand this. As a site that is not available, that is not going to be available, that does not want to be left by the people who are in it, that does not have any other alternatives, so why say now we need to reserve it for a second use so that we force the Government to choose some place somewhere? Then the States saying, what about, I do not know, the Maritime Museum? Why not saying the next use for the Maritime Museum, when they want to leave the building, is going to be for a youth centre? That does not pressure anybody to do anything. I can understand the principle and I am for the principle; I think this absolutely needs to be done. I do not understand why this particular building has been chosen as a hostage since it is unbelievably unlikely that the people in it are ever going to leave.

4.1.7 Deputy K.F. Morel:

I would just like to pick up from Deputy Guida there because Deputy Guida has highlighted the issue that has been concerning me. I would like to take it one step further, which is to say that my concern is that by zoning this particular building the Deputy may find it harder to get his youth centre because I think Deputy Guida is right. We have heard from the Connétable of St. Helier that the Honorary Police are not going anywhere anytime soon. It is quite possible that the argument will be made but we are not going to give you a youth centre somewhere else because you have got the Old Fire Station zoned as a youth centre and with the Honorary Police being there nothing will happen. I am concerned that this could work against Deputy Ward, who I know has fought valiantly for 4 years. I understand when he was calling himself naïve thinking that he got it in the Common Strategic Policy and, therefore, it would happen. I believed that too. As new Members I think I shared the Deputy's naivety thinking that it was in there so it will happen. But I am concerned that this could backfire on the Deputy and I would ask him to consider that.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy. Does any other Member wish to speak on this amendment? I call upon Deputy Ward to reply. Deputy Ward.

[15:30]

4.1.8 Deputy R.J. Ward:

I am glad no one else spoke because I have got it so clear in my head from the last 2 speakers and I have got to get this right. I thank Deputy Guida and Deputy Morel for that. This amendment is to say the alternative development of this site will not be allowed, apart from being a youth facility. But if something else comes up as a youth facility it will not be needed. I can answer as well the Constable of St. Saviour at the same time, the brewery site; I have seen plans for the brewery site as a youth facility but it has not been agreed. If that happens we will not use Nelson Street as a site, therefore, this amendment is unnecessary and you will never have to use it and it is in the worded amendment, however, if that does not happen and there is no certainty, there has not been certainty for years. As Senator Mézec said, we had the one site, I do not know how many plans we have seen, perhaps the Senator can indicate; I think it is 5 different sets of plans, Springfield here. One of the reasons, Deputy Guida, that I have put this forward and I do not think it is a hostage, I am not expecting someone to pay for it, one of the reasons I have put this forward is because plans have been produced for this site for a youth facility and discussed. There have been plans for this site; Brewery Street, Springfield, La Salle buildings, I think it is called, the old gas showroom was considered but that has gone. What has happened over the last few years is gradually they have been eroded away, apart from the Brewery Street, which is there and available should it be agreed because that is a genuine real site. The Nelson Street site, which is there and available, should it be rezoned and we say that

that is available for us to build and the plans are there. In terms of the Honorary Police, I understand the issue from the Constable about the Honorary Police and what I did not like from the Constable of St. Helier is this assumption that because we are daring to suggest that the Honorary Police need to be part of this change that we do not respect the work they do; that is just unfair. I see the Honorary Police as well and I know the guys in the area, we chat all the time, one of my ex-student's dad to be honest and we chat all the time. I understand the work that goes on. It is not about that, that is a side issue; this is about facilities in that area. Let us look at it the other way, if we do not build something and we do not get another site we will have nothing. If we have nothing the issues are going to grow and grow and grow and then the Honorary Police will have their site but they will be dealing with more and more and more issues in that area and when we come back to this Assembly at some time and say there is an emergency situation in St. Helier. What I am saying is if we rezone this and have it as a back-up site, if the Brewery Street does not work and the plans are there and the money is there, then it gives us the opportunity to produce this facility. I genuinely believe that if the Honorary Police enter into a proper discussion over this and see the benefits, because they are intelligent people who can look at the benefits for their society, their area, that is why they commit their time to the area, to try and improve it. There are sites in St. Helier, I know that the Honorary Police had a tour of La Motte Street with the C.E.O. of St. Helier and not with the Constable, and had that tour to say: "This is a possible site that you could use." I have said it before, I am going to say it again, it needs leadership. It needs leadership from the Deputies in the area - I am doing that - from the Constable - he is not doing that because he is opposing this - to say we need this facility. This is one site and if this was to happen we are going to need to make a change; I will offer you these facilities. The Parish Hall Inquiry, as succinct and wonderfully put by Deputy Tadier, I think is a side issue; there are plenty of places to have Parish Hall Inquiries, the Parish Hall being one of them, for example. I just think we are clutching at straws in some of the arguments here. Senator Mézec said, I think, this comes out of - I cannot remember his words - frustration, absolutely. This is a frustration of 3½ years of agreement, 3½ years of being told there is something, do not worry about that one, no, that one is gone. There is a plan, look at these plans, they are wonderful, great, let us go for it, no, that one is gone. But there are these plans from Nelson Street and Brewery Street, that is great, let us go with those; Andium, thank you, brilliant, let us get on with it but we are not sure. There is always an obstacle in the way. I have to say, and I am quite willing to make the difficult decisions of bringing difficult things forward, which may affect me at the ballot box. You know what, so what? I have to stand on the principles I believe in and the principles I believe in is we should be providing facilities for our young people in that area to make the lives of people in the area that I stand up and represent in this Assembly, for voices that perhaps do not have a voice, to make their lives better. I believe that this facility will make their lives better. I would say this, the comment from the Constable about what message are we giving to the Honorary Police; the message we are giving to the Honorary Police is we know you are going to have a big problem in the future if you do not get on with something but the Assembly has agreed the money. We have got plans here and what we need you to do is we need you to be involved with that, find another facility, perhaps a newer facility that will be better for you anyway and we want you to support this because you are going to have a better role in the future because of this facility. I will ask the Constable this: what message are we sending to the Youth Service? I will tell what the message is we are sending to the Youth Service in St. Helier: "When things go badly wrong, can you step in and help us out a little bit?" When there are problems in Millennium Park, which there have been repeatedly and are now probably just spreading to other areas, or having a discussion with Deputy Ahier earlier about a different area: "Can you help us out?" "Yes, we will bring the bus around, we have got to find the keys for the gate." This is a genuine situation that arose, they could not get in the park because there were no keys for the gates but we have sorted that out: "And then we will help you with young people in the area." But do not expect us to build your youth facility, even though the Assembly has agreed the money. Let us be honest, agreeing money in this place is not always easy but we have done it. What are we going to do? We are going to say to the Youth Service: "We will use you when we want to but other than that just step

back and just wait for it.” That is the wrong message and it is the wrong message to young people. There is one way in which you get young people on side and what you do is you value them and you say to young people: “You have a value to us and we are going to invest in you but with that investment and that value comes a responsibility for you to be part of our society as well.” When you do that with young people they will inevitably step up to the plate and be those wonderful young people that we see all of the time in our society, and that is what we need to be doing here. This amendment is a simple one, it says we are going to protect this area as a fall back and it is basically saying to us get on with it. You have talked enough, you have agreed enough but now get on with it. The obstacles of a few parking spaces, and I am willing to talk to the residents there and take that on the chin and say: “Look, sorry, guys, but this is the reason we are doing this and there is Ann Street around the corner and there are parking spaces there.” The vans that do park there - and Senator Mézec has a point - they park work vans, and I know they have got to park it somewhere, they have got to do something. Why have we not got a more co-ordinated approach from the Parish to say: “We know we have got a lot of work vans here, where can we put them? Is there somewhere out of town we can put them and people come in and make it easy?” It has never been addressed. We are not putting cars first, we are not putting the Honorary Police first, we are putting children first and if we do not put that first our future is not as bright as it should be. I would say to Members if you are erring on the side of caution, please do not. Please support this. This gives the opportunity for something to happen. I have accepted it is probably not going to happen before June, I have had to take that on board. I have spoken about it, I have spoken to my therapist, which is another party Member but she is not here at the moment because she is not very well, and I have accepted it. I have come up with that acceptance but what I will not accept is it is not going to happen in the next term, whoever is representing, and I hope it will be me because I want to see this through. I urge Members to vote for this and I 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 via the Teams link may 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 the amendment has been adopted.

POUR: 33		CONTRE: 10		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator L.J. Farnham		Senator I.J. Gorst		
Senator T.A. Vallois		Senator S.C. Ferguson		
Senator K.L. Moore		Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré		
Senator S.Y. Mézec		Connétable of St. Helier		
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Connétable of St. Saviour		
Connétable of Grouville		Connétable of St. Brelade		
Connétable of St. Peter		Connétable of Trinity		
Connétable of St. Mary		Deputy of Grouville		
Connétable of St. Ouen		Deputy L.B. Ash (C)		
Connétable of St. Martin		Deputy G.C.U. Guida (L)		
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)				
Deputy M. Tadier (B)				
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)				

Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy of St. Ouen				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet (S)				
Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)				
Deputy J.H. Young (B)				
Deputy K.F. Morel (L)				
Deputy of St. Peter				
Deputy of St. John				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)				
Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)				
Deputy J.H. Perchard (S)				
Deputy R.J. Ward (H)				
Deputy C.S. Alves (H)				
Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)				
Deputy I. Gardiner (H)				

5. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - ninety-fifth amendment: Policy CI5 - Sports, Leisure and Cultural Facilities (P.36/2021 Amd.(95))

The Deputy Bailiff:

The next is the 95th amendment lodged by the Minister for the Environment 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 within Policy CI5 - Sports, leisure and cultural facilities - (a) at point 3, the words “or increases” should be deleted and after the words “use by the public” there should be inserted the words “or increases the proportion of freely accessible public green space”; (b) after “Southwest St. Helier Planning Framework Area”, there should be inserted “6. FB Fields, La Grande Route de St. Clement”; (c) after the words “Southwest St. Helier Planning Framework Area”, there should be inserted the words - “The development of sports and leisure uses may also be supported in the identified sports and leisure area of potential (St. Peter) but only where the public benefit and contribution to the viability and success of local sports can be proven to outweigh any loss or harm to the landscape and agricultural land”; (d) the draft Island Plan 2022-25 should be further amended in such respects as may be necessary consequent upon the adoption of paragraphs (a)-(c); (e) the Draft Bridging Island Plan Proposals Map Part A - Planning Zones be amended to reflect the adoption of (b) and (c).”

