

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

THURSDAY, 17th MARCH 2022

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption	4
1. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - ninetieth amendment: Overall housing supply (P.36/2021 Amd.(90)) - resumption.....	4
Mr. M.H. Temple Q.C., H.M. Attorney General:	4
Deputy J.H. Young of St. Brelade:.....	5
Deputy H.C. Raymond of Trinity:.....	5
1.1 Deputy S.G. Luce of St. Martin:	6
1.1.1 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier:	6
1.1.2 Senator S.Y. Mézec:	8
1.1.3 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	9
1.1.4 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence:	10
1.1.5 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier:	11
1.1.6 Deputy G.C. Guida of St. Lawrence:.....	12
1.1.7 Senator K.L. Moore:	13
1.1.8 Senator L.J. Farnham:	14
1.1.9 Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré:	14
1.1.10 Connétable S.A. Le Sueur-Rennard of St. Saviour:	15
1.1.11 Deputy L.B.E. Ash of St. Clement:	16
1.1.12 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier:.....	16
1.1.13 Deputy J.H. Young:.....	17
2. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - seventh amendment: Restriction of Parish Priority (P/36/2021 Amd.(7))	20
2.1 Deputy I. Gardiner:	20
2.1.1 Deputy J.H. Young:	21
2.1.2 Deputy K.F. Morel:.....	21
2.1.3 Connétable J.E. Le Maistre of Grouville:	22
2.1.4 Deputy R.J. Renouf of St. Ouen:	22
2.1.5 Deputy D. Johnson of St. Mary:	22
2.1.6 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:	22
2.1.7 Connétable J. Le Bailly of St. Mary:	22
2.1.8 Connétable R. Vibert of St. Peter:	23
2.1.9 Deputy S.M. Wickenden of St. Helier:	23
2.1.10 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:	23
2.1.11 Deputy G.C. Guida:.....	23
2.1.12 Deputy G.P. Southern:	24
2.1.13 Deputy M. Tadier:	24
2.1.14 Connétable R.A. Buchanan of St. Ouen:.....	25
2.1.15 Senator L.J. Farnham:	26

2.1.16	Deputy R. Labey of St. Helier:.....	26
2.1.17	Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	27
2.1.18	Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:	28
2.1.19	Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier:	28
2.1.20	The Deputy of St. Martin:	29
2.1.21	Deputy I. Gardiner:	29
3.	Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) – ninety-first amendment: Affordable housing provision (P.36/2021 Amd.(91))	31
3.1	Deputy J.H. Young (The Minister for the Environment):	32
3.2	Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) – ninety-first amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)) – amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)Amd.).....	37
3.2.1	Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:	37
3.2.2	Deputy M.R. Higgins of St. Helier:	38
3.2.3	Deputy I. Gardiner:	38
	LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED	39
	LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT.....	39
3.2.4	The Connétable of St. Lawrence:	39
3.2.5	Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier:	40
3.2.6	Deputy J.H. Young:	40
3.2.7	The Deputy of St. Martin:	41
3.2.8	Senator K.L. Moore:	41
3.2.9	The Deputy of St. Ouen:	42
3.2.10	Deputy G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade:	43
3.2.11	Senator S.Y. Mézec:.....	44
3.2.12	Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:	44
3.3	Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) – ninety-first amendment.(P.36/2021 Amd.(91)) – fourth amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)Amd.(4)).....	47
3.3.1	Connétable A. Jehan of St. John:	47
3.3.2	Deputy S.M. Wickenden:.....	49
3.3.3	Deputy J.H. Young:	49
3.3.4	The Deputy of St. Martin:	50
3.3.5	Deputy K.F. Morel:.....	50
3.3.6	The Deputy of St. Mary:	51
3.3.7	The Connétable of St. Lawrence:	51
3.3.8	Deputy M. Tadier:.....	52
3.3.9	The Connétable of St. Brelade:	53
3.3.10	Deputy G.J. Truscott:	53
3.3.11	Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré:.....	53
3.3.12	Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	54
3.3.13	Deputy I. Gardiner:	54
	The Attorney General:.....	54
3.3.14	The Connétable of St. John:	55
3.4	Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - ninety-first amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)) - fifth amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)Amd.(5))	59
3.4.1	The Connétable of St. John:.....	59
3.4.2	Deputy J.H. Young:	60

3.4.3 Deputy S.M. Wickenden:.....	61
3.4.4 Deputy K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:	61
3.4.5 The Connétable of St. Brelade:.....	62
3.4.6 The Connétable of St. John:.....	62
3.5 Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021): ninety-first amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)) - second amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91) Amd.(2))	63
3.5.1 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:	63
3.5.2 The Connétable of St. Ouen:.....	65
3.5.3 Deputy J.H. Young:	68
3.5.4 The Deputy of St. Ouen:	68
3.5.5 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:	70
3.6 Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021): ninety-first amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)) - third amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)Amd.(3))	71
3.6.1 The Connétable of St. Saviour:.....	71
3.6.2 Deputy J.H. Young:	72
3.6.3 Deputy K.C. Lewis:	72
3.6.4 Deputy K.G. Pamplin of St. Saviour:	72
3.6.5 The Connétable of St. Saviour:.....	73
3.7 Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021): ninety-first amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)) - as amended	74
3.7.1 Deputy I. Gardiner:	74
3.7.2 The Connétable of St. John:.....	74
3.7.3 The Deputy of St. Martin:.....	76
3.7.4 The Connétable of St. Peter:	76
ADJOURNMENT.....	79

[9:30]

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

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption

1. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - ninetieth amendment: Overall housing supply (P.36/2021 Amd.(90)) - resumption

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

We return to the debate on the Island Plan. The 90th amendment was proposed last night by the Minister for the Environment and Deputy Tadier, I think, asked a question of the Attorney General. Mr. Attorney, are you able to give your answer to that question?

Mr. M.H. Temple Q.C., H.M. Attorney General:

Yes, Sir, I am. Deputy Tadier asked a question that if someone who privately owned a field was aggrieved by a decision of the Assembly to designate that field for affordable homes under the Island Plan would that be subject to some form of appeal or judicial review. My answer to that question is that there are 2 potential remedies to that situation. The first would be an application for judicial review to the Royal Court and it could be put on the basis that the decision of the States Assembly was incompatible with a convention right. In this case it would be likely to be Article 1, Protocol 1, which is to do with the protection of property. So that is the first potential remedy. The second one would be the person could apply for planning permission to develop the field for not affordable housing but normal private ownership, or unaffordable housing, and then appeal any refusal decision not to grant planning permission for private or unaffordable housing in the usual way to an inspector and then to the Royal Court on a point of law. Those are the 2 potential remedies. In relation to the prospects of success of certainly the first remedy, and probably the second, I think the prospects of success would be extremely low. The Assembly's task in passing the Island Plan is to decide on how best to use the Island's resources in accordance with its statutory duties under the Planning and Building Law 2002. Indeed Article 4, paragraph 4 of the 2002 law expressly provides that land can be used for persons who would otherwise have financial difficulties renting or acquiring residential accommodation in the general market or residential accommodation in Jersey. That is one of the express duties or purposes of the Island Plan. So, in my view, it would be extremely difficult to bring a judicial review on the basis that the Assembly had designated a site for affordable housing in accordance with that provision. A further difficulty is the advice that I gave to a question earlier in the week, and I am afraid I cannot remember which Deputy or States Member asked me the question, about whether there was an infringement of Article 1, Protocol 1, and my answer was no. So, for all the reasons that I gave in relation to that answer, those difficulties would also be faced by the sort of claim that Deputy Tadier had suggested in his question. The fact that in terms of a designation of, say, 15 per cent of properties on States-owned land was to be used for affordable housing, whereas a particular field had been designated entirely for affordable housing, would not, in my view, raise the prospects of success of that sort of challenge because all sorts of considerations have to be applied by the States Assembly in relation to the use of land. The fact that land is government-owned or it may be in private ownership, that is only one of the factors that is taken into account in deciding on the best use of land. I hope that answers Deputy Tadier's question. If I might also add, unfortunately I have to be called away at 10 a.m. for an urgent separate meeting so if there are further questions it might be wise to ask me now. I anticipate the meeting will be very brief and my assistant will continue to listen to the debate, so if there are questions that I can pick them up afterwards. I apologise to the Assembly but I will briefly have to be away for a few minutes at 10 a.m.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Thank you very much.

Deputy J.H. Young of St. Brelade:

I think that is a very helpful answer, as the Attorney General's always are, but from my point of view I know that when we approach a debate there has been a lot of comments in the media about the degree of public awareness people have.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Sorry, Deputy, can I just check this is a question for the Attorney General because you have spoken?

Deputy J.H. Young:

Yes, it is. The question is: do I interpret the answer correct that the States is paramount in these decisions and therefore it is extremely unlikely that any judicial review brought for whatever reason, either for or against a zoning, could be likely to be subject to such? I just would like to have a little bit of clarification of that please.

The Attorney General:

Yes, the States is the Island's legislature and clearly a great deal of weight will be placed on the fact that it is a legislature. In terms of the Island Plan, while it is not entirely free from argument or doubt, in my view it would be considered as subordinate legislation in accordance with a broad definition of subordinate legislation, which is in Article 1 of the Human Rights Law, and so there is an express right or obligation in Article 7(4) of the Human Rights Law, which provides that it is unlawful for the States Assembly to make subordinate legislation, which is incompatible with a convention right.

[9:45]

That provision might be used to mount a challenge to the Island Plan, or a particular part of the Island Plan, on the basis that it would be claimed that it is incompatible with the convention right. But as I have said, it would be subject to a huge number of difficulties in bringing that claim because, as I said in my previous answer, there are express provisions in primary legislation which provide for designating land for persons who would have financial difficulties in renting or buying a property in Jersey. So, by designating land for affordable housing, the States Assembly is acting entirely in accordance with that provision and, in making decisions about which land is to be used for affordable housing, there are a huge number of considerations which have to be taken into account, which is why the States Assembly is tasked with those decisions. It is why there is the extremely detailed and thorough process that is followed in relation to the development of the Island Plan, which is set out in the projet to this proposition, and which Members will be familiar with. Again, I hope that assists the Minister.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

There is a question from the Deputy of Trinity.

Deputy H.C. Raymond of Trinity:

I have spent the whole of my life discussing affordable housing. I am just concerned is that do we have a definition of affordable housing, and I will give the example that I spent, as I said, most of my life dealing with affordable housing since 1969. Affordable housing in the U.K. (United Kingdom) was different in different parts of the U.K. Are we saying that the land purchased for affordable housing from private individuals is going to be at the same price whether the land is in St. Ouen, Trinity or whatever? I am not clear what the definition of affordable housing is. But back to 1946 after the war, dare I say it, the word "affordable housing" came out because people were coming back from the war and they were trying to find a way of defining it. Here we are in 2022, we still do not have a definition of what is affordable housing. If we are going to go through the debate ...

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Deputy, can I just interrupt you there? This is moving into a speech, I feel. I think there is a question there for the Attorney General around whether in law there is a definition of affordable housing, which he can answer. Then if you wish to reflect on that and contribute to the debate that would be the best thing to do.

The Attorney General:

Affordable housing is not defined in the 2002 law, and I am not immediately aware of a definition elsewhere.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

If there are no other questions for the Attorney General, the amendment has been seconded and does any Member wish to speak on the amendment?

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

As a member St. Martin's Housing Association, as an Economic Scrutiny Panel member, Environment Scrutiny Panel member, as a member of the Planning Committee and as an ex-Minister for Planning, the Island Plan is of great interest to me. I am trying not to speak for long when I do speak but I guess I am speaking more often than I might in other types of debates. But I do not know if it is something I said but every day I am turning up and there are less and less people sitting around me. At the rate I am going, tomorrow the Minister himself probably will not be here and this debate will come to a very short conclusion. But I jest, and it is interesting that there are not very many of us here but we have got to this 32nd item and it is possibly one of those that is taking us into the more serious, if it is possible, part of this whole debate because we are getting now down to the really tricky stuff of selecting housing sites. This amendment, there are quite a few numbers in here but of course it is the smallest number of those (a), (b) and (c) that are the most important one; that number of 600. I just want to say to Members, which I am sure we are going to approve this, we are not going to sort of vote against it, but in approving this target of 600 we then must do our level best to try to get to that number. Planning decisions are always a balance and on one hand we have to balance the need and requirement of so many people on this Island to have an affordable home or to have a home to retire into, to have a family home for the rest of your life. But on the other side we have to try to balance the needs of the environment and greenfields, keeping Jersey beautiful. I just want to say to Members, we really have to do our best on both counts here. We have to try to find these sites but we have to try to do that in the most sensitive possible way and protect the beauty of our Island.

1.1.1 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier:

Just as I did that I closed the amendment so if you could just give me one second so I can open it again. So, my concern here is - and I accept from the Minister this is perhaps an impossible task - because what we have been given here is a number of homes to be built. I want to make the point that the word "homes" being used is welcomed. We are finally talking about homes and not units and properties, but the issue is, and I will raise this now, deep down we are still talking about properties and units rather than homes people need to live as a basic right. It is almost impossible to come up with that number of homes before we have debated where they will be. I accept that because the planners have given a view of what is needed. We are now going to talk about a number of different fields and there will be individual interests and interests with the election coming - let us be honest about it - for some, and we are going to have to come up with a decision. However, the real issue for me is that one of the principles that we have got wrong is entirely around affordable housing. First of all, I think the definition of affordable housing is a movable feast. There seem to be so many projects and we have had the current Minister for Housing and Communities talking about all of these different projects which are quite mystical in some ways of part share. If you talk to the average

person trying to find somewhere to live, it is something to negotiate their way through. We have a problem with the definition of affordable homes. But we also have a big problem, a huge problem for me, which is part (c), which says: ““new homes”” should be substituted with the words ““up to 600 affordable homes’.” I do not believe that on States-owned property we should be building anything other than affordable homes. States-owned property is exactly that. It is owned by the people of Jersey but we are willing, in this Assembly, to say it is okay, build something that the people of Jersey cannot afford to live in. That to me is an utter disgrace. It is the wrong thing to do. It is the wrong principle. If there is one thing that the bridging Island Plan needs to have it is clear principles as to what we are going to be doing. The principle therefore is wrong. Actually, the more I am talking, the more I am talking myself out of supporting this because it is fundamentally wrong. The issue of affordable housing in this is a token gesture, just like all of these numbers will be. I go back to what I started with. I feel to some extent for the Minister, because it is nigh on impossible to put these numbers together before we have agreed where they are going to be built. However, the principle of affordable housing on States land is something that we can talk about. I will take that a step further. Perhaps on privately-owned land, on an Island where we have a housing crisis - not a problem, not an issue, a housing crisis - the Government should be leading the way in housing and saying that we need to build affordable housing for people first and foremost. That is what will be given the priority for planning permission. Affordable homes for the next generation coming through. Otherwise, we will face a population crisis that is very different from what we perceive that we have at the moment. It will be a demographic crisis where younger people, and when I say “younger” I am going to include myself in that - there is no need to laugh at that - generationally people will move away because you cannot afford to live here. Your children will not be able to afford to live here. When you want to see your children you will move away too. We will have that drop in population that many people want but it means that we will not have a society that works. That starts with the notion of affordable homes. Homes. Not properties, not units. I think, if anything, the one big step forward is the use of the word “homes” in this document. There is a real issue with this in part (c) for me. If we take it separately, I do not know how that would work and I understand where we are. I also mention a couple of other things. We do not have the census data. We do not know where we are with empty properties. I will use that word “properties” because they are not being used for homes. We do not know where we are with them. In addition to that, we have no idea of the demographic at the moment that we actually have and what the need will be. Sorry, I am going to go through this now because there is a point to do. I go back to what I said about the use of units, what we seem to have is the developers are king and what they are developing is spreadsheet units of one bedrooms in town, in particular, and St. Helier is facing the brunt of this, which are not suitable for the demographic that we have because we do not even know what the demographic is. Until we have that ... and we have absolutely nothing in place in terms of an empty property tax, an empty property charge to encourage places back on to either rental or for sale, so that homes that are or could be available are not being made available because there is absolutely no incentive to do that. These numbers, and again I may be slightly off track here in terms of my criticism, but we can put as many numbers in here as we want, they might be right, they might be wrong, but until we address the issues of the way that we will use States land, until we address the issues of what drivers will be put in place for development of homes for people, and until we put some form of control over developers rather than these huge schemes that we have no control over and no investment in, then you can put whatever numbers you want here, it will not address the issues that we face. This bridging Island Plan is here to address the issues that we face. I do not know about voting for this. I do not know what the consequences are if we do not vote for it. But all I can say is there are huge inadequacies built in from the very fundamental principles in housing that we have had on this Island for far too long and from this Government and from previous Governments. We certainly need change and it is time for that change.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Before we move on, I notice that Deputy Southern is *en défaut*, if somebody could deal with that.

Deputy M. Tadier of. St. Brelade:

Could I raise the *défaut* on Deputy Southern please?

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

The *défaut* is raised on Deputy Southern.

1.1.2 Senator S.Y. Mézec:

I am really pleased to follow Deputy Ward who is absolutely spot on in everything he said there. In among the confusion we had last night in dealing with this we were, I think, a bit too polite and avoided calling it what it is. It is a complete and absolute mess that we have before us to vote now. It is a mess in its own right but it is also a mess to be dealt with now at this point in this debate when we are about to embark on all of the other amendments on different housing sites. So, the numbers that are actually in here may turn out to be purely theoretical and not based on the numbers for different sites that will end up in the plan itself. It is still a mess, even whatever the outcome is for the other amendments, because of the contents of this chart. Deputy Ward commended the progress that there has been in moving from referring to properties to homes, and he is right to commend that. But let us take a closer look. It refers to affordable homes and open market homes, which we should be clear is a euphemism for unaffordable homes. That is what it means if they do not fall into the affordable category. Look what it is that we are seeking to pledge to deliver for the Island. On government-owned sites in town we are seeking to deliver 150 unaffordable homes.

[10:00]

On land we own. That is a disgrace. That number in that chart should be zero. We should only be building homes on the land we own that match the profile of need that there is out in the community: 425 affordable, 150 unaffordable on government-owned sites in town. Let us look at the private sites in town: 600 for unaffordable, how many for affordable? Zero. Not one. On those private sites we will not be asking private developers to at least make a token gesture to our affordable housing contribution, to say that if you are going to take these sites and make lots of money out of them, which is absolutely fine, but in the midst of a housing crisis they should be required to contribute at least a proportion. That is common place in many other jurisdictions as a condition for getting planning permission. The Minister says that he will be supporting an amendment to this plan to require an affordable housing contribution from the private sector but it is not in this chart. This chart matters nothing. It may as well go in the bin seeing as it has no resemblance to what else is in the plan. Look as well at the windfall outside of town: 500 for unaffordable, zero for affordable. We see greater and greater pressure for more affordable homes compared to the original version of this chart, for rezoning in rural extension sites, losing more of our countryside because we are not using our brownfield sites and urban sites effectively because instead, rather than building homes that match the profile that we need, we are building homes for luxury investment apartments, which is seriously letting this Island down and it is leading to what Deputy Ward was talking about, about people thinking about leaving the Island, people actually leaving the Island. I say to the Minister for the Environment, that my email inbox, my Facebook message requests, and all the rest of it, is absolutely inundated from young people, people as young as their late teens and early 30s, people who have aspirations and dreams, people who have not started a family yet, people who are looking to start a family, who are looking to leave the Island because they have simply given up hope that they will ever be in a position to own their own home. In recent weeks my best friend, for example, has said that he will be leaving the Island and that is because he knows that he will never be able to own a home here because the Government simply does not care about people like him. He has not seen this chart but if I showed him he would say: "Well, that is typical. I can see why now." I do

not know what to do when it comes to how to vote on this. I may as well go and sit in the coffee room and do nothing since it will have no impact whatsoever for this Island because these numbers are utterly meaningless and even in this ... can you call it an improved version of the chart? It is still completely inadequate and will not deliver on the housing supply that we need for the Island. Further to that, I would say that the numbers that the Government has used to determine projections for housing types that it will seek to approve in this plan, I think they have taken a flawed reading of the *Objective Assessment of Housing Need* report, which came out a few years ago. It was published by myself when I was Minister for Housing, and that gave a breakdown under different population growth scenarios of what sorts of homes we would need. But it said in it that the numbers it was providing would change if circumstances on the Island changed. Like, for example, widening the criteria for the Housing Gateway. The projections they came up with were based on the old criteria and we know the criteria are changing and they are changing because there are people out there who are so clearly in desperate need that they ought to be supported in social housing, or those first-time buyers who are constantly being priced out of the open market would need to be captured into the affordable market instead. These numbers simply do not count for that. As for how to vote on this, do not worry about it, because it makes no difference either way, but this ambition for the delivery of housing from this Government is a bit let down to the Island. I hope the Minister realises that, that he ought to have been stronger against his colleagues when fighting for ordinary working people on this Island.

1.1.3 Deputy M. Tadier:

You are in for a treat this morning. You do not just get one, 2, you get 3 Reform Jersey speeches and I came in especially to deliver mine in person. I am pleased to be back. It is surreal being in the Assembly and listening to these detached voices coming from above; it almost feels like we are being spoken to by the Almighty Himself, of course with different voices on different occasions. I cannot decide whether it comes with more authority to have it in that way or less. But certainly, when I heard the disembodied voice of the Deputy of Trinity asking the Attorney General a question, which sounded like a speech, in fact I thought it was a speech when you interrupted him. I said: "Why is the Chair interrupting the Deputy of Trinity in the middle of his speech" realising it was a question to the Attorney General asking the Attorney General for clarification on what his party's policy and his Government's policy is on affordable housing. Because the Alliance Party and the current Government do not even know the definition of affordable housing and what it means, let alone have any ideas as to how to solve the crisis and problem of affordability.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

There was a voice from the ether.

Deputy M. Tadier:

I am waiting to be struck down any moment.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

If Members who are using Teams could make sure their mics are off because it is disruptive to Members who are speaking to hear these noises.

Deputy M. Tadier:

I do not expect to be struck down by the disembodied voice. Let us bring this back down a little bit. The reason I asked the question yesterday to the Attorney General was because I feel ... the point I was making is not one about left or right or where you stand on the political spectrum for me on this point. It is one about inherent fairness. Can we, as Assembly Members, it does not matter whether or not in reality any of the decisions that we make in this Island Plan will be challenged by judicial review or just by appeal in the usual ways and whether they will be successful. We are here to try and make fair and equitable decisions on the whole about the way our Island is governed and about

the impositions that we put on people, especially in this context about the things they can and cannot do with their own land. If we say to people: “You see that field over there, we want it for affordable housing, so it is no longer going to be a field for grazing, it is no longer going to be a field where perhaps people can walk through in order to get to another place, walk their dogs, go with their children, it is no longer a place where you can grow vegetables or do whatever it is that you might have done or we might have done with it in the past. It is for housing. By the way, it has to be 100 per cent affordable housing” and of course they might say to you: “Well why does it have to be 100 per cent affordable housing?” and the answer of course, maybe not the official answer, is: “Because you will not be given planning permission otherwise. So, you either keep it as a greenfield or you do what we say and you make it 100 per cent affordable housing.” Does that sound slightly alarming? Does that sound slightly mafioso the way of doing things? It does to me and I am a dirty lefty. Sorry, I should not say the word “lefty”. But I am an unwashed socialist and I can see that is inherently unfair. Maybe the conservatives in the Assembly think that it is okay for Government to act in that way. But yet when it comes to the Government and its own land, which it administers perhaps indirectly through arm’s length bodies, such as the States of Jersey Development Company or whoever else, Ports of Jersey, whatever, we say: “Oh no, the rules do not apply to us” and so if somebody comes along and says: “Maybe make it 30 per cent affordable homes, maybe make it 50 per cent.” “We could not possibly do that, how on earth would we make the figures stack up.” Yet we expect different economic rules to apply to the private sector. So, we say: “But your field, of course, you do not need to have 70 per cent or 85 per cent to make your project viable. Your project will be viable because we tell you that it has to be viable.” Do we support that inherently? Again, this is not about party politics, it is about what is fair. It is a bit like science, is it not, the climate science? The science is either correct or it is not. The economics either stack up or it does not. Until this Government and any future Government can play by fair rules when it comes to what we want to see in the Island, I think it is inherently unacceptable. Some Members have said it does not really matter whether we support these figures. It is just increasing it slightly from what it should be. I do not agree with that. The other point is, without any of these predefined policies and the thought that goes into it, why on earth would I support more homes being built when I already have a problem with rezoning in the first place. Until we have decided all of these things, and the Government has a proper policy, why would I want to be giving more and more land away based on these flawed policies that already exist for rezoning? I would not. That is why I am quite comfortable in voting against this. I am going to leave it at that. There are other points that I could make, which are probably better argued in a different context. But I would say to all Members in this Assembly, it is important that we individually, when we press that button, whoever we normally vote with and whoever we normally support and give our support to, if indeed that is the way one operates, is that we then have to own that decision. We cannot in the future say: “We just went along with what the Government of the day was doing.” The Government that did not have even a definition of the very word “affordability”; I think that is really important to remember. I, for my part, cannot support this today. I will look in the future hopefully, if I am still here with an open mind, about where in Jersey and how we can use land properly but I will make sure we do it in a way that takes the community with us and that does it in an even-handed way, and does it with a Government which is prepared to act fairly and apply the rules fairly because fundamentally I do not agree that it is okay to say do what I say not what I do. The Government should be leading, for example, and if this Government is not able to do it then it should make way for a Government who is.

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

If anyone was slumbering this morning I am sure they have been woken up by those 3 speeches, all of them, but ending with a particularly unexpected defence of the private sector by Deputy Tadier. That really was not expected at all but a really good point to be made. This amendment I just find such a strange amendment. It has, in a sense, come out of nowhere. The Minister yesterday accepted that he does not know the capacity of the construction sector to deliver these homes. We know that

the previous Island Plan, they under-delivered homes. This one is even shorter so we are now talking about requirements up to 2025, so there is an expectation in these numbers that somehow they will deliver 4,150 homes in 3 years. I have serious doubts about that. I asked yesterday if the Minister knew about the capacity of the construction sector. He effectively said he did not. There is only one way of course to deliver 4,150 homes in the next 3 years and that is to bring in huge amounts of construction workers to do so. Those huge amounts of construction workers obviously will, in turn, exacerbate our housing crisis. We see that we are caught in a vicious circle that I do not believe these revised numbers will do anything at all to change. I am with Senator Mézec and Deputy Tadier and hope for any numbers in some sense. It does not matter. These cannot be delivered. The Minister has increased them. Fine. That is absolutely fine. I think that Deputy Tadier has made a really good point about the unfairness but we know this. It does not matter who is in charge of the Government, the Government always prefers itself and gives itself preferential situation compared to the private sector. It is not a huge surprise. But I have to ask the Minister: does he know what place in the Island? Does he know the census results from last year? Because if he does I would be grateful if he could share them with the rest of the Assembly. Does he know the capacity of the building sector? No, he does not.

[10:15]

Does he know that the *Objective Assessment of Housing Need* is now an old document, and Senator Mézec was absolutely right to refer to it? But effectively that was written in 2017/2018; I believe it was published in 2018. We now know, following Brexit, following the pandemic, that that *Objective Assessment of Housing Need* is out of date, completely out of date based on completely different assumptions about what was happening with Jersey's population. Has the Minister determined how many unused homes or properties there are in Jersey? No, he has not. Has the Minister really ascertained what can be done with brownfield sites, or beige sites as we were told yesterday? No, he has not. Has the Minister just said: "You know what, let us build on greenfields because that is the easy place to do it?" Yes, he has. That is what I see. I do not see this cascade where you start with existing built-on sites and go down with greenfield sites as the absolute last resort. No. I feel, and this is why I find it difficult with this Island Plan, as a whole, I feel he has just leapt to the greenfield sites. I was in the Environment Scrutiny Panel, I was asking then what are we doing to understand how many unused properties there are in Jersey. The answer was very little, there were a few kind of blustered responses and that is it. It is appalling. We have to use land and our resources as efficiently as possible, and yet we are just staring at that problem and just saying: "You know what, it is too hard. It is really a bit too difficult for us to deal with. To try and find out how many unused homes in the Island it is really tough. It is so much easier to build on greenfield sites." For me, the Minister is making up some numbers and there is the argument to say therefore support this because it really does not matter. I take the opposite. I say this is not evidence-based, this is just Minister reaching for numbers. He has not done his homework, as far as I am concerned, and I shall not support this revision of numbers. We have the first set of numbers. We will take them and move on from there. So I urge other Members of the Assembly as well, do not just say yes because the Minister says yes, when Members know very well the Minister has not done his homework.