5.1 Deputy J.H. Young (The Minister for the Environment):

I think we have got as far as page 235 in the plan, community infrastructure. This is a straightforward amendment, hopefully. As a result, this is an amendment, one of my consolidating ones, which was done sort of after looking at the various Members’ amendments, areas where we knew there needed to be some change. There are 3 sets of changes. Just to explain what this policy is, this is CI5, sports, leisure and cultural and it deals with what the current Island Plan provides for where large-scale sports and leisure facilities will normally receive consent. It lists down a number of areas. I am making a number of changes to it. Part (b) corrects an omission where FB Fields was omitted; FB

Fields, St. Clement, that needed to be added in. If Members look at the back page of my proposition you will see a couple of drawings there; appendix 1 shows the area that that includes. Also, at the end of the list there is part (c) adds to that list of sites, an area that the team have called a sports and leisure enhancement area in the St. Peter area. I have to say this is absolutely not a zoning, this is not zoning any fields; this is not a planning application.

[15:45]

This identifies an area which is in the approximate area of the rugby club and those Members that know the Strive Fitness Centre, that is that large development as you go from the St. Peter roundabout through to the airport on the left after the rugby club in that area. The land being spoken about is to the south of that. Again, there are no field numbers, although there are field numbers mentioned there. You will see a yellow blob; this is absolutely not a zoning of those fields. The proposition (c) says that it identifies an area of potential to the south of Strive but the policy is very, very explicit that anything that is done there could only happen: "Where the public benefit and the contribution to the viability and success of local sport can be proven to outweigh any loss or harm to the landscape and agricultural land." If you like it is identifying an area of potential for the future. We will, I think, see what happens but there is a very, very severe proviso put on that area. That is, I think, where on that last one, that particular one, is supported, as I understand it, by both Jersey Sport and Strive in representations. I have read a number of comments by the sports aficionados in that area. They said they were encouraged by this but of course there is a lot of work to do and the need has to be proven and the case has to be made before it would go anywhere. The kind of potential that was spotted are the potential benefits, particularly the development possibly of netball courts, where there does seem to be an identified need. Senator Pallett will be pleased to know that this is some area where there is an expectation that private investment would be made, dare I say it. There we are, we have had that debate, which would reduce the pressure on Government to fund and develop these facilities somewhere else. I think that is the right way to approach it, particularly in light of the fact that the Island has got a sports strategy - we are big on sports - and there is a need for active lifestyles and so on. I have to say I am not great in the area of sports myself, I do not think I probably ever was, so I will bow absolutely to the sports aficionados and maybe we will hear from Senator Pallett later. Part (a), I have glossed over that one. I have just done a little change to respond to the amendment that Deputy Ward put in about Springfield because Springfield obviously is one of those areas of large-scale sports, to adopt his wording, so that Springfield maintains and increases the amount of freely accessible green space. Of course the more public open space we can protect and deliver the better. With those, and I think this is very, very straightforward, and hope there will not be a long debate on it and we can get on to perhaps some of the more contentious items later.

The Deputy Bailiff:

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

5.1.1 The Deputy of St. Martin:

I will not be long but I just rise to support the Minister with this, specifically the St. Peter side. When I was Minister, I tried my level best to get some initiative working on this site. I am absolutely delighted that the current Minister now has something to put in front of us. I have been to Strive, I have spoken to them about their plans for the future. I am going to talk more about them when I get to my own amendment in a couple of debates time to talk about cricket. I am hugely enthusiastic about what they are doing, they share my vision for the future and they get my full support, so I will support the Minister on this one.

5.1.2 The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I am cognisant of the need for providing sports facilities and certainly would be supportive of that. But I think we must also be aware of the visual effect of what we see has appeared on the L'Avenue De La Reine Elizabeth and, truthfully, we are moving from green to almost industrial, if you can call sports that. The Planning Department need to take very great care that we do not become just a suburban area surrounding the airport. There have been poor planning decisions on the other side of the road in terms of a large English-style garage. Let us not see a repetition of that sort of thing.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Connétable. Does any other Member wish to speak on this amendment? I call upon the Minister to reply.

5.1.3 Deputy J.H. Young:

I am grateful for the Deputy of St. Martin's support. I was persuaded of this. I suppose I should have declared, I do apologise, an interest, is that I am a member of the Jersey Rugby Club but I do not play, I just sit in the stand and enjoy it like everybody else. Hopefully, I am allowed to carry on speaking, Sir, am I?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Thank you very much. But I do not go to Strive. No, seriously, I think the Constable of St. Brelade makes a good point about what could change. These large-scale facilities do have the potential to dramatically change landscape and the character of an area, particularly when they are sited very close to roads and so on. My personal view about that, I have to say, it was not the decision to allow that development. The first time I saw it go up I thought: "My word that is big, how did that get there?" I was told this was a decision of the Planning Committee. The Planning Committee made a decision, which they are fully entitled to do, to depart from policy. We have heard all about the joys of being on the Planning Committee but there we are. That is where we have ended up and of course it does look though as if that has proven to be a good asset to the Island in all sorts of ways, not just domestically but in terms of our international presence and so on. I have to say from a planning point of view, if you are going to have that sort of facility I do think it is sensible to put it close to where we have really decent roads and road access. It is also sensible to put it near the airport so that people can get in and out to visit the facility, and it is also sensible to have all the sort of facilities and the bus routes to be able to get people on that site and off it. I think that was my planning sort of impressions, not be a party to the decision. But I think how far that develops in the future will be very much for the sports community, for the Minister for the Environment, the next Minister for the Environment and indeed those who pick up whatever Government roles in developing the sports strategy forward and indeed the Planning Committee in this Assembly. But I think it is important that we have that flagged up in the plan. From my point of view, it is quite important - the Deputy of St. Martin will not like this very much - that when we go on to discuss the next item because where you site these major facilities, I think, are very, very important. I make the proposition, thank you and call for the *appel*.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The *appel* has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. Those joining the meeting by the Teams like 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 amendment has been adopted unanimously.

POUR: 41		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAIN: 0
-----------------	--	------------------	--	-------------------

Senator I.J. Gorst				
Senator L.J. Farnham				
Senator S.C. Ferguson				
Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré				
Senator T.A. Vallois				
Senator K.L. Moore				
Senator S.Y. Mézec				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)				
Deputy of Grouville				
Deputy M. Tadier (B)				
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)				
Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet (S)				
Deputy R. Labey (H)				
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 St. Peter				
Deputy of St. John				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)				
Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)				
Deputy J.H. Perchard (S)				
Deputy R.J. Ward (H)				
Deputy C.S. Alves (H)				
Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)				
Deputy I. Gardiner (H)				

6. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - seventy-third amendment: Use of Field MN727, St. Martin (P.36/2021 Amd.(73))

The Deputy Bailiff:

Now I move on to the 73rd amendment 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 inserted within the list of sites to be designated as sports and leisure enhancement areas at Policy CI5 - Sports, Leisure and Cultural facilities - “6. Field MN727, St. Martin (0.99 hectares/5.5 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 Proposal Map Part A - Planning Zones should be amended to reflect the adoption of paragraph (a).”

6.1 The Deputy of St. Martin:

Here we are back in St. Martin again with another specific use on a specific site. Before I get into the detail though, can I just share with Members, and it comes on from the last amendment, which we supported unanimously, a vision for Jersey, a vision that has Jersey as a centre of sporting excellence, not just in the Channel Islands or in the U.K. but in Europe and even wider than Europe, in a global sense. Why do I say that? I say that because when you look at what has been happening at the other end of the Island in St. Peter, at Strive where we have just been talking about, you can see what can be done. We have had, will continue to have - and especially next year with the Rugby World Cup in France - visiting sportsmen and women and teams of the very, very highest world-class calibre visiting the Island to use the facilities at St. Peter and enjoy and make use of our fantastic countryside features. Strive has catapulted us to the top of the tree when it comes to sports training facilities. Here with my amendment is another feather that we can put in our cap when it comes to developing our Island as a destination for world-class sportspeople and sports teams. There is a vision here that compliments the vision at St. Peter. But this proposed facility is not just about those at the pinnacle of their careers, it is as much about those who are just starting out and everybody in between those 2 extremes. We are signed up to improving Islanders' well-being, mental and physical health and we know that staying fit keeps you healthy, both in body and in mind. We also know that organised facilities outside of school time reduce anti-social behaviour. Here with this amendment we have a health and social benefit that we can take at the same time. Let us talk briefly about the cricket and the success story that has been the Farmers' Field since 2003 when it first came into use. I have to say to Members in those days I was a farmer and I can remember ploughing, planting and growing crops in fields which have now turned into what was then farmers' fields and is now the Farmers' Field as a cricket ground. We now see matches played here from local junior teams right up to international competitions. Members have a list in the appendix at the end of this amendment of the international teams that have played in St. Martin. But this amendment is about taking the current facility to the next level and provide an indoor venue for matches and training that can be accessed 12 months of the year. Let me be clear with Members, I would not have brought this amendment had the independent inspector not said this and I quote: “The site is the logical place for such a facility, being adjacent to the existing cricket ground, which provides an excellent facility for cricket in the Island. The proposal is supported by the International Cricket Council and the ground has provided a venue for international teams to compete against the Jersey team. Secondly, the hearing was told that alternative arrangements for existing indoor sporting facilities at Fort Regent are being sought, as Fort Regent is not ideal for indoor sports. In our view, these factors outweigh the Minister's objection. The proposal would provide a privately funded, desirable facility in a logical location.