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

My speech at this stage will be short because I realised yesterday that this is the third Island Plan I have sat through, and I mean literally sat through because it is not a very active process. Each of those Island Plans has taken approximately a week, so that is 3 weeks of my life wasted. I will tell you why it is wasted, and we have had a hint about it in the 3 previous speeches, do we have an overwhelming demand for areas in which to grow potatoes or vegetables, all sorts? Do we have an overwhelming demand, are there cows knocking on our front door saying: "Let me be built? We need another million litres of milk." No, we do not. The world has changed. Jersey has changed. We are not predominantly dependent on milk, potatoes and, very appropriate to yesterday's debate,

on tomatoes, given that half of our glasshouses are falling down and we do not know what to do with them. The hint was there. We have a demand for housing. We have a demand for homes. There is a crying demand to house our population properly, decently, in a dignified way. Have we got that in front of us today? I do not believe we have. Because I recognised last night, and it was only towards the end, we had come to the final stage of an Island Plan, one which basically, and it happens time and time again, not just with Island Plans, but in all sorts of ways, one where we have got a bidding war basically. “You vote for my greenfield and I will vote for yours.” Have the phone calls been going round last night? Have the emails been going round last night? Of course, they have. I do not know that because nobody bothers to try and tap me up because I was born a grumpy old man and I will probably finish my days as a grumpy old man, so do not come knocking on my door for a swap. Yet I suspect very deeply that is exactly what is going on. People are doing deals. I look forward to seeing or trying to estimate where those deals have been done. “Ooh, interesting vote over there, ooh, matches this one over here. There is a swap.” So, I look forward to the next, it might be another 3 days yet. The next 3 days as we see the bids unravelling and the bidding war starts, here we go: “I will swap yours for mine.” See if you can spot them too.

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

I am a little bit confused because it seems that 2 things have happened. First which is we are now in full political mode and not talking at all about the subject at hand, which is the creation of affordable homes. But somehow we are being criticised that ... but that is what we are trying to do right now, putting this in. Secondly, I cannot believe what I just heard from Deputy Morel going about we have not done our homework, we have not looked at anything, we have not looked at brownfields, we have not looked at the things that could be developed. This is a summary of the Island Plan. It is a summary of thousands of pages of reports, of 3 years of work, that we have done on the whole Island. We have left no stone unturned. We have looked behind every blade of grass. We have looked at everything. The list of sites that were first presented were looked at for 2 years. They were selected extremely carefully. To tell us that: “Oh my God, there is still a greenhouse that you have not considered or there is still a brownfield somewhere that could be developed or acquired and turned into housing.” No, I am sorry, those have been done. Those have been considered. Again, if nature is going to do the work for you why would you start writing legislation? If anybody had a brownfield that they could develop they would have. You make millions quickly now; right now. Why would anybody keep a brownfield and wait for the Government to actually force them to build? It does not happen like that. That is something that is quite important in this. The plan is an allowance. It does not tell people what to do. When you say this field can be developed, that is exactly what it means. It means it can be developed. If somebody wants to develop it, it can be developed. Now, this allowance is extremely valuable. It multiplies the value of your field by 10 instantly and it is something that we give for free. Because we give it for free we put conditions on it and what we say is there is a limit to the profit that you can make. We do not want you to build expensive houses, we want you to build affordable homes where you, the developer, and the builders will have taken the smallest amount of profit as possible so that the houses remain affordable. That is the condition for multiplying the value of your field by 10. That is how it works. It has to work like that because we do not build. We are not going to go into those fields and build. We are allowing developers to do it with a condition. So, I have no idea where this comes from, this idea that, yes, we are working on the greenfields. It is cheaper to build on a greenfield because the greenfield starts with almost zero value. A one-hectare field in Jersey is £20,000. You can put dozens and dozens of houses on it, so it starts with almost no value, and that is how you make cheaper homes, more affordable homes, by starting with the land being extremely affordable. When you go to town it changes and some of those sites are extremely valuable. That is something again I do not understand. The Government has got a Rolls-Royce and instead of selling it to buy 30 caravans it is going to give you a sleeping bag and ask you to sleep in it. That is ridiculous. If we have a lot of value in sites in town we should extract that value and use it better and use it to make more affordable homes. The notion again, the laws of

physics, the laws of the economy just completely disappear, we just need to tell people: “Build here and we do not care if you are going to make money if it is going to be cheaper, whatever. Just build there because we have asked you to.” This is the normal process. Again, I cannot believe this from the Deputy, we have not done our homework. Look at this. I am sorry, first of all, any development that could happen has happened because the economy is so strongly biased towards developing anything in Jersey. Secondly, we have looked at everything that we could. Everything was looked at. This is very, very simple. We are going to spend the next week looking at how many affordable homes we can build. Why is there a resistance to that? It is mind-boggling, yes, of course you want your page on the *J.E.P. (Jersey Evening Post)* but, sorry, at the expense of building affordable homes; it is ridiculous; it is ridiculous. Please, let us get on with this very, very quickly. It is an indication of our will to go there, of our will to do that, of our will to make affordable homes; it is all it is. It is not binding, it is just an indication from this Assembly to say, yes, we do want affordable homes and this year we are ready to sacrifice our rare and important greenfields for that. Do not say the farmers do not need them, the Island needs them. There is nobody in the street that is going to say: “Yes, yes, raze the whole thing, it does not matter, that as long as 50 per cent of the Island is left green we can build on all that.” Nobody will say that. They want to live in Jersey because Jersey is beautiful because it is green. We are sacrificing this, kicking and screaming, because we need it. Please, let us get on with the process.

1.1.7 Senator K.L. Moore:

Following yesterday’s debate I would like to add briefly to this one because I really am struggling to understand the analysis that some political persuasions have placed upon this debate of affordable housing, when we are now, after yesterday’s result, facing greater pressure to build on greenfields because yesterday it was decided that affordable housing on beige fields was going to contribute too much profit and that was only 50 per cent of the sites but that in the eyes of the Assembly was too much profit for the owners of those beige sites. I hope Members will really dig deep in their consciences today when they are approaching this issue because at the end of the day this is a muddle. Deputy Morel was absolutely right that the Government has brought forward an Island Plan that does not have any census information. We are facing these decisions with a complete lack of evidence. But what we do know and what we do have is the anecdotal evidence is extremely clear, and I think it was Deputy Southern who said that the public are crying out for affordable homes. We all know that, despite the lack of evidence, because it is very clear. I did myself gather a little evidence in a small survey that was circulated a couple of months ago which indicated very clearly to me from the admittedly small sample that 25 per cent of people are spending over 61 per cent of their entire household income on housing costs, that is rent, mortgage or bills; 61 per cent of their household income is a huge amount of money. Then we have to take into account that 70 per cent of those people who were answering the survey spend between 11 per cent and 30 per cent of their household income on food costs. At the higher end of those groups we have practically the entire household income going on both housing costs and then food, so it leaves absolutely nothing left for anything else, which is the massive quality of life cost-of- living crisis that we are trying to deal with.

[10:30]

Those Members who are tempted just to baulk at the Government for their lack of evidence-based approach to this in what is, potentially, a tinkering with the numbers and no knowledge of whether we can deliver it or not, we are going to have to find a way to meet what we do know is a crisis. The numbers are, essentially, plucked out of the air but I am afraid we do need to support them because in our heart of hearts we know that we need to deliver more affordable housing. The stronger the message that we give to anybody who can contribute to resolving that issue, that is our job today, I guess. I would urge Members to support the increased numbers. It is going to be a difficult debate coming forward as we inevitably will clash and find great difficulty in accepting some of the sites that are being proposed to us but we have to move on and that is our job. We are here to consider

what our constituents think and feel and tell us and find the best way that we think on our consciences is going to resolve those issues for the Island.

1.1.8 Senator L.J. Farnham:

I supported Senator Moore's proposition yesterday because I do have a fundamental problem with some of the greenfield sites proposed. If that proposition had succeeded then we would have helped rebalance the number of houses, we would have made more homes available on those sites, brownfield sites potentially and, therefore, that would have given us more leeway with some of the greenfield sites proposed. I just wanted to try and bring some Members back on track a little bit. This amendment is largely an academic exercise to adjust the number of units that the plan is trying to achieve. Ironically, supporting this amendment supports increased numbers and not supporting it supports reduced numbers. The change is also, to be clear, that we must rezone enough land to support, realising the overall number. In relation to the provision of affordable homes, while we are rezoning and putting figures in, we have very little control over just how many affordable homes will emerge. I think every Member of this Assembly is absolutely aware without doubt that we must prioritise at every opportunity the delivery of affordable homes. There are some exciting, at last, plans. Plans, I think, will start gathering momentum to do that when we look at the Better Homes Plan and other innovative ideas that are coming forward, such as shared equity, access to fund longer mortgages, 100 per cent loans; this kind of thing. That is going to be a catalyst that delivers more affordable homes because developers will look to deliver a good return where the demand is. If we can increase the demand for affordable homes, because not every single Islander needs to come on to the housing ladder, there are a good percentage of Islanders who will want to downsize, upsize, sell different properties, develop their own homes and all sorts of things. A home is a home at the end of the day. But if we can really get behind the Better Homes Plan and innovative ideas to get especially our young Islanders on to the housing ladder, however we do that, create more demand for affordable homes, then the market will respond and more affordable homes will be delivered. There are other ways we can achieve that, the new Government must prioritise that. Not adopting this revision to the policy today will simply just set a slightly lower target, and the extra 150 ironically is in the affordable homes bracket. While it is a theoretical exercise, just to be clear, adopting this amendment does put in place a plan that delivers more homes; not adopting it puts in place a plan that delivers slightly less.

Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I am quite pleased to follow the last speaker. Can you hear me okay, Sir?

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

I can hear you fine, Chief Minister.

1.1.9 Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Yes, I was slightly confused listening to this debate because it seemed to go everywhere on what I thought was a relatively simple amendment, which, as certainly Senator Farnham has explained, is it is following the recommendation of the inspector, at the end of the day. I will just try and find the notes, it is the inspector's recommendation 20: "The housing supply figure expressed in policy H3 should make provision for 4,300 homes" et cetera. In other words, it is an increase recommended by the inspector on the basis of better data that has come through and as a result of the processes gone through for the bridging Island Plan. Therefore, it does rather feel that people have made an awful lot of mountains out of relatively very small molehills. On that basis, I think I agree with the latter part of Senator Moore's views as well, which were that, in essence, this amendment should be supported. I will make 2 comments. I will just again remind Members, I too would like to know the census data but I have made the point on a number of occasions the release of the census data is in the hands of the independent Statistics Department and the chief statistician. It is not under the

control of the Government. I too would like to know those numbers, as would all Ministers, but it is not under our control because this Assembly and previous Assemblies have rightfully defended the independence of the chief statistician and the people who work for him, and that is the position. I really do think Members need to be more careful about blaming a Government for the census data not being available. It is something where the process would be laid out and the dates have been set out. The other point which has been addressed and raised in the debate, I think we are going to need to make the point, is if one has to spend £50 million, for the sake of argument, if you have got a large scheme on infrastructure something has to pay for it. It is either a mix, i.e. more expensive homes, the profit on which, therefore, pays for the infrastructure or it is a straight payment from the Government, ultimately, depending on who owns the site, straight out of taxpayers' money. You can make the choice but if you want that £50 million of infrastructure usually to make the scheme better or to improve facilities for Islanders or Islanders in that area, wherever that development is, there are, essentially, very few choices. There is not a magic wand, a magic money tree that has to be waved. Therefore, unfortunately, money and viability and profitability and spreadsheets and all that sort of stuff are important when you are looking at schemes. It is a great shame that certain Members do not seem to recognise that. Those are the consequences that we have to face in what is always a very difficult decision. But on that basis, as I go back to the point, this is, as I said, basic implementing, as is laid down in the report to the amendment, it says that the inspector's recommendation 20, therefore, makes suggestions about increasing the number of homes and all it states is: "This amendment gives effect to that recommendation." It should, in my view, therefore, not be such a confusing debate, as some Members have attempted to make it. I will be supporting this amendment.

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

This is really worrying me, this whole process has given me lots of sleepless nights because my Parish is heavily involved in being transferred into a racetrack and all sorts of things. But it is the way we are going, this gung-ho attitude. Now we have this and we have just been told that if we vote for this we are going to have less, if we vote against it we are going to have more. I just cannot see why we have not got an immigration policy. We just cannot keep building on sites on greenfields because people need homes. I appreciate people need homes but we also have to have a proper balance. What do we do? We make sure that the people we have got here ... they have changed the numbers as it is in this number 90, the amendment, it is lip service. We have increased everything, from 3,750 to 4,000 and we cannot keep doing this when 9 by 5. Why can somebody not come up with something really sensible because this is not sensible? This is lip service, this is making sure that people are going to be thrilled, we are going to have these homes. Where are you going to put them? Are we going to have compulsory purchase on the greenfields if people do not want to sell them? I am very heartbroken as to where my Island is going with no sense of sensibility at all. We need an immigration policy and please do not keep telling me we need all these people to come and work, yes, we do. When I have had people come and work for me on the farm they have said: "I am not coming today because it is raining and besides I will get more with social security and providing I can buy my cigarettes and run my bike that is all I am interested in." That is not an incentive to get somebody to work. I have digressed just a little bit but this Island is going in the wrong direction, as far as I am concerned, and it is worrying me. Everybody wants a home and I can quite understand, although heaven knows why because when you get old you are going to have to sell it to keep you. You have worked yourself really hard to buy a property, to have the security and when you are old the States is going to take it off you anyway because it is going to be needing you to look after you. If you do not have a home you are going to be looked after anyway. It is a vicious circle. This plan at this moment and this increase of everything is worrying me very, very, very, very much I am afraid. Maybe because I am old but I cannot see a way out for this Island to be back to what it was for a while and be happy.