[16:00]

In reaching our view, we have taken into account the Active Jersey strategy and the aim in the draft bridging Island Plan to ensure a broad range of high-quality facilities for sport in the Island.” Jersey cricket is on a high at the moment and has been for a while and our team are representing us magnificently overseas. But this is about encouraging our young people to aspire to be the next Jersey cricket team. As with Strive, I envisage this new facility, should it happen, will allow for a large amount of public and educational access at no cost to become a real centre of excellence for all; not just locals but internationals as well. This would be a multi-functional sports venue with health and well-being facilities. It would encourage more physical activity and go a little way to get us to our aim of increasing physical activity by 10 per cent before 2030. Also, the time when Fort Regent has been taken out of action here is an opportunity for us to put something back. I am going to stop there but I would ask Members to share with me my vision for Jersey as a destination of international sporting excellence and at the same time a facility for all locals to enjoy and benefit from. I make the proposition and look forward to the debate.

The Deputy Bailiff:

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

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

I will start with a declaration of interest. I love cricket with everything in my being and I love this amendment too. Because for me personally the success of the Jersey cricket team, and I would also add the Jersey Nets women’s netball team, completely under the radar of the success and well-being because they do not have the level of support that the incredible success of the Jersey Rugby Club - and long may that continue as well - that they have had, the fact that they have achieved that. When I used to take my son to play cricket in the nets at FB Fields and see the deteriorating state of them is an even more incredible achievement, and I believe the Deputy is quite right. To me sport should be accessible for everybody wherever you are in the Island, and they have proven that across the Island, so I just think on that. I know I am a little bit biased but I will be voting with the Deputy on this one.

6.1.2 The Connétable of St. Martin:

I am delighted to follow Deputy Pamplin and hear how supportive he is of this amendment. As the Constable of the Parish in question, I feel it is necessary for me to comment on this amendment and I have been asked by several Members what my thoughts are. The views I have received from parishioners have been balanced, some have been very sceptical and cross and some have been extremely supportive of the proposed site. I myself am uncertain on whether I can support ...

The Deputy of St. Martin:

Sir, I am very sorry to interrupt my Constable but I am really struggling to hear her because I have a lot of chatter going on in the back here.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes. There is no harm in Members exchanging a word with the people sitting next to them but there have been times today when there have been 5 or 6 conversations going on all over Chamber. I am not singling out anyone, there have been conversations all over the place and it has been quite difficult for Members to speak I imagine. Perhaps Members can bear that in mind when they decide whether or not to communicate with the people sitting next to them. Yes, thank you, Deputy, for raising that.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I will start again with that sentence. The views I have received from parishioners have been very balanced, some have been very sceptical and cross and some have been extremely supportive of the proposed site. I myself am uncertain whether I can support this, based on the information provided.

I will say that I am erring more on the side of voting *pour* than *contre*. Further, the Minister for the Environment has outlined his view in his post-consultation that he does not consider it appropriate to designate this land for a new sports and leisure facility due to its unsustainable location and the significant harm that such a facility would have on the character and nature of this rural area, including agricultural land and, as the Constable, I cannot ignore this concern. I agree this is prime agricultural land and the owner has sheds adjacent to this field, which I believe would be better to convert into an indoor cricket facility, however, this has not been put forward. I note the reports of the inspectors that we should accept this amendment on the grounds that this is a logical site and that the lack of opportunity to provide alternative facilities at Fort Regent outweighs the Minister's objection. The amendment talks extensively about the positive contribution this amendment will make to improving Islanders' mental and physical health and the success of cricket in the Island. However, as the Minister's comments have noted, there are no nearby primary or secondary sporting centres nearby. It appears instead to be a small private facility with little additional information provided about how it would function, how the facilities would be accessed by the public. There is no clear outline of what discussions have been between the applicant, the proposer and the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture over how the facilities can be used to further the development of cricket on the Island, particularly in relation to how schools can use it. Indeed, the facility is only a few minutes' walk away from St. Martin's School, and I would welcome clarification from the Deputy as to whether he has spoken to teachers from the school regarding the use of the proposed facilities. I would further welcome clarification over whether discussions have been held over ensuring that discounts will be provided to schools. Cricket, there is no question, is a highly-regarded sport in Jersey and, as the Deputy has so elegantly outlined, one of the Island's great success stories. However, if we want to truly develop cricketing skills in Jersey we need to ensure that the public is able to fully benefit from the new facilities and children and young people are guaranteed and encouraged to use the cricketing facilities available to train and learn without facing high costs. We need guarantees that this is not just a private gym wearing leg guards. I am all for excellent sporting facilities but any proposed sporting facilities brought to the Assembly as part of the Island Plan should be clearly accessible to all members of the public and not risk depleting agricultural land without clear details on its use and operations, and the amendment does not have these. Overall, this one as well has caused me sleepless nights because I can see that Farmers' Field is an amazing world-renowned cricket field and I just would like a bit more information. If the Deputy or the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture is able to offer insight into the concerns raised, then I would welcome it. As I have already said, the Farmers' cricket ground is indeed a marvellous facility enjoyed by locals and visitors and I would like to support this but do need to be convinced that a green field should be converted to an indoor facility. I ask again, why have the owner's sheds not been put forward for conversion?

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

I suppose I almost thought to declare an interest here because I love sport. I have always loved sport, it has very much been my life; it probably still is my life. This is more of a bit of a sideline I am doing here, I think, compared to sport. I think it just offers children a chance to dream as well. I think it gives everybody escapism, if you like. I can remember when I was young and dreaming of a great sporting career where I took my brand new school Clydella white shirt and redecorated the left-hand side of it using a felt tip pen and painted on a nice red rose with a green stem before going out into the garden to play for England and then being subject to rather violent abuse from a pitch invader, namely my mother, but I digress. The reason I mention this right to dream is when Strive opened, Ben Harvey, the proprietor, for want of a better word, of Strive, he made a fantastic point in my book where he said: "If we provide top facilities for people, particularly youngsters in the Island, they have a chance to aim at the top." He said: "At the moment we have children and I played against Guernsey." As he said: "That is great, if you want to aim to play in the Muratti or something that is fantastic but when children are 8 or 9 they should be aiming at winning an Olympic gold medal; that

is the dream. They should be aiming to play for Liverpool, play for England at rugby.” If we provide those facilities they have that dream and that opportunity and we are slowly seeing people like Serena Guthrie, who were given an opportunity and they have gone through to achieve that. We saw in the U.K., our Olympic performances were absolutely shocking if you remember back to it, really awful until the lottery funding came in and we provided people with the facilities and it has revolutionised Team G.B. (Great Britain) at the Olympics. The other thing we have here is the ability now to provide a first-rate cricket facility; one of the great games. Neville Cardus, I think, described it as the epitome of the team game. I think he described it as: “The finest game that the wit of man has ever invented.” There would be some who would disagree from other sports but that was what Neville Cardus said. What we are seeing though with cricket, partly because of equipment and things, is certain grounds are no longer suitable. From what I hear we may well see the FB Fields for adult cricket soon, particularly if a cycle track is put in there, will no longer become suitable. Firstly, I think that will be a great shame if that is the case but if it is the case we have to try and give something back to cricket. It is all very well putting cycle paths all over the place but we have to give something back to cricket. If we are taking it away from them in one place we have to give it back to them in another. What better way to put it back in an indoor facility that could be used all year round for young boys, young girls to get involved in what is still a wonderful sport and really provide a great facility for the Island and also provide an indoor facility. As Deputy Luce said, we are hosting world-class competitions now, I.C.C. (International Cricket Council) competitions, and if it rains there is not a lot to do but if you have got an indoor practice facility for these teams it will encourage people to come here even more. I cannot stress strongly enough that we should back this and provide a great facility for the Island going forward.

6.1.4 Deputy S.M. Wickenden:

I remember being on the Planning Committee when Strive came forward for their planning application and I want to use it in comparison to this. Because, like this, the facility was on green fields, agricultural fields but not very good agricultural, it was quite poor agricultural fields. It was right next to the bowling alley and the rugby club and it was across the road from the airport. It was not going to suddenly sit out of place in what was already quite a built-up area. What we are asking here - and this is why I struggle and I am glad the Constable of St. Martin has mentioned the sheds - which is this is about building a big site that I absolutely agree would be fantastic for cricket and fantastic for the school nearby and Islanders. But we are asking to use what is very good agricultural land in a really rural area to put a big sporting facility right bang in the middle of it. Where Strive, when they came with their planning application, they came to rezone the land during a planning application and they came with the support like this one has with the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture and Jersey Sport. They had also engaged with Education to make an agreement that the facilities once made would be used for young Islanders in their education and they were opening it up and making a fixed arrangement with Education so that their facility will be used free of charge by the Education Department so schools could go there and use the top-class facilities. This is where I have a problem with this one, we are coming together in a bridging Island Plan to rezone this land and we are not seeing the whole picture. As the Constable of St. Martin has said as well is: where are the discussions? We cannot see everything that is happening here. What will it look like? Who will it support? If this site wanted to be rezoned it should come with a full business case and we should know, like they did for the Strive building, in advance what all of those arrangements are and that they have been had or they are signed, so that we could understand what the loss of what this prime agriculture in a really rural area would do for the Island and what it looks like. The sheds, I think that is a great idea from the Constable, where it sits back further out of the way in a place that has already got buildings on, rather than putting it here.

[16:15]

For that I cannot support this as an Island Plan amendment. I would like to see what the plans look like in a planning situation but I think this is the wrong place to make this decision by the Assembly because we just do not have the level of detail that we want. As much as it would be good for cricket, as much as it would be good for sport, is it the right spot? That has not been proven that this is absolutely the right spot and that all the right outcomes will be there. For that reason I cannot support turning this green field into a sports centre in this way that it is being done. There is a facility to get that to happen but it needs to be with more information.

6.1.5 Deputy R. Labey:

Yes, I remember the planning application for the Strive gym very well. I went to visit it the other day, I went for breakfast, not to go to the gym. They do a very good full English; I must tell the Minister for the Environment, he should visit. I was met by the proprietor and he said: "Russell, I have been trying to get hold of you, I need to talk to you. I want to take you round" and so I went on the tour. He reminded me that it was me who turned a corner for him in that application because it was recommended for refusal by the department and they did not like the business case, thought it was too ambitious. There was a kind of build it and they will come kind of business plan and they did not reckon people would come and the various other planning considerations. There were a lot of glum faces around and I remember saying: "I like it." This land it was standing on is not great land, it is some of the worst in terms of productivity, agricultural productivity, because it is not long before you hit bedrock. He spelt out in the plans that the Minister for Children and Education was talking about for schools, and that is happening. It is a bit like the 13th juror in "12 Angry Men", gradually the other members of the committee, I remember the next person who said: "Yes, I like it too" was the late Deputy Richard Rondel, and so on and so forth, and eventually the committee went with this scheme, and it was built and, of course, they did come. The Lions came twice. It is frustrating to make this speech at the moment because I know that a lot of Members will not know what the next plans are for the development, and it is not my place in this forum now to divulge those because that is up to the Strive people to make those announcements when they want to. But it is very exciting. I really hope that people are going to get behind them because they have proved that it can be done, it is all private money; ambitious plan but it is working and look who they are attracting. With their plans, they are very certain that they will attract more premiership, not only rugby clubs but football clubs too, with the kind of hybrid pitch and facilities that they want to put in there, and all sorts of other goodies. That is tremendous good news and I wish them all the best for their future. If other Members want to pop up and have a look at it and take the tour and understand what the plans are for the future, the proprietor will be only too happy to show them around. You can make an appointment or just pop up and see him. That is just such good news for Jersey. The next phase is very ambitious but let us try to be positive about it because I do think we tend to be very sceptical and it is not going to happen here, but it can happen. They are proving it can happen. It is such good news, which brings me on to this amendment. I have to say we are veering here into the territory of planning application again. I have watched the Farmers' Field grow, I enjoy the tweets about it, and I like cricket too. But my question to the proposer here is: does the indoor facility have to be next door to the pitch itself? Is not the natural home for an indoor facility for the cricket in the new St. Peter's sports hub to come, if all goes well? I wonder if he could address that in his summing up.

6.1.6 Connétable A. Jehan of St. John:

I believe that centres of excellence for sport should be encouraged. Cricket in Jersey and Farmers Cricket Club have done extremely well in supporting both youngsters and promoting the Island on an international stage. Only in recent weeks we saw them representing the Island in Spain. They are doing a great job, cricket, in involving women in sport, and I think that is to be applauded. We should also be applauding the owners for looking to invest but also for the high standards they have demonstrated in their current facility as we have heard their current facility is already used for international matches, and I have no doubt that if they are successful then this will also be held to a

high standard. Sports facilities, in my experience, which is quite extensive - not playing but managing - can be sold time and time again at the key times every day of the week. The challenge for sports facilities is throughout the day and therefore you need to find revenue to make that work. I am involved in 2 sports facilities; one has 28 different user groups. It provides facilities for all of those groups but none of them are excellent. It is about providing something for them. We are talking about something which is built for purpose. A sporting centre of excellence. Using the shed, the idea is applaudable but the reality is, again in my experience when I have looked at that with other sporting areas, it is not realistic. If you are trying to provide a general facility it may be feasible but to provide a centre of excellence you do need to start from a blank sheet of paper. Today is about the rezoning, it is not a detailed application, and I would ask the Deputy to give us some assurance about community use of the facility, should it be rezoned. But overall, I believe that we should get behind this. We have heard about the benefits of sports tourism and I believe this is another string to our bow, and I wish them every success.

6.1.7 Senator S.W. Pallett:

A lot has been said about this is not the application but a lot has been said about Strive. Strive was a long story and I am afraid some people have some very short memories, and I am not going to spend too long on Strive because that is not this application. But this is something that the proprietor will not say but I am going to say. The hoops and hurdles that gentleman had to jump over to get his centre through to the success it is now is totally unbelievable. I watched it almost on a day by day, week by week, and his patience with Government, his patience with the planning system, his vision and his drive is second to none. Had it not been for that we would not have Strive and we would not be talking about the Lions coming here and premiership football clubs. But he stuck at it and we should be applauding him for that because, to be honest, there were times I thought he would throw the towel in because he got sick to death of some of the things he is being asked to do, and I am not going to mention them because we are through that now. But somebody has mentioned if you build it people will come. That is exactly what has happened. What St. Peter's is, is the home of rugby. In my opinion, and I am not universally thanked for this, I also think it could be the home for football. Not everybody agrees with me but nevertheless it could be. What it is not going to be is the home of cricket. That is not where cricket has ever been based and it will not be a cricket centre. I am going to support this because it is a rezoning of the land for sport and for cricket, and it is clear from the proposition what they would like to do on it. Again, I am going to repeat myself from before, it is not a planning application. This is about rezoning. But there are some things I would like to see done before a planning application is ... I am going to support this because I think it is right to rezone it, but I think there are a couple of things that need to happen before it gets to the point of a planning application. Government is in the process of investing into Jersey Cricket at Grainville, and make the home of Jersey Cricket Grainville. That is absolutely the right thing to do. We do need more than one cricket centre in the Island, the sport is on an up and up. Women's cricket is becoming increasingly popular and there is a need for better facilities for cricket. The level they are playing at, frankly considering the size of the Island population we have, is absolutely incredible and long may that continue. But I think there does need to be some discussion between Farmers and Jersey Cricket about what centre offers what, and if it is to be an indoor centre at St. Martin's - and I am not saying that is a good or bad thing - then I think that support when it comes to planning application, it was mentioned about Strive, it needs to be with the support of Jersey Cricket, it needs to be with the support of Jersey Sport, it needs to be with the support of the Minister for Sport, whoever that might be at the time, and hopefully with the support of the majority of States Members. But they need to get their ducks in line and they need to be clear about what they are offering and what they are intending to do. It needs to be joined-up thinking. This is the first step. I would urge Members to support this because it is a rezoning of the site. It is not the planning application. There is plenty of opportunity when they put the planning application in to put all the sorts of questions that were put to Strive at the planning application meeting. The right questions, I mean people are always right to

be dubious about people making promises and being able to deliver them, but we have to have faith in people that are prepared to put their vision on the line, put their money on the line because it is private investment, as it was at Strive, and we have to have the confidence to back them. We are going to have to do it more and more moving forward around sport. I mentioned it before, some of the plans for the rugby club site and for Strive moving forward, I think would make this Island a centre of sporting excellence, there is nothing the like of in the U.K., and we have to grab that as quick as we can and support the proprietor in his dreams. There are benefits not just to sport, there are benefits to the Island more generally of what he will, at some point, bring forward. But just specifically on this, we need to support this because it is the right thing to do now. He may come with a planning application at some point that is just not acceptable and we will deal with that when we get to that point. But this is about rezoning that land for cricket into sport, and I am not going to go into all the benefits of sport; that has been well put together within the amendment. But I do urge Members to support it and give the owner of Farmers Cricket Club the support that he is looking for and, frankly, he deserves for putting his neck on the line at times and putting his own money and investment into sport. Much of what he has done has got cricket in Jersey to where it is now. I thank him for that and we should all thank him for that.

6.1.8 Deputy H.C. Raymond of Trinity:

It gives me great pleasure to follow the Senators and Deputies that have just spoken. It is so important that we get things in order. I have had great lengths of talk with the owner of the field. The one thing I did not know about, because I have not been in the States that long, was how the Farmers' Field came about many years ago and how it worked. What the owner is trying to do now is to bring everything together. I have said particularly, just to satisfy the Constable of St. Martin, that he must indulge himself in speaking to all the people concerned and what benefits will come back.

[16:30]

But that becomes the planning implication. But from my perspective, and can I just say on behalf of Education, Sport and Culture and the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture, we are very much appreciative of what the owner of the Farmers' Field is trying to do. Comments have been made about youth and everything else and the one thing I will also say, it is a great opportunity talking about housing, education and health; very important factors. But sport is becoming an important factor as well in the sense that it keeps people off the street and they provide so much of our facilities we must look at. The other thing is that we had the great dilemma, because I sit on the Fort Regent board, with regards to where sport was going to go and where we put them. We have started that at Springfield and we are hoping to carry that on. There is no doubt that we would love to see this happen at the Farmers' Field. The thing about providing indoor facilities at Fort Regent, even with cricket, was difficult and the suggestion of going almost into town is not viable. I think that this application should be supported. It was very well put over by the Deputy of St. Martin and I think, as I said, followed through by so many other people. I am just slightly concerned with some of the comments that were made by Deputy Wickenden, where I am not quite sure whether he has got the gist of the whole implication with regards to Strive and everything else. But then, as the previous speaker just said, I do not think we should go down that route at the present time because what we are talking about, removing and rezoning this for sporting facilities. I put my whole heart and soul behind it. The other thing is that I think sometimes people do tend to forget that if people are going to put money into something and it does not involve the States involvement in financial implications then I think that we have to look at it more often. I think in this particular case it is next door to the Farmers' Field where there is a cricket pitch, and the facilities there, as rightly said, are almost world class. So, it is very important that, as far as I am concerned, from the sporting aspect, and me in charge of sport for the present time until obviously elections or whatever happens, I can only endorse the previous Minister for Sport who was totally behind the application. Can I just leave with you the thought that I think it still has to go to a planning application, as was

said, but I think that this is an ideal situation where rezoning can be considered and should be looked at. I will insist almost that everything that is required of by the individual or by the Constable in St. Martin will be adhered to and what benefits they feel will benefit this side of Island. Can I please ask you to just consider your views and consider voting for this application because Education, Sport and Culture will certainly support it?