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

I would just like to come back to what Senator Moore said and I think she is 100 per cent right, maybe these figures are not as accurate as they could be and possibly there might even be a wish list. I do not know because I have not worked on them. But she is 100 per cent right when she says we have set some sort of target and try to do it. There is no point in everybody wandering around saying we have got this crisis going on if they are not willing to take any action to stop it. Again, in fairness, yesterday she was again correct, she tried to bring the glasshouses. I voted against that because I do not believe in them and I detailed my reasons then. But members of the Reform Party voted against the glasshouses. I voted that we should build higher, they voted against going higher. What do they want? They do not want to build on greenfields, they do not want to build on the glasshouses, they do not want to go higher but we have got this big housing problem that we really need to address as soon as possible. I fully agree with Senator Moore that we do have to try, whether we can do it or not, well, we will have to see but if we do not set an ambitious goal we are not going to get anywhere. There was a little bit of good news I noted earlier in the debate, Senator Mézec said he was going to retire to the coffee lounge and say nothing for the rest of the debate. Hopefully, he may take a few other members of his party there and while they share their fairtrade mocha in the coffee room, if he wants to dial 726373 that will take him through to Specsavers. Once he avails himself of Specsavers' services I will take him round various sites, such as the Samarès development that is being done, and very impressively done, even though I perhaps would not have voted for it in St. Clement but it is very impressive, the complete renovation of the Le Squez area, the La Collette low rise that is now becoming built, the Mayfair Hotel, The Limes, the Horizon building, anybody who wants to wander out now in St. Helier will see cranes everywhere. It is quite wrong to say that nobody has been trying to build housing and I use the word "housing" because I know Deputy Ward would not want to use units, although I noticed Senator Farnham did, Deputy Ward, if you want to put a negative mark there against him. It is very, very important to realise that there is an effort being made with housing. Yes, we need to make a bigger effort but there is plenty going on at the moment; you only have to open your eyes to see it. Let us not get too bogged down in this rhetoric that we are just ignoring the problem.

[10:45]

The other thing, while he is there if he gets a pair of reading glasses, he can go on the Jersey Alliance website, have a look at our housing paper, which will tell him that what we want to do is up the target for 3,000 affordable Andium Homes. We have put 3,000 Andium Homes to 5,000 Andium Homes by 2030. I hope that clarifies the position for him.

1.1.12 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier:

First of all, I was the person who asked yesterday for a point of clarification if we will vote for this amount of houses, what is the implication what we are committing for? It was a very helpful conversation with the Minister yesterday. I came to the Assembly and I listened for a speech from the Reform Party and there are points, most of them, that I agree with. We do need homes, we need affordable homes. I listened to Senator Moore and I agree with her. I even listened to Deputy Ash and I think the point that he made, we have to make choices where we will build. Everyone sitting here in this Assembly will need to make a choice, if it is greenfield, what type of greenfield, if it is glasshouses, if we will build higher. We cannot have it all and we do need houses. I think the point that really stuck with me, 600 affordable homes that are proposed here on rezoning, it is the target, have to put the target. I do not believe that we will reach this target through the bridging Island Plan; I might be surprised. Personally, I will struggle to see all fields but we have to have a target. After voting or not voting here the next Government needs to deliver the target, if it is through the derelict glasshouses, and bring amendments, or it is through the highest, we need to find the solution to have affordable houses and we need to have a target. With all the considerations I think I will be supporting this amendment.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Does any other Member wish to speak on this amendment? If not, I will call on the Minister to respond.

1.1.13 Deputy J.H. Young:

I think that it is an extremely good opening debate. I think the last speaker echoed the very words when I was elected Minister for the Environment and taking on the task of producing the plan for the Assembly. This process requires choices, we have to choose between options which are in many cases conflicting, and that is why we have a plan. It is a plan. It cannot be based on exact information, it is based on the best possible information or best available information; the figures are estimated but they have gone through a long process. I have to challenge the view that these figures are without foundation. I am trying to find the actual word used; baseless. They are not. I point Members to the inspector's report because the report was very brief and succinct but they devote 3 pages of analysis to the evidence that they considered on both the housing need because that is part of the story and it is true, the *Objective Assessment of Housing Need* that Senator Mézec referred to is 2018. But of course, beyond that and, well, that identified a shortfall and of course we have not been able to have that revision, we had COVID. I cannot remember the time but if Senator Mézec perhaps had been able to see that through we might have had better numbers, but they were the best numbers and so we have to use them. They are absolutely not fiction. The inspector's report, again, pages 21 to 24, I am going to pick out a couple of phrases, if I may. The inspector finds: "The cautious approach taken by the Minister, we find it is prudent and logical, take into account the available evidence and the obvious uncertainties flying from Brexit and the COVID pandemic." We got to a calculation there and the issue was how did that estimate need compare to the estimated supply? We are starting from numbers here where already ... and Deputy Ash referred to cranes everywhere in St. Helier. The last figures we had on homes under construction now or at least the last figures, I think, 1,325 under construction, homes under construction. There are 1,000 homes that have planning permission and the assumption based on historical trends and evidence is that we plan on the basis that 70 per cent of those, 70 per cent of 700, will come forward during the planning period. Some of those 700 are probably already now under construction, updating the number of homes under construction, so that is around 2,000. We are about halfway there but not enough and that was the issue that the Island Plan had to grapple with and the inspector reviewed in great detail. I know Senator Mézec was not able to be at the inquiry, I think the Senator was ill, I understand that. I am sure if the Senator had been there he would have been able to fully state his case with the inspector, but others were and this was thrashed out. I cannot recall whether Deputy Morel was there. I think Deputy Morel may have attended something else but I do not remember and I apologise to him if I get this wrong. I watched all the videos back, I do not remember the challenge that Deputy Morel has made to the veracity of these numbers being made at the inquiry and I will correct that, but I do not remember it and nor did the Housing, nor did the planning officers who were present at that inquiry. It is a technical business, it is difficult. It is about using the information we have got, the best available. What were they trying to address? We can be pretty firm about what is under construction and what is likely to come forward but what about the rest? There is a real shortfall. On assumption a decision had to be made, how much of that shortfall should we seek to recover in the planned period or build or to catch up? During the planned period, how much of it? We know that the 2,000 homes, which is where we are now, is our current starting point in the capacity industry. Deputy Morel says there is no information. Again, this was an issue thrashed out at the inquiry. The inspector's report deals with it; 2,000 is our current where we are now, so we could have gone to a much bigger number. But what we decided to do was to assume we could achieve half of the shortfall. Half of the shortfall is what drives the targets that were proposed in the Island Plan, the targets which the inspectors are now telling us why we need to just increase even more, hence this amendment; 50 per cent but that is still a doubling. The key thing about the Island Plan - and this is the criteria for planning processes everywhere and the inspectors addressed this - it has to be deliverable. We could have a plan that says we are going

to meet 100 per cent but we would not have a chance of being able to triple the rate of homes production, we cannot do it. The industry said that they are geared up, their evidence from the construction industry at the inquiry was they are geared up to do it. With the impact as well of modern construction methods and labour efficiency and that whole agenda which they are very active on, they support it, they think this is something which is doable. But of course, the jury is out, as Deputy Gardiner says, we have to set a target and those Members have said that we have to and do our best to try and achieve it and have a plan if we are doing it. I very much enjoyed the Reform speeches. I particularly, I have to say, enjoyed Deputy Tadier and welcome into the Assembly because I used to sit next to Deputy Tadier and I loved his wit. Somehow or other the disembodied voice of Deputy Tadier coming over, no, it is not quite the same as what it is in here with his wit. I congratulate him on that because I think he did get his point across very effectively with that. I am not challenging the logic of what he said; we are saying you poor guys have greenfields that are only worth ... we are not going to let you have the crown jewels by developing it for open-market housing, we are going to make sure you just get half the crown jewels for affordable housing. At the same time we say we want the full crown jewels from our own lands but of course that does not take into account ... nor did the various positions of the Reform members when they dealt with the issues of the sites. I think the proposition has said, and I am just going to read it if I might, sorry if I go offline, it says here ... the point is this, the homes in the built area could be used for anything. The land in the built area can be used for open market, can be used for affordable homes and of course where we own our own lands we could develop them for affordable homes. That is the choice that the members of the Reform Party are offering us in amendments, which we are going to be coming to later on after we have got through this part of the housing section. That is on amendments 25 and 41 that deal with the issue of how and what type of homes we develop on both States-owned land, that is in amendment 25 and also in amendment 41 - I hope I get the order of these right - is about what impositions we put on over market developers to produce a portion of homes. We have called those in the proposition, which I have put an amendment in, as assisted-purchased homes because the Reform members did rightfully flag up some of the issues which have arisen about the type of tenures that the Minister for Housing and Communities is talking about, low staff, all this type of thing and the intention there is to have more flexibility in that. But, nonetheless, we are going to have those debates and it is true possibly, depending on the outcome, that may well change this table. But I think that is a later debate, we will be able to assess that as we go through. But at the moment this table is based on us achieving a 50 per cent impact into the backlog. You see that the 600 homes that are proposed to be affordable, they are on land which is specifically zoned. Perhaps I did not get that clear across, the affordable homes in this proposition or this particular policy in the Island Plan, which is H3, is about land which is specifically zoned for affordable homes; the 600. That helps us, it is a component, it is a pretty big component of the target, yes. I do not quite see where there is a case for saying we do not like this target, we want to bring it down, we want to bring it down to 450. I think we will see, as we go through the later debates, what the States Members decide in their individual decisions, but at the moment I believe we should stick with the target because it is a target. I am just going to look to see if there are any other points, no.

[11:00]

Answer to Deputy Morel, I do not know the census data, I do not know the empty-pocket property, I am not so sure. I have railed on about this for a long time in all of the Island Plan process, why do we not know. But as we got closer to now this debate I asked: how is it going to help us if we do? I do not know what it is. It would be like reading a thermometer, that is where it is now, which way is it going to go? We know that the assumption in the demand is based on the fact that we are going to see at least a 40 per cent reduction in persons coming to work in Jersey, 40 per cent reduction and that was the figure that was discussed at the inquiry. I think I have probably said enough to persuade Members that I think we should carry on. This is not a perfect process. I think we should absolutely

stick with this and move on to the much more difficult debates. This is technical but it is an important one.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Sir, I have a point of clarification for the Minister, it is just to ask what type of thermometer?

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

I think we will move on to the votes. Members online should be prepared to vote in the chat, this is on the 90th amendment. Members in the Chamber, I will ask the Greffier to open the voting. If Members have had an opportunity to cast their votes, I will ask the Greffier to close the voting. The amendment has been adopted.

POUR: 33		CONTRE: 9		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator I.J. Gorst		Senator S.Y. Mézec		
Senator L.J. Farnham		Connétable of St. Saviour		
Senator S.C. Ferguson		Connétable of Grouville		
Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré		Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		
Senator K.L. Moore		Deputy M. Tadier (B)		
Senator S.W. Pallett		Deputy K.F. Morel (L)		
Connétable of St. Helier		Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)		
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)		
Connétable of St. Brelade		Deputy R.J. Ward (H)		
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)				
Deputy of Grouville				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy of St. Ouen				
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 G.C.U. Guida (L)				
Deputy of Trinity				
Deputy of St. John				
Deputy J.H. Perchard (S)				
Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)				

Deputy I. Gardiner (H)			
------------------------	--	--	--

2. Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - seventh amendment: Restriction of Parish Priority (P/36/2021 Amd.(7))

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

We move on to the 7th amendment, which is proposed by Deputy Gardiner, and I will ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Assistant Greffier of the States:

Page 2, after the words “the draft Island Plan 2022-25” insert the words “, except that, within Policy H5, after the words “Affordable Housing Gateway” should be inserted the words, “, where no more than 50 per cent of the allocation of affordable homes for purchase on any given site should be to people who are prioritised due to being able to demonstrate links to the Parish in which the homes are located, with no such restriction applying to people aged 55 or over,””.

2.1 Deputy I. Gardiner:

I am sure that Members remember the debate, it was my first proposition 3 years ago when I asked for 100 per cent of the houses not to go through the Parish allocations, to be open for anybody who is eligible to access Affordable Housing Gateway; that proposition was rejected. It is not that I am not aiming to have 100 per cent, at the same time I realise that the best is to find halfway in the middle and this is where the amendment to the bridging Island Plan came. We all know and discussed not once that Jersey is in a housing crisis and especially a shortage of social and affordable housing. This amendment put in the centre the first time by us, it does not touch over-55 who would like to remain in the Parishes, and I can understand why. If you look into the bridging Island Plan 2022-25 page 2: “Planning is about creating a better future, protecting our environment for generations to come and enabling sensitive development that improves the lives of people now and over the long term. The Island Plan is hugely important for Jersey. It sets out how, as a community, we will create homes, strengthen our economy, protect and improve our environment, provide for a good quality of life and enhance what is special about our Island.” The key word I wish to focus on, it is from the quote, as you can imagine, is community. The idea of building a strong and inclusive Island-wide community, in line with our common strategic goals, it means that we have the Housing Gateway open for the community. Up to 50 per cent for the housing Parish links is a compromise that can ensure that people who would like to stay, and it is really important to stay in the Parish, and they would be willing to wait maybe another 5 or 10 years when the Parish will have development, will continue, and at the same time 50 per cent of the residents in the Parishes that do not have Parish developments: St. Helier, St. Saviour, St. Clement, probably Grouville also will not have many Parish developments and, it looks now, will be able to access according to their eligibility and not according to their Parish connection. I am proposing my amendment.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Is the amendment seconded? [**Seconded**] Sorry, Deputy Southern, did you have a ...

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Point of clarification.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

If the Deputy wants to accept it, yes.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

The problem is if we vote against, if we vote your 50 per cent down, what do we revert to? Do we revert to 100 per cent or zero per cent?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

From what is my understanding in the latest, it will depend on the Parish schemes. Some of the Parishes would be willing to open it to Island-wide and some of the Parishes still will have Parish development that will have their Parish connections. This will allow at least secure that where the Parish developments would go forward would have 50 per cent open to the Island.

Deputy M. Tadier:

I think it is a clarification but the proposition does not say that, it says: "No more than 50 per cent." If a Parish wants to give more than 50 per cent of its allocation to people with Parish links they cannot do that, is that what the ...

Deputy I. Gardiner:

No, it is no more; so they can give 70 per cent, 80 per cent, as much as they wish, but no more than 50 per cent to the Parish links.