6.1.9 Deputy K.F. Morel:

I am pleased we heard from the Minister for Sport, although I would have preferred him to have been the person to speak after me because I had a question which I was hoping he would answer. That really was Senator Pallett raised it, which was a duplication. I am concerned because there is activity going on at Grainville, with a view to creating better cricket facilities at Grainville, and I completely agree with sport, the good it does. I think in his opening speech the Deputy of St. Martin was absolutely right to talk about, and I believe this was the case in the 1980s and 1990s, et cetera, if you believe you cannot get there, if you believe you cannot be world-class, if you do not have that dream when you are 8, 9 years old then you will not be. In the 1980s and 1990s, when I was growing up, it was just: "You are from Jersey, you are not going to be world class when it comes to sport" and the same ... I am trying to get that through the arts and culture strategy as well, that we can be, as far as our human talent is concerned, as fantastic as any other jurisdiction. But I am concerned about duplication because we are only 100,000 people and I find it hard to believe that we would need one centre of excellence for cricket in St. Martin and another centre of excellence for cricket almost due south in St. Saviour. One is almost certainly enough for the Island, I am sure. Speaking as it were something of a planning application, there is an issue there for traffic because we have been talking about this as a cricket facility but the report in the proposition clearly also states about other sporting facilities, such as gymnasium and other health and well-being activities. That is going to be, and the Connétable of St. Martin needs to think about that, quite an increase in traffic in that particular part of the Island. I do not know how much that has been taken into account and of course the planning application should deal with that. Talking now about Strive and planning applications, I saw Mr. Harvey probably last month, had a really good tour, and everything that Senator Pallett and others have said about Strive is absolutely correct. It is a superb facility. But me being me, and never one to miss the opportunity to be direct with someone, if I can, I did point out that it was one of the ugliest buildings in Jersey and when you fly into the airport, and this is what really ... I came back in August from a week away from the Island and I flew in, I was kind of: "What is that incredibly ugly building down there?" as I am coming into land. "Oh, it is Strive." So I did mention that to Mr. Harvey and did say ...

The Deputy Bailiff:

Deputy Morel, other Members have been very careful not to name the person you have just named twice. Bearing in mind Standing Order 104, it is not necessary to name him.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

I am not the first person to name him in this particular thing, that is why I named him; somebody else did previously.

The Deputy Bailiff:

You are the first person I have been conscious of, other Members have been very careful.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

Senator Pallett mentioned him and that was the only reason. Senator Pallett had mentioned the name, that was why. Anyway, the Strive facility, sports halls are not attractive facilities from the outside, we have this next to Hautlieu. I am trying to think what the name of the field is where the planning application for the sports facility at Hautlieu got knocked back first of all before being accepted, and so when it comes to the design of this sports facility, and given that this will be in a very rural area,

I think there is going to have to be some very careful thinking about the way it looks. While we talking about Strive, it also makes me think about Jersey Bowl, which is obviously just next door effectively. That, as a sporting facility, was built probably in the 1990s some time, and it was obviously clad in granite and so on. It obviously is a leisure facility in many different ways but it was made to try and fit in with that, at the time, slightly more rural element of the Island. Next door Strive has not gone down that route and unfortunately from an architectural perspective I do not think it adds anything to the area. In this area, a facility of this nature would need to be properly considered in terms of design. It must not and should not be 4 walls and a roof painted white, and in the countryside. I do say all those things because ... I believe I will be supporting this but it is with that sense that the planning application that follows will need to be properly scrutinised and not just accepted because we want the sporting facility. It is a sporting facility which needs to fit into the area and it is a sporting facility which will have to think about sustainable transport. If this is a gym that is operating day-in day-out then a large increase in traffic in St. Martin will occur. There is no wonderful sustainable transport solution for bringing people from all over the Island to St. Martin. That is the sort of thing that is going to have to be thought about as well. I do commend the Deputy of St. Martin for ... he talked about vision, and I commend him for that because I think he is absolutely right, it was when he spoke about 8 or 9 year-olds believing they can play for Liverpool. I think that was the line that sold me on this. But it made me realise, yes, you do have to make people think in Jersey that they can achieve the best themselves. Unless I hear otherwise from somebody else I think I almost certainly will be supporting this.

6.1.10 Deputy J.H. Young:

I held back because I thought it was important to let those who are strongly supportive of the community and make the case. My job here is to assist the Assembly, make decisions on how we allocate scarce land and make sure that the uses we allocate it for is in the right place. I think those tests are vital and so looking at the proposition here we are talking about a field, which is an agricultural field, which is 5.5 vergées. We could have been discussing this for 35 houses. That is a scale of what we are looking at here; 35 homes. We have here a proposal, which obviously the activities that were approved in 2003 when former Senator Perchard succeeded in gaining application for turning agricultural land into a cricket pitch, he did so, and that has been the case and they have been very successful. Of course now, one of the features of such successes is they start off small and they grow. Of course I noticed that all the debate has been about a cricket centre. But of course, when we read the proposition, it is an indoor cricket and sports centre with associated health and fitness facilities. Those advocates have drawn comparisons with Jersey Strive, which is a huge facility. Are we really being asked to put a facility that size slap bang in the middle of the countryside where there is road congestion getting to it from Five Oaks? Are we really going to have large-scale - because this is what this is about, policy CI5 - sporting facilities in a location such as that? Are we really going to do that? Would it not be right that we think, well, where else are we going to have sports facilities on the Island? We do not just have what I added earlier, because in my earlier amendment, the one we approved, I did not come forward and say we are going to zone these fields at St. Peter for a Strive mark 2. I said we need to have a plan for seeing how the sports needs may be met in this area. Leaving the way open for a whole process of sports strategy work, working with the owners and eventually a planning application. Here, I think Deputy Labey is right and Deputy Wickenden is right. We are in, effectively, a planning application. Just remind ourselves of the debate we had earlier. The proposition is brought to make it easier for the planning application to go through. Easier. Now Senator Pallett said all the hoops that they had to go through over St. Peter, all the procedures, it drove him mad, *et cetera*, all the tasks he was asked to do, the evidence. It is not right that where we give up agricultural land, and we give up other possibilities for such a use, we go through those hoops. That is what the planning system does. I am getting shaking of heads. I disagree, Senator. Because the planning system can enable, on exceptional basis, as the Planning Committee did in that case, and they went through the evidence. You have heard from the chairman

at the time and the process they went through. They were uneasy about it. But these things are, in the end, a planning balance. That was after a number of stages had gone through. Here now we are saying: “No, we are going to earmark this in the plan, we are going to put it in as a large-scale centre alongside Les Quennevais, alongside Le Rocquier, alongside FB Fields, alongside Springfield.” We are going to give it that status because all those places have got good traffic connections. All those places are, I think, more sustainable. This is a rural area. This is an area, I think it is pretty well the only one that I absolutely broke company with what the Planning Inspector said.

[16:45]

The proposition lists the final comments of the Inspectors, which says there were 2 reasons why they thought. Firstly, because it is next door to the cricket centre and supported by the International Cricket Council. I do not know whether the inspectors are cricket fans; I do not know. They may be, I make no comment. But that is what links the first. The second I can understand. “The alternative arrangements for indoor sporting facilities at Fort Regent are not ideal.” Well, I do not know what we are doing at Fort Regent and I wish I knew where things are going but, my word, we do need to provide decent facilities. I thought our sports strategy was to develop at Le Rocquier, for example. I thought we were going to put sports facilities for the community, which is on main roads, close to urban areas, much more sustainable. I thought that was the plan. Also I learnt in this debate - I have to say I did not know - we are going to do things at Grainville for the cricket. Of course, Grainville is in an urban location, there are traffic issues there, but I think there are less traffic issues there than potentially in the middle of this location, in the middle of the countryside. The inspector overrode those comments. They said I was right but because it was next to the cricket pitch and because Fort Regent was so poor, that is why they had to do it. The other thing I noticed, Senator Pallett told us that Strive to come, which is as it were a vision, will not include cricket. Where does that come from? I thought that was the whole point of having a centre.

Senator S.W. Pallett:

Could I ask for clarification?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, you can.

Senator S.W. Pallett:

Two things, I did not actually say that. What I said is I did not expect it to be a centre for cricket, I said it could be a centre for rugby and football. I suggested it. It is not for me to make that decision. The Minister would agree with that. The other one was, he also said that I said: “Jumping through hoops and over hurdles in regards to planning.” I did not say that. I said had to jump through hoops and hurdles. I never mentioned planning. I hope the Minister will agree that I would accept that he had to jump through hurdles from planning, but that is not the hurdles I was talking about.

Deputy J.H. Young:

On the first point, sorry, I apologise to the Senator, he was absolutely right. I did not mean to misrepresent his words. I have written down on the planning side he was sick to death. I have written those words down ...

Senator S.W. Pallett:

Not on the planning side; it was other issues.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Okay. My point was is that going through the planning process and making your case and defining your scheme and proving the need where there are exceptional policies, where you can have something as long as you do this; that is part of the planning system. Here we have one that has come

in which almost has a jump in that process. That was the point I was going to make. I thought we had a sports strategy. That is where I have a difficulty here, because I am not plugged into all these bodies. Deputy of Trinity, he is on all these bodies, but I do not know what their plan is. I would have hoped we would have got a clearer strategy coming through into the bridging Island Plan, but nonetheless we have a series of centres for development of sport, which is right, we need to do that. We have a possibility of an expansion out west and we have those States centres on the east. If they are not good enough and they prove not good enough in the bridging Island Plan then it can be changed, exceptional cases can be made. The planning system can do that. I do question whether it is right to go this mile now. It is a bridging Island Plan for a smaller number of years. Our current policy is to try and locate those large-scale sports and leisure facilities within primary and secondary urban centres. If that was small scale, I would be less critical. However, this is clearly large scale, because that is what the proposition being brought is. This is a rural location and I am not able to support this. I am sorry to be a party pooper, but there we are. It is my job to advise Members and put Members on caution. Just remember the zoning debate and the pain we have gone through with all those housing sites where in the case of housing we absolutely know there is a proven need; the pain we have gone through. When we are asked to make decisions on other uses where we do not have the evidence of proven needs, I put Members on caution whether they should vote for this. I do not consider that this case is proven.

Senator S.W. Pallett:

Can I ask for another point of clarification, it is a minor one?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes.

Senator S.W. Pallett:

The Minister said he did not know about sports strategy, or words to that effect. Would the Minister agree that his officers have been briefed on the sports strategy and the Minister should be aware of the sports strategy?

Deputy J.H. Young:

Yes, apologies. I meant me personally, I suppose. When you are Minister for the Environment you are completely overloaded with work and you tend to allow people to get on with their business area. What I have here is: “The Active Places strategy and the plan makes provision for this in CI5 through the inclusion of land at Le Rocquier School.” That is what it says. Probably I did say that. There is the plan and that is what it says. I question: do we need something else that is not in the plan?

6.1.11 Deputy M. Tadier:

I have been going through some thoughts on this. The first thing I thought of is that we all know the story of creation and that God made the world in 6 days and he made different things on each day. I do not propose to recount what they were, but obviously one of them was the separation of light and darkness and then the fishes and the sea. Quite wisely on the 7th day he rested. We are now in the 7th day of the Island Plan and we have not rested. We are getting into a territory where late on the 7th day we are risking making some dubious decisions, albeit for well-intentioned reasons. Let me talk us through why I think that. What some Members are trying to do is fight a proxy cause. They are identifying what has often happened in the past and saying: “Look, I am in favour of sport ...” I do not mind admitting a bit of banter, because I do not mind receiving it. I prefer to give it, of course, which is the same on the sports field, although I have not been on one for quite a while. When I did hear Deputy Ash saying that he loved his sport, I shouted out: “Mate, you love watching sport”, like I do as well. I am sure he does like participating as well. Members are standing up saying: “I support sport and I love cricket, therefore, I am supporting this Government proposal, because I want to show my support for cricket.” In the same way that I might want to do that instinctively for certain key

areas that I like to support. If there was a proposal on the table for somebody who wanted to build an art gallery in their field or if they wanted to open up some kind of arthouse cinema in an appropriate location, but where they would probably struggle to get planning permission, I might be initially supportive if I thought: "Yes, I love arthouse theatres. I love galleries. I would love it if there was an exclusive gallery." As long as I could go to it, I do not really mind if anyone else could go to it. If it showed contemporary modern art, I would be there quite a lot and I would encourage people to go there. It does not mean that the correct process is to bring an amendment to this Assembly and ask the Assembly to make that decision. I have had an epiphany moment, albeit on a day where I should be resting. The penny has finally dropped for me as to why these kinds of amendments make me uneasy. It is because normally it is the Assembly or the Minister in an Island Plan every 10 years, or in this case a bridging Island Plan which will last for 3 years, we effectively are telling people what they can and cannot do with their land. We are saying to you: you have this field here. You can build housing on it, but it has to be affordable. Sometimes we do it much more generally than that and it is less problematic, because we do it in zones. We say: "If you live in this particular zone, it might be the north of St. Helier, it might be the greenbelt, for want of a better word or a coastal national park, you can do this and you cannot do that." You have to abide by that. You might like it. You might not like it. It might benefit some people. It might disadvantage others. Those will all be proportional measures that we put in place, which we think are in the public interest for whatever particular legitimate outcome. It could be to preserve the character of an area. It could be to provide much-needed homes. What we have in this scenario is we have somebody who is a private individual, who no doubt provides a great service and some of us have even played on this cricket field, because he was a former States Member. In the good old days when we used to have the States Members cricket match and we could muster a team and, more importantly, Guernsey could muster a team. We would normally beat them, of course, but either way we would have a great day out. Sometimes we would play at the Cricketers and sometimes we would play in Guernsey. I do appreciate the support that that individual and the cricketers give to the sport and provides a facility for the Island. However, it comes back to the point, we have an individual who says: "I want to do this with a particular field." He then finds a willing States Member, as is his right, and other members of the public can do that. Then that States Member will say to the Assembly: "We all should tell this person what they should put on their land." We have this contrived situation where we say: "You know what, if I can get everybody to agree, let us tell that person that he has to build a sports facility in that field over there." Then, of course, what happens is he is like: "Oh, go on then, if you really insist. I suppose I better do it, seeing as you have told me to do it." Then, of course, he puts in a planning application. The Planning Committee has to, effectively, pass that unless it is an outlandish plan, because it is a rezoned field. I would ask the question: is that the right process? It does not seem to me to be any different to the argument that was just made over the nursing home going on the Rue de Huquet, in the same Parish in fact. It is not a case of: do you support nursing homes or do you not? Do you support the elderly or do you not? Do you support increasing better care facilities in the Island or do you not? It is about no, you put the planning application in and if there is a need for it on this green field we will pass it. There is a risk, for anyone listening outside, that they will listen to this debate and think it is okay to have due process in certain circumstances. I have listened to the nuanced arguments. People in the previous debate who were saying: "No we cannot possibly pass this field for a care home, because it has to go through the right process" are now saying: "Well, it is getting quite late. The groundswell of opinion is that we need to be getting behind sport." I personally do not have a problem with encouraging sport on the Island. However, I do not know particularly what kind of facility this is going to be. I do not know what the people of St. Martin think. Certainly, if I were in St. Martin, and if I was in a political position, I would want to be asking the Parish what they thought. I would want there to be a Parish Assembly. I would want a planning application to be put in on this. I would also ask: what if it was an amendment to put something else on the field? If we were asking to put affordable homes on this particular field, would we be saying, yes, absolutely, let us do that? What I would say is that we cannot simply be saying: "Yes, I support

sport. Yes, I like cricket. Therefore, let us get behind this.” We need to go through the absolute correct channels and process to make sure the decisions that we make are consistent and that we are not seen to be getting behind causes or indeed laudable causes. I will leave it at that. It is important that the process, like the Minister said ... we cannot simply think because this is a good, well-established cricket ground in the area by somebody who has proven himself to be a strong supporter, that we automatically therefore say: “There you go, there is planning permission.” I would say that the process, as frustrating as it might have been for Senator Pallet to have gone through that with Strive and others who have sought to support that, it was the correct process nonetheless. Strive is there. We have a rugby club and we have a Strive next to it. As I see it, they are not inherently linked. I do not see Strive as providing a direct rugby service any more than I would expect whatever happens to that field to be a cricket facility. It would be strange if it was not in some ways.

[17:00]

Does that mean that every field we have, every football club, St. Peter’s football club, what if they wanted to put an application in to develop a field next to it for a centre of excellence for football? It does not seem to make sense that we should be making those decisions outside of a wider sports strategy. For good reason, we should be voting against this to set a good example and process. That does not by any means suggest that we are against sport.

6.1.12 Senator L.J. Farnham:

Since I put my light on, Senator Pallet and Deputy of Trinity have spoken and have presented pretty well the arguments I was going to talk about. I will not repeat them. I am a bit stumped at a bit of Deputy Tadier’s comments, but bowled over with the original amendment. I thought: “How’s that?” when I looked at the details. I want to make sure we keep the debate within the boundary. We do not want to get caught out by any silly point. I will probably leave it at that. I am supportive. Just going back to the serious point of the rezoning, it is a bit like when we look at the overall budget. Health is extremely important, but we do not put all of our funding into health. Housing is the key challenge, we do not have to think if we are not putting housing on a particular site we cannot put anything else on it. The development of sport is extremely important. We have seen that where we do invest in facilities we tend to see standards rise and lots of opportunities appear in Jersey. Jersey punches above its weight and competes on the international stage. Cricket is a good case in point. I am very minded to support this, not just in my capacity as a Minister with responsibility for sport, but as an Islander who wants to see Jersey continue to succeed in most sporting activities. I am minded to support it, thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Senator. Your point of clarification, Deputy Higgins, was that of Senator Farnham? It probably was not, was it?

Deputy M.R. Higgins:

It was, Sir. Unfortunately, the question I have to ask is the Constable of St. Martin and some others asked a number of questions earlier, which he wanted Senator Farnham to answer. None of them have been answered. Unfortunately, I cannot find my notes at the moment to clarify what they are. I am hoping that the Constable of St. Martin will seek a point of clarification on her points.

The Deputy Bailiff:

That is not a point of clarification.

Senator L.J. Farnham:

If it was not a point of clarification, I understand the Deputy of Trinity answered those points in relation to having discussed the matter with the proprietor of the field and having it discussed at the

department, which I thought was the Constable's question, which is why I did not raise it, because I understood the Deputy of Trinity addressed those questions.

6.1.13 Deputy G.P. Southern:

This puts into context what my colleague Deputy Tadier has just said. We are in the zone now where we risk making some terrible decisions, because we just need to stop. We have done not 7, but we are towards the end of the 8th day. At its basics, we can sum it up by saying it is not a question of how much you love cricket. It is not a measure of how much you love sport. The question is one of adjacency. We have heard that one of the reasons is that this facility will be put next to the cricket field. May I remind Members that it would also be next to a big shed. The way forward is really get the big shed realigned and then perhaps come back to the States and ask to put in the facility. We already have a shed there, change of use, very simple.