2.1.1 Deputy J.H. Young:

To rise briefly, I have indicated I was going to accept this; I still support it. I think it is important, in fact it was my suggestion that this be considered because past experience indicates that when it comes to this difficult subject of the zoning of fields that you are going to find a very variable position between the Parishes, and it is important to have rules. Also, I recognise that this plan, it did need to address the provision of homes in the villages, which are largely products of the 1970s and 1980s development and the message I got from the Connétables that we needed to allow a limited but very controlled expansion of those areas to ensure those communities remain sustainable in the future. That has meant that I did encourage dialogue with the planning officers in the Parishes and obviously they have the community to deal with. I think it is important that in the rules for the Gateway that we integrate that with the issue about Parish connections. I think that was an important element of trying to ensure as best we can that what we do in these decisions is, as far as we can, supported by a majority in the Parish communities. In the past I know the example, this is back in my civil servant days, when a major development took place in Belle Vue Pleasure Park, which was developed for - I cannot remember - I think nearly 300 homes and there was the same issue arose and the 50/50 solution Island-wide be Parish connections but all of which have to qualify as affordable. I think the Minister for Housing and Communities will probably make that claim, the issue about qualifications and running the Gateway and the rules of that are all set within the Minister for Housing and Communities' gift; that is what the zone is. As far as the Island Plan does is just create the category, the designation affordable but I support this.

2.1.2 Deputy K.F. Morel:

I stand to agree with the Minister and support this amendment. To me it seems eminently sensible. I completely understand why Parishes want to maintain Parish links to new housing but, equally, as Deputy Gardiner puts it so well, we are an Island 9 by 5 and, potentially, to restrict some rezoned affordable housing areas to purely Parish links, which theoretically is possible if we do not bring this amendment, it just seems untenable in today's world where at the end of the day you jump in a car and you can drive from Corbière to Gorey in half an hour. As much as many people want to remain in the Parishes that they know best and they will try absolutely to do so, that is where the 50 per cent comes in. It enables Parishes to say: "Yes, half of this housing is for people in this Parish already or have strong links to the Parish but we just have to accept that the other half, quite rightly, is open to people on the Gateway from all over the Island." That in itself creates a good mixing of people as

well. It is really important that we do not segregate people. People with Parish links, people without Parish links and keep people separate. Communities thrive because of mixing and because of learning from each other. As a result of that, I think, to me, this seems like an eminently sensible amendment. If people think otherwise I would be really interested to hear their views.

2.1.3 Connétable J.E. Le Maistre of Grouville:

I wish I had spoken before the Minister because I have some sympathies with the proposition before us. But Grouville will not have a Parish-sponsored scheme sadly because I have withdrawn mine. If the Minister feels that what he is putting forward is accepted, what involvement will the Parish have in providing homes - I know needed by my parishioners - in their district? He will not be able to answer because he has already spoken but perhaps his Assistant Minister might be able to.

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

I remember the debate around the first proposition the Deputy brought and I spoke in it and opposed the proposal then because I believed it important to retain the Parish links. They are people who do wish to continue to live in the Parish in which they have close links and family links very often. It has been a success story in the past, developments have gone ahead because they have had Parish support because parishioners were often moving into the new developments. But what the Deputy has done this time I think is entirely fair, and I commend her for understanding the reasons why parishioners might want to think that way and I would support it. I thank her for bringing this amendment. For our part in St. Ouen, I have discussed it also with the Connétable, we would be very happy with a split of 50/50 in anything that we can create in St. Ouen.

2.1.5 Deputy D. Johnson of St. Mary:

Perhaps I will begin by saying I am in no way challenging the proposition and I understand the merit of it. In fact, the last housing development in St. Mary we have a fair proportion of our properties occupied by people outside the Parish and the mix goes well. I am just concerned or confused about the actual wording. The 50 per cent allocation can be given to people who are prioritised due to Parish connections.

[11:15]

But the restriction applying to people aged 55 or over, does that technically mean that a Parish could use its 50 per cent allocation fully to younger people and, in addition, people over 55 would have priority in respect of the other 50 per cent? Could she clarify that please?

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

I am happy to support this. As Constable of a Parish and a relative newcomer to my own Parish because I have only lived in the Parish for just over 30 years - I grew up in St. Aubin - it is very good to support the community and I really understand why people want to live in the community they grew up in. It is also very good to have people from other Parishes, like myself, moving to another Parish. I do support this. I would also like to say - because this will come up in a later debate - that I have lost count of the number of over-55s who have spoken to me who say they would love to downsize or rightsize but we absolutely have nowhere in the Parish to do this. I welcome this, I think it is really healthy.

2.1.7 Connétable J. Le Bailly of St. Mary:

I am concerned that we are considering to make this law. If we have 20 housing units in the Parish and we have 20 parishioners, I think the first pick should go to those parishioners. But if we have 20 houses and we only have 2 parishioners that want them, then fine, they should go to outside people and it does not matter who they are. Everybody wants a first home. I cannot understand why we need to make a law on this. If we were to produce enough housing we would not have this problem.

2.1.8 Connétable R. Vibert of St. Peter:

I had the opportunity to speak with Deputy Gardiner a few minutes ago and I perhaps come to this from a different approach to the previous speaker, in that I said I certainly would support this but in a way I was hoping it was not necessary. Because I feel that the traditional Parish development is not necessarily the mechanism by which we should be delivering houses today. I applaud the Minister for saying that all the affordable housing in the areas that we have zoned must go through the Gateway because I think that is the fair mechanism for deciding who should be allocated a house and who should not. Yes, within that Gateway there would be possible provision for a Parish link. But I would hope that that Parish link perhaps does not reach the 50 per cent level. Because it is quite important to have people from other areas of the Island within our community, and I think that benefits the community to be welcoming people from other parts of the Island. That is my view and that is the model that I will be proposing, that if we rezone the fields in St. Peter that is the model that we will be working to. We will work with Andium, it will not be a Parish development in the old traditional form. We will discuss with Andium, it has an impact on our village, but that is the Parish involvement. It is not to decide who is allocated a house and who is not. I think back to the 1970s and would this be acceptable today? Where quite literally the old Constable, and I am sure he will not mind, W.P. Le Marquand, pulled the names out of a hat, quite literally, of who would get a house in La Grande Pièce and build a bocage. I presume that some form of Parish list had been put together and that the lucky recipients got their piece of paper and got on with building their own house. Because the situation then - and, sorry, digressing slightly - but they were delivered a shell of a house and they then built the interior themselves and completed it. That is the reason why many of them have never moved, because they have that strong connection with having built the interior of their house. Anyway, thank you very much but those are my views on this, and I will support Deputy Gardiner.

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

I am happy to follow my Assistant Minister there and some of it with very good views. I am worried about possible unintended consequences with this because when I speak to students and parents, which I have done a lot of recently, their concern is clearly about housing, as we all know. But it is the over-55s; could an unintended consequence of this be that all the Parish housing schemes just go 100 per cent over-55s instead? I have a few friends that have bought into the Parish systems and they are all young professionals. Could we be ending up doing something via putting this in law that would mean that there would be less housing for young first-time buyers with strong Parish links, which is what I think the whole system was set up to do and then it all goes to over-55s; 100 per cent Parish links over-55s? I am just a bit curious. I would not mind if the Deputy in her summing up would just address whether she feels that that is a possibility or if that is an unintended consequence that has not been considered.

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

I regret that I am unable to support this amendment due to its prescriptiveness. We have in St. Brelade no available sites over which we have influence at this moment in time. But my view is that parishioners and their families before them have supported their Parishes through the payment of Parish rates, so surely they must have priority and the weighting must be significantly in their favour. However, if there were to be a Government development then maybe my view would not apply. I do not keep a list as such because we have nothing to offer but in the past the filter has been fair and scored on the basis of Parish connections in a variety of ways, and it seems though the Constable of St. Martin could well qualify.

2.1.11 Deputy G.C. Guida:

I will try to answer the few questions that I got. The first thing of course is that it would have been fair to give 100 per cent of any new housing development to the Housing Gateway to deal with

according to the waiting list. However, we know that historically some developments, especially within the Parishes, have been done with the interest of the Parish in mind, usually for extremely altruistic reasons. For example, I feel that might be given by an owner in the Parish for development if the fields could be used to house the person's neighbours. We did recognise that there was a reason for keeping a Parish need where necessary and we referred this compromise to Deputy Gardiner, which she accepted gladly. In this case it is a maximum figure and everything does go through the Housing Gateway anyway. When a Parish has a development that has a strong Parish link for any particular reason, for example, because the land was given to the Parish, they can request that up to 50 per cent of the houses be given to people who have a Parish link. That does make sense because, again, sometimes it is children of the Parish or grandparents of the Parish that are trying to find a home. That is the principle but I think the most important thing in it is that everything does go to the Gateway and the Gateway manages its waiting list, as it wants, with one of the characteristics being the Parish links but only to a maximum of 50 per cent of the houses. I hope this answers the question.

The Connétable of Grouville:

I beg your pardon, it did not quite answer the question I was asking, which was Grouville will have no Parish-sponsored fields; there is only one field put forward, it has been put forward by the Minister. How much, say, will the Parish have in promoting those who require affordable homes who have Parish connections in that particular instance?

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Deputy, is that a question you are able to answer?

Deputy G.C. Guida:

Yes, but I am still not sure I quite understand it. If the Parish does not have its own developments, its people will go on the Gateway like anybody else in the Island and they will have to find homes in other Parishes all the way to the maximum of 50 per cent if that development has been sort of pre-empted by a Parish. But, again, this is not going to affect probably many of the developments, when there is a very strong link between the Parish and the development, again, because of a gift of land. Because the Parish is the developer, there is at least one case that we know of, so the Parish is the developer of the land for the parishioners and what we say is, yes, but only for 50 per cent of the available housing; the other homes have to be made available to people on the Housing Gateway list, according to their other characteristics.

2.1.12 Deputy G.P. Southern:

I suppose the question it comes down to in the end is if we accept this proposition do we end up in a better position than otherwise we would. I think the answer to that is yes, so I think this has my vote. I just want to make a few remarks about the way the system works. Because I was involved in the scrutiny of the Gateway and, quite frankly, at the time I was completely gobsmacked when we said, yes, on an Island 9 by 5 we will have a central organisation with clear, set-out rules as to who gets housed and in what order and who gets priority. Then we will have an extra little bit built on to it to allow the Parishes to say who gets the houses, and I just could not ... how do you work that? So, it is not a centralised scheme, it is the same scheme as we have had for centuries with the Parish getting priority. That does not make sense to me. Nonetheless, having said that, it is still happening. This contains the words "no more than 50 per cent" and, therefore, has the structure of a limit so at least we are getting a decent allocation and prioritisation for most of the people coming before the Gateway. But really the time will come soon, surely, to make sure we have a single unified system for prioritisation of housing on this Island. It has to happen soon.

2.1.13 Deputy M. Tadier:

I am a bit more interested in the statistical analysis of this and the practical way it will be administered. So, let us take a scenario where there are 100 new homes in a Parish. There are 150

applicants, 75 of them have demonstrable strong links to the Parish, 75 have no links to the Parish. Presumably, what would happen is that the first 50 homes, which you have to have links to the Parish, will be allocated to the first 50 of the 75, so you will have 25 remaining who have strong links to the Parish, and then the other 75 who do not have any links, let us say, for simplicity. I know in reality it might be more complex than that. Then you can allocate another 50 homes between the 25 who have strong links to the Parish and the 75 who do not have links to the Parish but, of course, you will have to allocate those new homes in a way which does not take into account the fact that those 25 have strong links already because otherwise it goes against what we are deciding today. There will be an inherent wish, I would have thought, or temptation from anyone to say: “Look, you could not get on to the allocated Parish housing so we will just put you on to the non-Parish housing.” So, it is really important, I think, that there are going to be strong mechanisms in place that are robust, where you have that blind, if you like, process where you do not ... because you cannot take into account whether somebody has links to the Parish, it is no longer relevant for the remaining 50 homes. That presumably needs to be done ... I do not think it can be done by drawing out of a hat either.

[11:30]

It could be, possibly, but you would probably need to have other criteria on which you score people. Or maybe you do not, I do not know. That for me is where the devil is in the detail because, of course, you could say: “Do not worry if you do not get one of these 50 homes, you can get one of the other 50.” It would be statistically worrying if, in fact, all 75 people with strong links to the Parish ending up getting a home in those 100 homes because it means we would not have abided by what we are passing today. So, I am sorry if that sounds slightly cold and analytical in the way it looks at it, but I think we cannot just pass things now which we do not think about what the consequences might be of that. The point I would make, of course, is that I do support the principle. If you are in a small Parish in particular you may not have a sufficient number of people who already have links to the Parish in order to move in and they may have made their own arrangements anyway in the meantime. People do not stand on one leg for 50 years waiting for something to come up in the Parish which is suitable and they can afford, they want to get on to the homes ladder, if that is not a tautologically strange thing to say. But we do not need to worry, of course, because as soon as somebody moves into the Parish then they have Parish links. Everybody who lives in your Parish will have Parish links. It might only be for a few days, months or years or centuries in terms of families. I think the more not concerning thing but the more interesting point here that does not seem to have solicited much discussion yet is the removal of the over-55s requirement. It seems to me in my reading that we would simply get away with it completely, we would get rid of it. Again, I do not have a problem with that but I have often questioned why we have an over-55s policy. It seems to be at best slightly arbitrary and a blunt tool. Of course, it does not stop people who are under 55 living in the property. You will get people who have slightly older spouses or partners, so you could have somebody who is 45 with a 55 year-old spouse. Of course, you can be living with your children, and increasingly it is intergenerational now. I think it can have perverse consequences for communities when we do put age restrictions on, not to mention the fact that unless it is genuinely justified to achieve a legitimate result, it is a form of discrimination which I think we can do without. So, I am very comfortable to support this but I will be interested to know about some of the practicalities on how housing is administered in reality.