6.1.14 Deputy G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade:

It has been an interesting debate. I too sat on the original Strive application to the Planning Committee and I was one of the, or the only, Member who voted against the original Strive building. For me, it was built in the green zone, which I was against. The visual impact that this particular building would have had, one, for people landing in Jersey would see this rather large industrial looking building to the left or right, whichever way you were coming in. The impact in the green zone was too much for me. Obviously, the other Members thought otherwise and voted accordingly. I have to say, I was fully supportive of the applicant. The intention was totally laudable. I remember commending him for bringing it forward. It was great to have individuals wanting to invest so heavily in sport in the Island. The provision of what has been put there has paid dividends. We have put our profile up in the sporting world. I did also at the time criticise the fact, for me, that there seemed to be little co-ordinated joined-up thinking as part of the sports strategy. The former Constable of St. Brelade, Senator Pallet now, did come to that meeting and put a very good case forward. He was struggling to make headwind against, it seemed at the time, opposition of that Council of Ministers. Me, I felt that there was not a policy in place. I felt there was no joined-up thinking of a sports strategy. There has been talk for absolutely years of a national stadium locally. We ended up with Springfield and a poor imitation of one, sadly. When it comes to this particular amendment, I have concerns. If we are to vote this through this afternoon, it is a case of jump the first significant hurdle. The original Strive one had a big hurdle to jump, which was policy NE7. To let Members know, policy NE7 sets a presumption, not an absolute moratorium, against development in the green zone. A case can be made and then it is down to the balanced judgment of the committee to vote the way they feel has been justified. I have got reservations about this going forward. I look forward to the Deputy summing up. I am comforted to a degree that this will ... I will not, plainly, make any prejudgments about how when it does come to the Planning Committee how it will go. It will have a significant amount of hurdles to jump to get to the next stage; that I am comforted by.

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

I would like to say a few words to this amendment. I note Appendix 1 lists the international cricket teams that have played at the Farmers' Field. I would like to make a declaration that I too have played at the Farmers' Field. **[Approbation]** As I look around the Chamber, I see Deputy Southern, who I know has also played cricket on that hallowed ground; maybe Senator Pallet as well, because we played for the States of Jersey many years ago when we used to play against the States of Guernsey. Probably we may have won that competition when we played at the Farmers' Field. As I say, it was some years ago and I have not visited it since then, but my recollection of my game there ... I was put on the boundary, because I was not a very good player. I was almost out of sight. I have heard that we are encouraging women to play cricket, so maybe I should try and get back into it again. My recollection of the field is it was great; it was a cricket pitch. The only building that I remember on what is, of course, a very big site, was the pavilion, where we enjoyed a breakfast when

we arrived and we enjoyed a good lunch during the lunch break. It was very green. It was not really built upon, other than the cricket pavilion. However, what we are being asked to agree today by the Deputy of St. Martin is in principle to rezone field MN727 to allow a future application to the Planning Committee to build an indoor cricket facility and other associated sporting facilities on that site. What we have heard from the Minister for the Environment is that this is a 5 vergées field. Vergée is the proper measurement that we should be referring to in the States Chamber. It is 5 vergées and is so large that, in fact, if an application went in to put housing on it, we have heard from the Minister that it would probably comfortably accommodate 35 homes. It comes down to me to make a decision on this; it is for the balance, again. We heard a very good speech from the Minister explaining his reasons for not supporting this, reasons which were not recognised by the inspectors when they deliberated on this. They thought that the sports strategy that we have signed up to should override the loss of agricultural land, should override the impact that a building would inevitably have on the countryside, were this in-principle rezoning to be approved and then a planning application approved at a later date. Of course, if we rezone this, what we are effectively saying is that at some time in the future the developer, the applicant, will, without a doubt, get that building on that field. There will be a presumption that because the land has been rezoned they will have to go through planning procedure, they will have to adhere to planning policies, but something will be built there. What we do not know at the moment is the size of what will be proposed to be built there. Is it one building? Will it be more? We just do not know. The problem is, to me, we will lose that field. We will be encouraging far more vehicles using the country lanes to get to it. It is the wrong place, in my very humble opinion. I spoke against developing L127, because it was the wrong place to put a housing estate. I believe that MN727 is the wrong place to put this rather massive sports facility. It would impact upon the character of the countryside and it would be completely out of place. I would urge Members to think very carefully about what we are being asked to do here. We are being asked to rezone. As far as I am concerned, notwithstanding my performance on the cricket field many years ago, which is not very memorable because I do not see Deputy Southern shaking his head and saying: “Constable, you did really well many years ago” because obviously I did not, if I cannot support building much needed homes on agricultural land smack bang in the middle of our green zone in the countryside, I regret that I cannot support rezoning to provide this sporting facility.

6.1.16 Deputy M.R. Higgins:

I will be brief, because the Constable of St. Lawrence has made a lot of excellent points, as has the Minister for the Environment, Deputy Tadier, and Deputy Labey. There are so many things against this. I do not like the idea that we are essentially, for the first stage, getting planning permission for this particular thing without knowing what is going to take place.

[17:15]

Secondly, we are told that the Federation of International Cricketers’ Association supports this, but we are also told that there is another plan for a cricketing centre at Grainville. Do they support that? We have no knowledge at all. I think we should not be using the Island Plan as a means of getting planning permission for private schemes.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy. Does any other Member wish to speak? If not, I call on the Deputy of St. Martin to reply.

6.1.17 The Deputy of St. Martin:

It has been a considerably longer debate than I expected, but I am very grateful to all States Members for taking part. I am not sure if we will get anything more done this evening, but I certainly have time to sum up in any case. I will just run through the contributors, if I may, as quickly as possible. Deputy Pamplin, I thank him for a great story to promote the Island when he spoke about access for

all. My Constable made a good speech and I am grateful to her for making that. She and I obviously confer greatly on Parish matters and she is right, this has been very difficult to take a balanced view and to hear both sides. It has been a mighty difficult decision for those of us who represent St. Martin, because this is a rural area, this is agricultural land and we do not know yet exactly how this land is going to be used. I have to say to her, I have not spoken to the teachers at the school. Yes, it is clear that it is close to St. Martin's school for access. I have not spoken to others who might use this facility. I am clear that if this moves forward from today that there will be, and I have told the applicant this already, planning obligation agreements, there will be conditions, there will be a whole string of hoops that will have to be jumped through. There will also be, and I will come to it again in the future, some sort of obligation to allow public access to allow education to use the facility. I have told the person that already. I have used the example of Strive. I am under no illusions that this is not straightforward. Deputy Ash loves sport. He supports the wrong football team. He says we aim at the top, provide the facility and allow dreams to happen. I agree. I will come back to that at the end. Deputy Wickenden said the site was better at Strive. He quoted back again the agricultural land in a rural area. He spoke about school access. He raised the subject, which was then brought up by many others, about this is really a planning application. I can agree and disagree. Where are people to start? They either start here or they start outside of the Island. We are put here, when I come to Deputy Tadier, to make decisions. This has been put in front of us and we are being asked. However, Deputy Wickenden said we will have to have the detail on why here. The reason is in the planning inspector quote: "The site is the logical place for such a facility." Deputy Labey raised the issue of the Strive application. He told the story, and I am going to come back to that right at the end, of how Strive came to be. He said we need to be ambitious and positive. I completely agree. However, then he came back to the point that this is a planning application and should not be in front of us today. That is his opinion. He also said, and I want to refer to it, the indoor centre could be anywhere. He is absolutely right. You could build a shed. You could put an indoor cricket centre into any part of the Island. However, what you might not have alongside it are nets or outdoor facilities. It certainly would not be described as a centre, if all it provided was an indoor pitch. I thank the Constable of St. John for his encouragement and, yes, its community use and its sports truism. As I have said before, there will be certainly some serious conditions that will have to be put on to make sure that the community use comes forward. Senator Pallet, I thank him for his contribution. I agree, the determination shown by the person who has driven the Strive Centre forward at St. Peter is par excellence. I know the owner of the cricket pitch at the Farmers' Field is another one who feels absolutely passionate about his sport and has worked tirelessly day and night to get it to where it is. The Minister for Sport, Deputy Raymond, I thank him for his support. He again said it needs a planning application. I agree. The detail will come in the planning application. I can say that to Deputy Morel as well. He was another one concerned about duplication of Grainville. We need to be clear, Grainville is the home of Jersey Cricket. It always will be. However, we do have the opportunity to have an area of cricket excellence in St. Martin. Deputy Morel said the facility at St. Martin would have to look better than the one at St. Peter. I tend to agree. I would say to others who have raised the issue, if this application does come forward, and I refer to the Constable of St. Lawrence, this has an impact on the environment. There is a whole list of policies it is going to have to jump through. It is going to have to somehow camouflage itself. It is going to have to do all sorts of wonderful things. Then we come to the Minister, who spoke about 35 homes. I cannot disagree. This is an agricultural field and we have had some heart-searching over the last 8 days. What can I say? It could potentially have been a site for 35 homes. The Minister spoke about associated facilities. There will have to be some, because this is how the facility will have to be paid for. If Strive just allowed the public and education people to use it and did not charge, it would not be working. We need to accept, and I am not trying to hide the fact, if this is a centre of excellence there will have to be a certain level of commerciality about it in order to justify the expense in the first place. The evidence will have to come forward in the application. Yes, Minister, I could not agree with you more. There will be a lot of detail in the application and a lot of boxes to tick.