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

Firstly, I was very interested in Deputy Tadier’s speech. As always on the mathematics bit, he managed to lose me almost instantly, but I am sure the logic is correct. Firstly, talking about over-55 homes, perhaps I could help him a bit by describing how St. Ouen works its over-55 allocation. Firstly, obviously you have to be over 55, but then we do a fairly in-depth analysis of need. We will go through the list and we will try to allocate homes to those people that have the greatest need, i.e. they cannot afford their rent or they have some medical condition that requires carers to come in, a

whole range of reasons but it is based on need. At the end of the day, yes, sometimes we will have people who are just over 55 living there, but broadly speaking our housing is allocated to those people who are in ... I would not say desperate circumstances but in circumstances such that a move to our over-55 sheltered housing will make their lives a lot easier and will ease some of the financial burdens of perhaps running a house or, indeed, in some cases paying high rents. So, I hope in some way that has helped Deputy Tadier at least look at the St. Ouen view of things. Moving on to the Parish allocation, if I could just describe how St. Ouen addresses the Island Plan, we set up a committee in 2018 to look at all the sites in St. Ouen that we could put into the Island Plan. That involved an awful lot of work and an awful lot of research, but why this is relevant to this particular proposition is because a number of the sites have been put forward and I have to say with the consent of the owners. I think we looked at several hundred in the process. Some of them had attached to them conditions which said: "Yes, we are happy for this site to go into the call for sites process but we would like to see some of the site, if it is passed, appropriated to St. Ouen parishioners." Now, how we deal with this is we try to be as fair and objective as we can. We have a list and the people on that list are dated in terms of the time that they have been on the list. Also, they are required, if they want to go on the list, to go on to the Housing Gateway. So, they are selected from the Gateway and then, as Deputy Guida said, then they will look at Parish connections. So, we believe that this is a fair and appropriate way of doing things. This brings me to the reason why I am prepared and keen to support Deputy Gardiner's proposal. I think it is entirely fair and reasonable that half the allocation should go to non-St. Ouen parishioners, or indeed any Parish parishioners who are looking at the housing development. We know there is a housing crisis and we know that there are people outside of St. Ouen who are absolutely desperate for homes in the same way that I have over 100 people on my list who are absolutely desperate for homes. Any development that is made in St. Ouen or indeed any Parish, in my view, should help the Island-wide need as well as helping parochial needs. So, I think it is an entirely fair and reasonable proposal from Deputy Gardiner and one which has my support. Indeed, I think in some cases if we did not support this, if we said that no Parish site could allocate houses to their own parishioners, there would be some sites that would fall away, which would be a great shame, frankly, and indeed would not help the housing crisis overall. So, in summary, I will be supporting this and I think it is a very fair and reasonable way forward.

2.1.15 Senator L.J. Farnham:

A number of the points I was going to make have already been made, but I just wanted to reinforce the fact that notwithstanding our Parishes which make up the rich tapestry of Island life and are at the heart of many communities, the Island is just a small community. The whole Island is a community, and given the sudden, should I say, deterioration in the need or the availability of affordable housing or the more dire need that is ramping up, we do need to work as collaboratively as possible as an Island. So, this amendment I think is sensible. I think it does make the system a little bit fairer but maintains some of the important Parish links.

2.1.16 Deputy R. Labey of St. Helier:

All of the Constables I spoke to in relation to this on my tour of the Parishes last year were entirely ... I asked them specifically if they were happy to work with the Gateway and all of them to a man and woman were entirely happy to do so. Certainly, the Gateway officers would be very happy to work with the Constables, too. So, there is not 2 lists anymore because all of those that once were on the Constable's list on his desk have been encouraged to go on the Gateway and people will be accessing these properties through the Gateway. So, it is one list, which is the Gateway, and on that there are various things that need to be taken into consideration; for instance, the length of time that somebody has been waiting on the Gateway list, location preferences and all sorts of other things. So that all has to be taken into account by the officers, who are scrupulous, do a difficult job and do it very, very fairly. I do not see the need for this because I think allocations should be made on the basis of need and appropriateness and fairness, not on filling quotas or percentages. So, I did not

vote for it last time; Deputy Gardiner will not be surprised for me to say that I will not be voting for it this time. Family circumstances, of course, have to be taken into account. There are lots of complex needs and requirements occasionally and that has to come into play. So, it is a difficult job that the Gateway officers are doing day in and day out, and I pay tribute to them. They do it very well. It is tough and they will certainly be very, very happy to work with the Parishes and the Constables on the allocation of these particular sites. The Minister for Housing and Communities will be there to adjudicate if they have a dispute or would like some advice or they need another pair of eyes or a decision to be made. Then I see it as the Minister for Housing and Communities' role to be the arbiter there, but they will have a formula to work to and it is broadly along the lines I have been expounding just now.

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

Sir, excuse me, I have a point of clarification if I may, if the Minister is prepared to answer.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Of course.

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

It was not clear to me when the Minister spoke a moment ago whether he was telling us that the Parish has no say at the moment in the allocation of homes to the sites that they are developing. I wonder if the Minister would just clarify that for me, please.

Deputy R. Labey:

I have been working on the assumption that the Connétables would be able to get involved with allocation if that is what they wished. I think it is very important that the Constable does play a role if they want to.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Can I just check if you wanted to speak?

2.1.17 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I hope that Members will support this because I think it is very much a compromise which I think is there for what I am feeling is a minority of Parishes that want to retain this idea of Parish links in their housing developments. It sounds like most are going through the Gateway and the Constable of St. Ouen outlined how they are allocating homes based on need; I think he said the majority on need. I have found this debate very interesting. I was not expecting a debate on this because it was accepted, but it is very interesting to me from a sociological point of view because it centres around our feelings of belonging, which, of course, are of central importance to us as humans. If we view a Parish in isolation, then the logic behind the Parish links argument and of having Parish links as a designation for housing, it does make some superficial sense. So, I grew up in a Parish, my family are there, I feel attached to the people and the place, I feel I belong there, I want to stay there. We may feel on that level that it is logical, but Parishes do not exist in isolation. They are not floating around in the ether in isolation. As humans and as members of individual Parishes, we are all connected to one another. We have a responsibility to be mindful of and care for not just those who are like us and in this context who are close to us in terms of proximity, but also those humans who do not necessarily share all of our own characteristics, and that includes place of birth or childhood home. The fact is at least a third of our Island live in the urban Parish of St. Helier and many more in our suburban Parishes, one of which is St. Saviour, of course. But are we not all linked to all of our Parishes in the Island? How do we define such links? Because I feel linked in some way or another to every single Parish on this Island and I make an effort to spend time in every single Parish. I do not live out my days in a single Parish; the woodlands of St. Martin, the beaches of St. Ouen, and I could go on. So, I find the concept of Parish links problematic and I hope that the Constables

will continue to take increasing use of the Gateway and not go up to this 50 per cent that Deputy Gardiner is proposing as a maximum that can be allocated. I hope it will be much lower and that the Constables when they are creating these fantastic developments - and they are all so beautiful, are they not, and I can understand why people want to live there - I hope that the Constables will go by need and that that will take priority over some of the other ideas that we have discussed today.

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

I feel inclined to respond to Deputy Doublet because the way I read the report from Deputy Gardiner, and I did not support her initial proposition when she brought it ... I cannot remember when it was, last year or 3 years ago. I see this that she takes now a different view and she recognises the value of the Parish link, which Deputy Doublet seemed to me a moment ago to say that she does not recognise the strong Parish links that many people feel. I think if we look at the paragraph that Deputy Gardiner refers to, the Parish priority of 50 per cent, she does say that she recognises that Parish links are important to many but she also goes on to say, of course, as did Senator Farnham and Deputy Doublet, the Island is, of course, only 9 by 5 and that we need to ensure that we work together to grow as an inclusive and integrated society.

[11:45]

So I have no problem in supporting this amendment from Deputy Gardiner today because I want to acknowledge the fact that in my view she has changed her opinion and recognises very much the value of the Parish community, the 12 Parishes, albeit that they do, of course, make up a much larger Island-wide community that is the Island of Jersey, where we all live and, as Deputy Doublet mentioned, we all have links to every Parish because we travel through those Parishes, we make use of the amenities within those other Parishes. The fundamental is the link that people feel very strongly often to the Parish in which they live, so I am very pleased to support this and to acknowledge what I think is a change of view from Deputy Gardiner and one that is for the better.

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I am not sure if this is a point of clarification but the Constable mentioned that I had said I did not feel Parish links were important. That is not something that was part of my speech.

The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

In that case I retract those words, Sir.

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

It is interesting because I did vote for the last one of 100 per cent and I will give you a little bit of history. I was born in St. John and then I moved west to St. Ouen, then to St. Peter, and I have now gone east to St. Martin. Now, that would give me 4 opportunities, so this for me is about equality as much as anything. That would give me 4 opportunities to have links to certain Parishes or certain areas. So I had a discussion with one of my colleagues in the last couple of moments and they have only lived in one location. That location is a location that does not actually provide any Parish link accommodation, which is St. Helier, of course. As a district representative, I am mindful of equality across our Island. Some speakers have mentioned that is a good fact, is it not, that it is a very small Island, so for me it is about equality. I was pleased to note that we are going and everybody is going through the Gateway now because it has to be about equality but it also has to be about need. Now, of all of the places that I have lived, although I have been in St. Martin the longest, my connection probably was more within St. Peter because more of my family are there now but also because I did things within the Parish. I have to confess I probably have not done as many things with St. Martin as I had done with St. Peter, so oddly I have lived in St. Martin longer but I probably have more connection with St. Peter. I just wanted to make a point that I think it is right Deputy Gardiner brought back 50/50 because I think she believed that the Constables and the Parishes felt that they wanted to keep those connections, and I fully can appreciate that because obviously, as I said, that

has been part of my life all of my life so I can fully understand that. But I will be supporting Deputy Gardiner because I do also feel that we do need to look at equality across the board.

2.1.20 The Deputy of St. Martin:

I will be very brief, but following Deputy Le Hegarat, I spent the first 26 years of my life living in St. Clement and I still have strong links to that Parish. Those were the links that I put down in my early years, people I played with, people I went to school with, people I went to the Parish school with. Then I moved to St. Martin and I recognise those same links in young people in St. Martin, the links that go on throughout their lives. So, I think that Parish links are really important. I am a compromiser. I hummed and hawed about this when I first read it but I have to say Deputy Tadier is the one that swung me over the line. His statistical analysis of the numbers and the way he described what might happen to the 50 per cent that is not allocated as a Parish priority has persuaded me that I am going to support this. I think it is a good compromise and I am going to vote in favour.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Does any other Member wish to speak on this amendment? If not, I will call on Deputy Gardiner.

2.1.21 Deputy I. Gardiner:

First of all, I would like to thank all Members who contributed to this debate. I also would like to thank Members who expressed their support. I hope I will not forget, first of all, the Minister, who accepted my amendment, the Deputy and Constable of St. Ouen, the Constables of St. Lawrence, St. Martin, St. Peter, Deputy Guida, Deputy Le Hegarat, Deputy Doublet, Deputy Tadier, Deputy Southern, and Senator Farnham. I will try to address comments and questions. First of all, I will start with the question from the Deputy of St. Mary and also Deputy Wickenden. If you look at the proposition about 55: "with no such restriction applying to people aged 55 and over." It means if the sheltered housing downsize development will be within the Parishes, it is open to the Parishes not to have any restrictions. It can be 100 per cent and it can be zero per cent. I think it is important to understand it is no restriction. It does not mean 100 per cent will go to the Parish or zero per cent will go to the Parish. For me, over-55, it is to assist to downsize and to free bigger houses, larger properties in the Parish for the families that need bigger properties. So, I hope the 55 was clarified and I answered the question. I cannot agree more with the Constable of St. Peter. I wish it was not necessary. I wish it would be 100 per cent. At the same time, I do recognise the importance. I work a lot around community and inclusivity as one of my core values in my work. It is to listen and try to find the bridges between views. This is the reason that I brought this particular amendment. As Deputy Southern said, when we look at it, is it ideal? It is not ideal probably for either side. It depends where you are standing between zero to 100, but if it is a way forward, yes, it is. It is a way forward especially for my parishioners in St. Helier who do not have, like Deputy Le Hegarat said, any housing development and maybe the third generation of a family would like to move to and live in a house and not in the flat. They are on Housing Gateway. Deputy Tadier raised a question, and thank you to Deputy Guida, he did answer, and also the Constable of St. Ouen. If you remember my first proposition which I brought, my actual first proposition to the States 3 years ago, one of the paragraphs addressed this, that everyone should go through the Gateway anyway and from there allocation will be according to the need. There will be some movements but at the end of the day it is when the people registered, what the size is and what the need is. So, I can trust that the Gateway would know how to manage it fairly. Senator Farnham said it is about a collaborative approach. It is opening more. Deputy Doublet raised about connection to the Parish because we feel connected. I think one of the reasons that I brought the original proposition, and I am not sure if you remember this example, is the design area. When you have a bus stop on the road that belongs to Trinity, the moment that you step down from the bus to the bus stop, you are in St. Helier and 3 minutes' walk down the road you are in St. John. It is very difficult to live in that area. It was difficult for me when I was canvassing to understand when the houses of St. John finished, where Trinity finished and

where St. Helier starts. We had a couple of discussions with the Deputy of Trinity if it is a Trinity house or in St. Helier. So, it is a very close Island. Based on our common strategic plan we need to ensure every qualified resident will be given equal opportunity to access affordable housing schemes to all qualified in Jersey. It is about us as an Assembly saying one Island, one community approach, and I would be grateful if we would get this compromise and make it clear not more than 50 per cent will be allocated and 50 will be available to anyone else on this Island. I ask for the appel.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Thank you very much. The appel has been called for so I ask Members to return to their seats. Those Members online vote in the chat; for those Members in the Chamber I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had an opportunity to cast their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The amendment has been adopted.

POUR: 40		CONTRE: 2		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator I.J. Gorst		Connétable of St. Brelade		
Senator L.J. Farnham		Connétable of St. Mary		
Senator S.C. Ferguson				
Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré				
Senator K.L. Moore				
Senator S.W. Pallett				
Senator S.Y. Mézec				
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)				
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)				
Deputy of Grouville				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy M. Tadier (B)				
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)				
Deputy 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 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 I. Gardiner (H)				

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

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Thank you very much. We now move on to the 91st amendment, which is to be proposed by the Minister for the Environment. I will ask the Greffier to prepare to read the amendment. Deputy Morel, do you have a ...?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

It is just to say, as I mentioned earlier, I will be leaving now for a funeral and will return after lunch.

Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Sir, may I just make a declaration of interest in relation to one of the sites? I believe I have the right piece of land. The one in St. Mary, (b)iii, MY563, I believe belongs to an organisation of which I am a trustee. Therefore, I do not think ... and I have to say I have not had any discussions at any point on the matter, but I do not think it is appropriate for me, therefore, to take part in the vote on the overall amendment because I think it will be one vote. However, I am presuming any amendments which do not affect that piece of land I am obviously not conflicted on and, therefore, can take part in any debates on the amendments to this amendment.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Thank you very much. Can I ask the Greffier to read the amendments?

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

After the words “the draft Island Plan 2022-25” insert the words “except that - (a) the following should be removed from the list of sites to be zoned for affordable homes in Policy H5 – Provision of affordable homes – i. Fields H1186A, H1189, H1198 La Grande Route de St. Jean, St. Helier; ii. Fields MN389 and MN390 La Rue de la Haye, St. Martin; iii. Fields S729 New York Lane, St. Saviour; (b) the following should be inserted within the list of sites to be zoned for affordable homes in Policy H5 – Provision of affordable homes – i. H1248 Highview Lane, St. Helier; ii. J1109 La Grande Route de St. Jean, St. John; iii. MY563 La Rue de la Rosière and La Rue de la Vallée, St. Mary; iv. O622 and O623 La Rue de la Croute, St. Ouen; v. O785 La Rue des Cosnets, St. Ouen, and also, amend the cartographic error on the proposals map to ensure the site remains in the green zone, consistent with all other H5 sites; vi. P558 La Verte Rue, St. Peter, to be brought forward as part of a comprehensive scheme with P559 and P632; vii. P559 La Route du Manoir, St. Peter, to be brought forward as part of a comprehensive scheme with P558 and P632; viii. S341 Bel Air Lane, St. Saviour.

[12:00]

(c) in Appendix 1 – Affordable housing site assessments, from page 325 of the Draft Bridging Island Plan – i. the assessments for those sites listed in paragraph (a) should be removed; and ii. initial

assessments, as set out in Appendix 1 to the amendment of the Minister for the Environment, for those sites listed in paragraph (b) should be added; and (d) the Draft Bridging Island Plan Proposals Map Part A – Planning Zones should be amended to reflect the adoption of paragraph (a) and (b).”.

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

Probably for the public the most significant amendment in our debate, one where there is the most public interest because it concerns individual sites that all of us are familiar with. The changes and the decisions made will have long-term effects on those areas, major parts of the Island. So, my amendment deals with Policy H5. Let us remember, just to summarise the process - I will not go into detail - that we arrived at when we went through the draft plan preparation, we invited all landowners and the public to submit and forward sites for consideration in the Island Plan. We invited persons with an interest in land to put that forward. I cannot remember exactly how many there were, but there were several hundred. They went through a process of technical officer evaluation under a series of different categories. All of those were detailed in the working documents that were submitted to the planning inquiry. Because what one had, my recollection was, is that out of those several hundred came a top, I believe, I think from memory - I apologise if it is not exactly right - 16 sites that were proposed in the draft plan for inclusion as affordable homes. Those homes, most of them, I think were involved with ... there were lots of processes that went on in the Parishes. That was not a prescriptive process. The view I took is there should be open consultation between the planning officers and the Parish communities and I think from what I know the way that was done varied considerably according to the preferences of the Parishes. Some Parishes set up what you might call unofficial committees to guide them, others were led by the Connétable. Others were done in different ways. I think there was one which was rather more formalised than that, which did surprise me and I have to say I was not aware of until very late. I did not know that previously a predecessor Minister for the Environment - I think it was former Senator Cohen - had signed a Ministerial Order setting up a committee in St. John. I did not know that was the case. I am sure the Constable of St. John will refer to that when he speaks about those fields. But nonetheless, I think the point was that I sought to make sure that during the process of the plan formation there was that dialogue so what we arrived at was understood. Obviously, I took the view that it was not for me to be prescriptive about how we ensured that the Parish communities were fully engaged. That I felt was a matter for the Constables. But what we did do is we had a series of roadshows where planning officers went to the Parishes and put details of the fields under consideration on display. We used all of the modern methods as well, through the internet as well as those in-person workshops, all of which where we ended up arriving at the listed sites that went to the bridging Island Plan. Sorry, I should have mentioned en route to the bridging Island Plan inquiry a number of Members submitted amendments, both to take out sites that were in that list, which I think colloquially is known as the plan A list, and to include new ones. So, I did when I went to the planning inquiry ... because I recognised that there were some sites which may not be approved by the States and recognising that there was a target of the number of homes that we needed to identify, I asked the officers to go through the next tranche under the first 16 and look at a number of sites as to whether or not I should ask the inspector his opinion on those, which I did. I provided a list of those sites and, in fact, those, of course, we are in a position now that the inspector considered those and gave me recommendations on both. He gave me recommendations or gave us recommendations on list A, his opinions, their opinions, and on list B, which were the maybes or reserved sites, if you like, whether or not he thought they were suitable or not. That came back. Without going into the details of when and where and whatever, but when I got the inspector's report I then had to ... I thought it was the right thing to do to ... well, in fact, more than the right thing, it needed to be done. I needed to correct or adjust the Policy H5 in - if you want to look it up - page 193 in the draft plan. These were sites for affordable homes. I needed to adjust that to bring it into line with the inspector's conclusions and the decisions that I wanted to bring forward to the States. So, I put them in this 91st amendment. Obviously, since lodging the amendment there are new things that have happened in that we have now 5 amendments

been lodged since to vary that, but obviously we will deal with those amendments one by one after we deal with the generality, talk through the generality. The amendment, I suppose, the 91st, is basically 2 provisions: point A and point B. The first point dealing with part (a) of the provision, it lists sites that were proposed in the plan A list, where I decided that they should be removed. I will go through those. I need to do this in detail, I am afraid. I will try and make sure I get it right. The first was fields 1186, 1189, 1198, La Grande Route de St. Jean, St. Helier. I am seeking to remove that from the list as a result of the recommendation of the planning inspectors, which is principally because of recognition of their importance for the remaining organic dairy industry. I can tell Members that that was not an easy issue. We went to considerable lengths to try and get evidence on the basis of the agricultural value and I think in the end, in the absence of that evidence, I went forward in the draft plan. But clearly evidence has come to light, it came to light in the planning inquiry, I remember it. I think that the chairman of the Jersey Milk Marketing Board spoke on the subject and, indeed, I think the Constable of St. Saviour, with her knowledge of that industry, too, has spelt that out. I should point out that I have had representations from the landowners saying that they disagree with that evidence, but nonetheless I am maintaining what I said. I am maintaining the proposition to remove it from the list, those 3 fields, and thereby that does have the effect of accepting the amendment 1 that Deputy Le Hegarat had lodged during the first period anyway. The second pair of fields which are sought to be withdrawn from the plan A list are St. Martin 389 and St. Martin 390, La Rue de la Haye, St. Martin, which is south of the village green. I think this was again, I have to say, difficult to be sure of the landowner's position on this. I think it became uncertain and I think, therefore, it was decided that, given the uncertainty or the unwillingness of the landowner ... because there is no point in having a plan if the plan is not achievable. That should be removed. The third one is fields S729 New York Lane, St. Saviour, which Members will, of course, know is the glasshouse, where I think the owner there had other aspirations for that site. Although it came forward as part of the call for sites for affordable housing, the owner changed his mind and, therefore, I am proposing that that be removed. Those are the ones that I removed. In all there are 6 fields on point A, i, ii and iii. That deals with the removals. Then I spoke about the plan B list. This is one, just to remember, where they were not proposed for zoning in the original plan but they were always higher, if not pretty well up the top, of the evaluation list in the paperwork we published of all sites way back in April 2020. I asked the inspector for an opinion on those sites and, in fact, there they are, you can see them: i, ii, iii, iv, v, vi, vii and viii. Rather than speak about them now, I think Members can see them in the proposition. In all, there are 9 fields I have put forward for inclusion. Obviously, the purpose of doing that is to meet the overall housing supply but, of course, as I mentioned earlier, amendments from Members, as they are absolutely fully entitled to do and I expected would happen. Again, I praise Members for their engagement in this. It was only a short period of time but we did have amendments which we will need to deal with once I have finished speaking. There are 3 amendments to remove 3 of those sites, which are H1248, which is Highview Lane, St. Helier, which in my own simple mind is the site up at La Pouquelaye at the back of the old Channel TV that used to be there. So, that is that one. There is a proposed amendment to take that out, an amendment from a Member, which we will need to debate. I should be saying on that one, as I have indicated, I will not be supporting that removal. Then we have amendments for fields O622 and O623 St. Ouen. In fact, I should have said the Highview site is 40 units and the O622 and O623 St. Ouen is 77 units. It is a very large site. It is on the west of the village of St. Ouen and it would be contiguous to the village area. So, I am not supporting the removal of that. Of course, we have an amendment on that specific site to debate. Then I think before I refer to the other amendment we have, I think I would like to deal with the 2 we have had amendments to put 2 new ones in, additional ones. These are ones which were not on my plan A or plan B. They are J229 St. John, which is a small site for 11 units, and J236 St. John, which is 13 units. I always mix these up. One of those is north, next to the low verge to the north, which is like a wooded area, and the other one is to the west of the village in the cemetery area or next to it. They are quite small sites. Those are to add them in, and at the moment I think I am not able to support J229. That is the one to the north, next to the low

bush. So those amendments we will be discussing. Now, I have left the S341 St. Saviour to last because I think the Constable of St. Saviour has put in an amendment, which we need to discuss, to remove that site.

[12:15]

In my note in preparation, and Members will see it in the running order, I have indicated that I will not be accepting that. Having considered further the position on S341 St. Saviour, that site is I think Deloraine Road ... I am getting a nod from the Deputy, thank you. It is not exactly my area but I think it is in quite a congested area. I have decided not to oppose the removal of that site. So, obviously when we debate the Connétable of St. Saviour's amendment, I will be supporting it. But, of course, that is losing housing units. Here I had not intended to support J236 St. John, the one from the Constable of St. John who wanted that added in. I think I indicated I did not support that but I am now proposing to accept that, so effectively, if you like, swapping the 2 out. We have a Constable in one case who does not want a site and we have a Constable in another case who does. That seems to be a very pragmatic, common-sense solution to those amendments, S341 and J236. I do not know if I am getting some muttering from down the end, but I am afraid these are the sort of judgments that we make. This is not a perfect thing. But in the end, they are all ones I have spoken of where you will be voting individually because we have to vote on those. You can have the choice. Now, that leaves us ... and I will point this out. Of course, Members who look at the detail will see under point B there are a number of sites that I propose to add in point B which are not subject to any particular amendments.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Sorry, Minister, the Constable of St. Ouen has a ... is it a point of clarification you wish to request?

The Constable of St. Ouen:

I am sorry, Sir, it may just be a problem with my hearing but could the Minister just clarify which sites in St. John he is accepting? Is it both of them, J229 and J236, or just one of them? I am sorry but the sound quality from his side of the Chamber is not that good or maybe my hearing is not that good but I did not catch the site numbers.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Sorry, Sir, I did get complaints from Deputy Pinel in front of me that I was speaking too loud the other day so I am trying to modify it a bit. I apologise, I will try to raise my voice a bit. I am trying to get this right. I will not be supporting J229. I will be supporting J236.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Thank you. Have you finished your ...?

Deputy J.H. Young:

No, I was about to ...

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Your microphone is off.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Sorry, Sir, this is quite a lot. I do apologise for the length of this but I think it is important I introduce this part of the debate properly. Members will note that there are a number of sites that I have not spoken of because there are no amendments listed for this item, so I want to talk about these. In my opinion, those sites that are not opposed at the moment by amendments ... although, of course, Members are free to vote against them in some way but there is no amendment, there is no specific amendment. I think they are very straight forward. First of all, route O785 La Rue des Cosnets, St.

Ouen, this is right out in the Les Landes area. This was a site originally zoned in the 2011 Island Plan. It is a derelict glasshouse. It is disappointing that in the last 10 years of the plan it still has not been developed. I think there is to-ing and fro-ing on that, which I am not party to, but realistically it is right out by St. George's estate. It is well out there. It does not really score very well in the sustainability criteria, frankly, very isolated. Of course, having lived out in that area for a while myself, I do not think they even have a Sunday bus service. It is pretty isolated and when your kids go to school in town they have to get up for the bus at about 6 o'clock in the morning in the dark in order to be able to get to school. It is very, very isolated and there are no pavements. But anyway, nonetheless, it is not well related to the centre of St. Ouen. The Constable will know this, I am sure. So, we were told that apparently at the examination in public the landowner came forward and said: "I am doing this" and indicated his intention: "It has been zoned for 10 years and I am getting on with it and I am doing it." The planning inspector on that basis that I should not ... that I should make sure it goes back in, so I have accepted the planning inspector's recommendation. But, of course, what we will do, and this may not be music to the ears of the developer, is that we will put this time a supplementary, we will put a requirement for bus and road improvements as part of the terms of that because it absolutely needs such an arrangement. The other benefit, because it is a glasshouse site, acknowledging one of the effects of the Senator's failed amendment, as it were, it will reduce the pressure on high-quality agricultural land because it is all really a glasshouse. That is an example of where there are exceptions made for glasshouses. We have done numerous over the years. Here is a second one. I can see the support from St. Clement. Okay, well, that will be for the next Minister I am sure. Now, the next one is MY563, La Rue de la Rosière and La Rue de la Vallée, St. Mary. I have to be honest, I am not a great expert on St. Mary so I cannot tell you exactly where it is, but the Constable has put it forward. I know of the 2 sites because he put forward 2 sites and one of the sites, MY463, I think that is not again ... I cannot remember whether we have an amendment on that, I will have to check that in a minute, but anyway MY563 is on the list of item (b) for inclusion. The Constable wants it, so on MY563 I am going to be supporting that, as I said I would. The other site that the Constable proposes, MY463, in the opinion of the officers - and I support their view - it would seriously harm the rural character of St. Mary and is too large. The site MY563, which I am happy, prepared to accept - and when I say happy I will come to that in a minute - is supported by the inspectors and it will help local need in St. Mary and introduce more younger families to the Parish. So that is why it receives that support. The J.F.U. (Jersey Farmers' Union), it has to be said, inform me it is a significant loss to agriculture. I do not know if Members have seen it. I did ask to be circulated the notes from the Jersey Farmers' Union that listed their order of buy. I hope Members have all got that. If you have not, I am sure the officers will put it in the chat. It is regretted, but this is an issue and I think one of the Members spoke about planning balance. There are no perfect decisions in planning. You just have to find out which side of the line it is and whether you can live with it. It is not a perfect world and what we have to do in this system is make the best judgments we can. Now, I am getting near the end of the list and ...

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Minister, the Constable of St. Mary wishes to intervene. Are you prepared to accept that?

The Connétable of St. Mary

I would just like to correct the Minister. It is not field 463, it is 493.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Thank you very much.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Can I have a minute to check that, please? Well, my note at the moment says it is 463, but I will get that checked and hopefully I will get the note through if I can come back in my speech, if that is okay.