However, the planning inspector did say yes. I have to say to Members it was the owner of this site who took it to the planning inspector in public, not me, not a States Members, not the Constable of St. Martin. He went himself and spoke in the public about it and managed to gain the support of the inspector himself. The Minister mentioned that decent facilities are needed. He is quite right. He said: is it right to take the step now? Could we wait another 4 years? Maybe we could. I do not know. However, it is being put in front of us today and we will vote on it. Deputy Tadier did not start off well, because math is not his best subject today. He was talking about the 7th day. I know it has been a long 2 weeks, but it day 8. However, he made his point. He certainly did. He got our attention. He got my attention, because at least I can add up, 7 and 1 equals 8. There we are. Again, we came back to the point: this is what we are here for. Should we be having applications like this brought before the Assembly? We might disagree on that. This is a first step. I cannot disagree with him, if this goes through today it will make it easier for the next step on that tortuous process, but you have to start somewhere. Is this a contrived situation? I do not think so. I have spoken to the applicant about the possibility of this some time ago now. I was not aware he was taking it to the inspector in public. He did. He came back to me and on the basis of the support from the inspector I said I would put it in front of Members today. I have to say that I have not been to the Parish Assembly to ask for their agreement or their views. There is a process to be followed. I have to say to Members, if there is a lesson I have learned from this whole debate, if I am fortunate enough to be here in 4 years' time and we do this all again, I will be asking my Constable if we can do it very differently to the way we have done it this time. It is clear, and I am sure the Minister would agree, that there are better ways of proposing some of these housing sites. We will do things differently in the future. Senator Farnham, thank you for a very good, a very quick and a very amusing speech. After all, anybody who can find a case of putting a hospital on top of a hill must find it very easy to find a case for a field in the middle of the countryside. Deputy Southern said that we are in the zone of terrible decision-making. He might be right. When we get to day 8 it is starting to become very difficult to know which day of the week it is. We do need to be careful that we do not do something wrong at 5.25 p.m. on a Wednesday afternoon in week 2. He asked a question about the sheds. I have asked a question about the sheds myself. I am sure the agricultural sheds adjacent to the site are in joint ownership and they are not owned by the person who owns the cricket field. Deputy Truscott told us how he voted against Strive and saw little joined-up strategy for sport. He is concerned and has reservation for development in a green zone. Of course, he is quite right, an agreement today may take us a step closer, but there are still a lot of hurdles to get over to build a facility such as this in the green zone. The Constable of St. Lawrence told us about how she played cricket at Farmers' Field. I too have played there. She mentioned a good point, because she mentioned women's cricket. Women and girls' cricket is something that is on the fall at the moment and must be encouraged at all opportunities. She is quite right. There was and is only a pavilion on the site. It is the most wonderful of sites, for those of us who have been there. She is probably right to challenge. If you stand in the middle of the Farmers Cricket Field on a sunny afternoon and you look around, you see very little in the way of buildings, other than the pavilion, which fits in very well. We know there are some challenges of design. There are some challenges of impact. That is all going to have to be overcome if we move forward. Deputy Higgins said we do not know what is coming. He mentioned Grainville duplication and he is not going to support this. I take sympathy with his views. I go back to sum up. I would say I started this debate by saying that we needed to take, and I use the words here of the ex-Constable of St. Mary, who was on the planning panel that approved Strive, when she said, and her words have stuck in my mind ever since, she was taking a leap of faith when she pushed the P button for that application. I ask Members to take a bit of a leap of faith today. We know it is going to be a challenge. I mentioned to States Members dreams and the rights of youngsters to dream. I talk about people like Graeme Le Saux, who aspired and played for his country. People like Becky Herbert, who played hockey for her country. More recently, and we have mentioned netball and we have mentioned the hopes of netball at St. Peter, Serena Guthrie, who has come up from the ranks through our schools in Jersey. Serena has been described by many,

who know far better than me, as the best netball player in the world. She came from Jersey. Because of the facilities, training and help she has had, young girls in Jersey can now aspire to be like her. There are others coming behind her. This is an application which is not everybody's cup of tea, but it is a vision for the future. It does help the Island, so others can look upon us as a centre of sporting excellence. I ask Members to take that leap of faith taken by the ex-Constable of St. Mary so long ago, along with the Planning Committee, about Strive. I ask for the appel.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you. Deputy, there is a request for clarification from the Deputy of Trinity. Would you accept that request?

The Deputy of St. Martin:

Absolutely, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Deputy of Trinity, do you want to make your request for clarification? We will move to the *appel*.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

It was just to clarify something from my own speech. It was an apology. It may not have been Senator Pallet who mentioned the name first. I have been thinking about it since. We talked about the name and I was in breach of Standing Orders and I mentioned Senator Pallet. I do not think it was him. I think it was a voice from the ether, Sir, rather than someone in the Chamber.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy. If Members are content we will move to the *appel*. 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.

[17:30]

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 rejected.

POUR: 18		CONTRE: 27		ABSTAIN: 1
Senator I.J. Gorst		Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré		Connétable of St. Martin
Senator L.J. Farnham		Senator T.A. Vallois		
Senator S.C. Ferguson		Senator S.Y. Mézec		
Senator K.L. Moore		Connétable of St. Helier		
Senator S.W. Pallett		Connétable of St. Lawrence		
Connétable of St. Mary		Connétable of St. Saviour		
Connétable of St. Ouen		Connétable of St. Brelade		
Connétable of St. John		Connétable of Grouville		
Deputy of Grouville		Connétable of Trinity		
Deputy of St. Martin		Connétable of St. Peter		
Deputy of St. Mary		Connétable of St. Clement		
Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)		Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		
Deputy L.B. Ash (C)		Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)		
Deputy K.F. Morel (L)		Deputy M. Tadier (B)		
Deputy of St. Peter		Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)		

Deputy of Trinity		Deputy of St. Ouen		
Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)		Deputy L.M.C. Doublet (S)		
Deputy I. Gardiner (H)		Deputy R. Labey (H)		
		Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)		
		Deputy J.H. Young (B)		
		Deputy G.C.U. Guida (L)		
		Deputy of St. John		
		Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)		
		Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)		
		Deputy J.H. Perchard (S)		
		Deputy R.J. Ward (H)		
		Deputy C.S. Alves (H)		

The Deputy Bailiff:

Senator Moore, I saw your light first.

Senator K.L. Moore:

Before the adjournment is proposed, I thought it might be wise if the Assembly considered how we are going to deal with business going forward. I do not think we are as advanced as we thought we might be today. I was going to perhaps propose that we sit later tomorrow night, please.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, we could do that. Connétable of Grouville, your light is on as well.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Yes, Sir. I was going to make exactly the same point, because I do not like making a decision like that on the day, because it does not give people an opportunity to make other arrangements for childcare or other responsibilities they have. People should be, at least, prepared to extend tomorrow's sitting. We have gone through 6 items today. We have 12 left. We have a problem on our hands.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to say something before that is proposed?

Deputy J.H. Young:

I absolutely agree. I am quite troubled about the timing. The only thing I would wonder is whether tomorrow we could have a half an hour adjournment, because Members are tired and there is the risk of bad decision-making, so we at least have a chance to refresh. In other words, when we get to 5.30 p.m. we adjourn for half an hour and then come back. I would go on to say, we might make the same arrangement for Friday in order to finish, if necessary. Perhaps we should take the Thursday suggestion first, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes. What was your proposition, Senator Moore, then?

Senator K.L. Moore:

That we sit until 8.00 p.m, I am looking at Members around the Chamber, if we sit late tomorrow evening after a half hour adjournment at 5.30 p.m.

The Deputy Bailiff:

You propose that we sit until 8.00 p.m. tomorrow after a short adjournment at 5.30 p.m.?

Senator K.L. Moore:

Thank you, Sir, yes.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is that seconded? [**Seconded**] Does any Member wish to speak on that proposition?

Deputy R.J. Ward:

I want to raise one point, and I have no problem if people are ill, and I know we have COVID-19, but it does seem to be that some Members are not in the Chamber, but can attend other events. [**Approbation**] If you are in the Chamber, staying until 8.00 p.m. is very different from sitting at home staying to 8.00 p.m. I want to raise that point, because it is important that it is raised.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, the point was well made, Deputy Ward. Does any other Member wish to speak on this proposition? Shall we continue on a standing vote? Would those in favour of sitting until 8.00 p.m. tomorrow night, please show; those against? Thank you very much.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Sorry, I have one more point of order, which leads on from Deputy Ward's point. Could you tell us what the reasons are that somebody need not be in this Assembly, Sir? My understanding was that obviously if you have COVID-19 or are being tested for COVID-19 you should not be here.

The Deputy Bailiff:

I was making sure that my understanding of the position was the same as the Greffier's, which it is. In summary, as people outside of this Chamber are expected to go to work as usual then people inside this Chamber would also attend this Chamber, [**Approbation**] unless there was a health or other similar reason not to do so. That was my understanding and the Greffier agrees with me.

The Connétable of Grouville:

It is my understanding that there are Members who are going about their ordinary business, but not attending this Assembly. If they do not attend tomorrow, will they be *en défaut*, Sir?

The Deputy Bailiff:

That is a matter I will consider overnight.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Could I also further propose that we consider a contingency arrangement, similar, for Friday? It is better that we conclude this week and do not go into next week. It would be good if we made that as a contingency. I hope we do not need it. There is less contentious business towards the end. Fingers crossed. I make that as a proposition: that we make contingency arrangements to stay late on Friday if necessary.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes. Your proposal is that the Assembly sits until it finishes on Friday? Is that your proposal that the Assembly sits on Friday until it is finished?

Deputy J.H. Young:

That we make a similar arrangement for the planned sitting on Friday, because I do not believe we will finish tomorrow, so to finish the business, we carry on until 8.00 p.m. with a half hour adjournment in order to refresh ourselves.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes. Is that seconded? **[Seconded]** Yes. Do you wish to speak Deputy Southern?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Just briefly, to point out that my experience is that we go on usually until we fill the time allotted. I suggest that we risk that again.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, that is a point well made as well.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Could I just make an observation? I hope, obviously, that we can finish by Friday and not 10.00 pm on Friday, but we need to have contingencies whereby if we are not finishing at a reasonable hour we look at whether we can roll over until the next session and then we knock on the business. It is not an ideal situation, but we need to be aware of trying to cram in until 10.00 p.m. What happens if we still have business at 10.00 p.m. on a Friday night? We need to think about moving over other propositions which can wait, because this needs to be finished first.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The proposal is only that we sit until 8.00 p.m. on Friday.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Would it help if I withdrew and we can discuss this tomorrow? I withdraw my proposition, if I may. Can I do that?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Are Members to permit the Deputy to ... yes, you may do so. Any more matters to raise before we adjourn?

The Deputy Bailiff:

The adjournment is proposed. Is it seconded? **[Seconded]** Members agree to adjourn? Very well, the States stands adjourned until 9.30 a.m. tomorrow morning.

ADJOURNMENT

[17:39]