I am afraid this is a complex technical business and sometimes errors do occur, but I can be very clear that I am proposing to accept MY563 and not the other one. But in the end it is Members' decisions, not mine. Sorry, I think my screen has timed out so I cannot see the answer when it comes. All right, that is better. Perhaps I will ask my Assistant Minister if he can perhaps check for me through the chat what the correct number is. The Deputy of St. Mary has challenged my reference to MY463 St. Mary and he says it should be MY493. Right, I have seen this now. I am sorry, I was wading through. The reason why I was hesitant is that I was working my way through steadily amendment 91 and the amendments to it. What I am trying to cover now is anything that is covered by amendment 91 and amendments to it. I have just been alerted to the fact that to come, once we get through this one, is a series of individual amendments, of which the 50th amendment is on MY493 St. Mary, and I am grateful for Members sorting that out, but that will come later. That was the one that I gave heads up that I would not be supporting.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Thank you, Minister. There is a point of order from Deputy Wickenden.

Deputy S.M. Wickenden:

I just want to ask if the amendment says the Minister is accepting 563 and that is not the case. If we do go on the working of the amendment, could we end up inadvertently amending the wrong field, Sir?

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

I do not think so. Everyone agrees on MY563. We are talking about a different field, which the Constable put forward and the Minister has rejected. As I was going to mention to the Minister, it is not the subject of this amendment. We do not perhaps need to get so bogged down.

Deputy J.H. Young:

I realise, if I may, that I have slipped up there. I should discipline myself rather better.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Thank you, Deputy Wickenden.

Deputy J.H. Young:

I can assure Deputy Wickenden there is absolutely no way we are going to make a mistake on the fields that make it into the final list. However, we have a journey to go yet. I am getting near to the end of the list. Then we come to field P558 and 559. P558 is La Verte Rue, St. Peter and P559 is La Route du Manoir. These are additions, because there is a field in La Route du Manoir in my recommended list A sites. That is why I have put these forward, but this has to be clearly explicitly stated: they should only go forward as long as they are brought forward as part of a comprehensive scheme of development with fields 559 and 632. The reason is because if these 2 fields, 558 and 559 St. Peter, are added ... we ask there is going to be a lot of new development in the St. Peter's village and it is absolutely clear that we need to provide for community space within that, a community open space to serve St. Peter's village, what one could call colloquially a village green. That is important to ensure that we do not end up with a wall-to-wall housing development in St. Peter's village if these 2 ends are added in. In practical terms, I believe these sites are in different ownerships. They will need to be done together and brought together in some way. Thankfully that will not be my task. It will be for those that procure development after, if these fields are included. However, I think it is a clear condition that that is the case. That is why it is in proposition (b). The last one is - I can mention because its lease is in the proposition - J1109 La Grande Route De St. Jean. I put this one in in the Sion area. The initial reaction from the Constable of St. John was one of disappointment. I am not aware at the moment whether there is an objection. The site is in agricultural use and the J.F.U. say it will be a significant loss to agriculture.

[12:30]

However, it is believed that if the site is a good enough size to put really good landscape buffers and space for the community, again, in that site, which can be done through the mechanics of a planning obligation agreement that every developer on every one of these sites that go ahead into zoning, will need to enter into to do this. That is my closing remark. As I said, this amendment is arguably the most important in the debate. If it is rejected, we will lose all of the sites. Then the Assembly will be in a position of what then to do. I certainly do not want to be party to making decisions on sites that I do not think are good sites and should not be designated. We will also fail to deliver homes for Islanders. I wanted to give you a very clear focus of what this amendment is about. Then, of course, we will be dealing with individual amendments now, I believe, on both taking out sites. I will deal with them as we come to them. I make the amendment.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Is the amendment seconded? **[Seconded]**

3.2 Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) – ninety-first amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)) – amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)Amd.)

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

There are, as the Minister mentioned, a number of amendments to this amendment and the first to be taken is the first amendment, to be proposed by Deputy Le Hegarat. I ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Delete the words “i. H1248 Highview Lane, St. Helier” and renumber the remaining items accordingly.

3.2.1 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Field 148 has previously been considered for housing and there is obviously a significant history in relation to this site. It is at the back of what used to be the Channel television site and access to this site is on a very small road. It is anticipated, of course, that some negotiation or agreement would make the access through where signal 1 is, of La Pouquelaye and through that car park. That is obviously not the case at present. It is through a very small road. It is concerning from the perspective that this is a very built-up area already. You have significant traffic congestion in La Pouquelaye with the new college site and the other site that is being developed in relation to what was previously a nursing home within St. Helier. There is a significant concern already. You have schools in this area and myself, like other Deputies, have had to deal with concerns of parishioners walking their children to school along those roads. This is on a daily basis, both afternoon and morning. At the present time we also have the new hospital site at Overdale. Both Queen’s Road, as well as La Pouquelaye, is also very, very busy. Therefore, building more homes at La Pouquelaye will only create more traffic on Queen’s Road and, of course, as I said with the new potential hospital site at Overdale. What we are doing is we are compounding more and more traffic problems. I do not believe that we have dealt with those matters at all in relation to this particular area. That is why it is reassuring that although it is more based on the fact that it was a dairy herd use of the land at Mont à L’abbé, it was concerning for the residents of that area about the traffic and about the compounding traffic in this area. In recent times, as part of the Planning Committee, I visited the old site at La Pouquelaye, because there was an application for a change of use, which obviously I did not participate in, because this is my district. However, that application was about a change of use. Infrastructure, Housing and Environment were against - I will repeat that - against the development or the change of use of that site, because, and I will read this: “Object to the proposal which could see significant additional vehicle trips generated throughout the day affecting the operation of poor junction with Queen’s Road, the operation of the bus service and also the safe passage of vulnerable

road users, including school children.” Again, I find it very, very strange that not 6 months ago, we are saying this is not suitable to have a change of use within a site that is already used for commercial purposes, but it was going to be used for a purpose and it was going to make more traffic, and the department said: “No, we are not supportive of this.” I do ask the question how this has come to that. I am very happy that we have thankfully saved the site across the road so that that dairy farmer can continue producing organic milk. Yet, here we are again, as I said, looking at another site, St. Helier. The other concern is that if we build on this site, where does it stop? If you look on your maps, there are then further green sites edging east of that particular site. I, like some of my Constable colleagues, went out on the bus last Friday morning and I must say that I was exceptionally thankful to the department and the officers that took us to the sites. We were able to see this green site being used for agriculture. It is a site that is used for agriculture. Make no bones about it, it is not green land that is not being used for any significant period of time, it is actively being used at present. From that perspective and the perspective that if you look at what we have been provided from the Jersey Farmers’ Union, this is a significant loss to agriculture. They, like I, identify we are going to have to rezone some green sites. However, we need to be careful about which green sites we do rezone. Also, I do believe that we do need to consider the residents of St. Helier, who do take the burden of development with their Parish. We do need to make sure that we are not creeping further and further into their green spaces. Part of the walking around this area is down to Valée Des Vaux and the National Trust woodlands. We do need to be careful. If we keep creeping then we will end up with a whole thing all the way to Gorey. We do need to be careful. I will be interested to hear what other Members have to say in relation to this, but I do say that it is a concern that we are looking at prime land, which has already been identified as traffic chaos by the people who are part of that infrastructure.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

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

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

I will be exceptionally brief because Deputy Le Hegarat has basically said everything I was going to say. All I can say is that this area is becoming overcrowded. Certainly, the College Gardens area is a very narrow funnel leading up to La Pouquelaye and with high-rise buildings on both sides the traffic volumes are too great. I agree with what she said 100 per cent: this site is not suitable. It is going to create further problems down the line and I hope Members will reject it.

3.2.3 Deputy I. Gardiner:

I will be also very brief. Deputy Le Hegarat covered most of the points. I have to declare, I live in that area and I experience what was presented. I do not want to call N.I.M.B.Y. (not in my backyard), because I do believe we need developments in different areas. At the same time, I have been approached by residents and I have engagement with residents and they clearly stated it is the urban sprawl into the countryside. We have St. Helier countryside. We have St. Helier green spaces. However, there are not many of them left. If you look at the map or if you come for a walk into Valée Des Vaux ... the Highview lands is one of them that leads to Valée Des Vaux. There are only 3 fields left to get some green space before you enter into the valley. Regarding the traffic, St. Helier Parish invested in 2 pavements leading to schools with children walking to different schools. As Deputy Le Hegarat mentioned, use of change of space in ITV was disputed by the government department because of the traffic. Believe me, if I leave my home, and I live at Manor Park, 8.10 a.m., I will be standing for a while to turn to La Pouquelaye, because we have traffic from Manor Park to the turning into Queen’s Road. If I left 45 minutes or 30 minutes later I might be able to do it. The traffic on La Pouquelaye in the morning and after school pick up is already very, very heavy. Apart from this, all residents in that area already have enough parking and use of the space. Let us go back to St. Helier. In St. Helier, if you look at how many units will be delivered in St. Helier over

the next 5 years, will probably touch around 12,000. We just heard about the waterfront; the 1,000 we will have at Horizon; we will have the Mayfair hotel; we will have the brewery site; we will have Randalls; we will have The Limes development; and we will have next to the Rouge Bouillon area just open. St. Helier does contribute to the housing on the Island. My request to the Members, is to consider leaving us some green space - not much - but wherever we have green space just leave it to St. Helier.

The Deputy of St. Ouen:

Could I ask for a clarification, Sir? Could I ask the Deputy, could she tell us whether the change of use application was granted or was refused?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

The change of use application finally was granted. I would like to clarify what the change of use was, it was to have a gym. What the applicant needed to present on was the increase of traffic. The applicant managed to present that there would be lots of use by the community, as you can imagine. It is up the hill, we would like to build the neighbourhood, and lots of people of the area would work and use the gym and not drive. When they presented, if I understand correctly, the amount of cars by people who would be using via the community is gone, but if we would go towards the cars it definitely would not go there. I hope that helped.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

I have nobody else to speak at the moment, but it is also 12.45 p.m. The adjournment is called for. I sense a standing vote. Thank you very much. The Assembly stands adjourned until 2.15 p.m.

[12:45]

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

[14:16]

The Deputy Bailiff:

We resume the debate on the first amendment of the 91st amendment. Does any other Member wish to speak on this amendment to the amendment?

3.2.4 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

We keep hearing the word “balance” used as we debate all of these amendments. For me, amendment 91 is causing me some concern. When I look at the amendment that the Minister has brought to us, I am quite happy to go with part (a), which is to remove fields which were submitted on the list. However, part (b) gives me some concern, because not all of the fields, from what I can see, on the list are rejected by the Jersey Farmers’ Union as being of high-quality agricultural land. I am very grateful for the J.F.U.’s report or the information that they sent to all Ministers, whereby they carried out an assessment themselves of the fields that have been put forward for rezoning for the provision of affordable homes. It is quite clear that a number of the fields that we are due to consider are, in their opinion, far too important to the use of agriculture to be rezoned for affordable homes. That comes back to the question of balance, for me, while recognising the need for the provision of affordable homes over here and indeed being able to empathise with those who are desperate for an affordable home that they can buy to have their own home to potentially raise a family in. I have been there myself, many years ago, desperate to have a first-time buyer home. I can empathise with people and I can understand how many will be listening and indeed hoping that we go with every field that has been put in front of us. The Minister said earlier the decision is for each of us as individual to weigh up the pros and cons of the value of these agricultural fields that are in front of us. The first amendment here to the amendment 91 brought by Deputy Le Hegarat is quite an easy

choice for me to support it, because the J.F.U. have said to us that it is prime agricultural land and should be rezoned as a last resort. That is how I am going to make my decision, very much on the rezoning of these agricultural fields. I will be guided by the Jersey Farmers' Union who know far better than I what is prime agricultural land and what is not. That is where I will be weighing their report up as well as, of course, listening to what other Members have to say, and then deciding which way I will vote, coming back to the balance; the balance for the need to provide affordable housing and also the balance to retain our prime agricultural land. Particularly as we know and as over the past couple of days we have heard Members refer to food security and the provision of food. We just do not know where we are going to be over the next few years. Based on that, I am supporting the removal of field H1248 as proposed by Deputy Le Hegarat.

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

While I am delighted that the Constable of St. Lawrence is supporting this proposition, I want to suggest that her reasoning may be slightly flawed. That is because I do not believe that the comments of the agricultural lobby are the only reasons for deciding not to rezone fields. They are, of course, one reason, but they are not the only reason. I would hate to think that if there was a greenfield slated for development that had other charms, other reasons for protection that the Constable would not support it, simply because it was not on the list of the Jersey Farmers' Union. I want to go back to Deputy Le Hegarat's successful lobbying for 3 agricultural fields to be removed, and which the Minister has thankfully removed from the list. These are the fields noted for their organic dairy production on La Grande Route De St. Jean. When I met the inspectors at the hearing, I urged them not to allow those fields to be included. My main argument was not about agriculture. It was about the urban sprawl of St. Helier towards Sion and then towards St. John. I will be saving, hopefully, my firepower for my own amendment, so I am not going to say a lot more now. What I will say is that there are other reasons to protect our fields that are not about food security and they are not about agriculture. They are simply about keeping Jersey green. What I will say about this particular field that Deputy Le Hegarat has spoken about is that if this or any other field on the outskirts of town is not required for agriculture then the first claim upon it should be for community orchards, for allotments, for the kind of projects that are happening near Surville Cemetery with the Grow project. Or simply for woodlands. If these fields are spare, let us plant trees on them. Why do we have to put houses and allow the town to grow out into the countryside when, as another Member has already said in this debate, St. Helier is already doing much more than its fair share of taking the homes that the Island needs. We have spoken in the past about a line in the sand to protect the coastal areas of Jersey. I ask Members to think about a line in the grass, to protect the countryside around St. Helier from further development. As I say, if these fields are available, let us have allotments, let us have orchards, let us have community gardens, let us have woodlands. We do not need houses on the fringe of St. Helier. I urge Members to support the amendment.

3.2.6 Deputy J.H. Young:

I should say throughout this debate I will try to take a partisan advocate view here, because on each of these sites my role is to advise the Assembly on the matters of the reasoning why it has been put forward. Also, to reply to any questions that come out of the debate. In this question, I was reading the inspector's words in the Constable's speech there. This is what they say about H1248: "This reasonably flat site is included and would form a logical extension to the northern edge of St. Helier, without undue landscape impact. The field has some, but not exceptional agricultural value, and any remaining ecological features in the surrounding hedgerows could be retained through development brief conditions. The Minister's main concern regarding access is likely to be resolved through negotiations with the owner of the adjoining industrial premises to achieve a new road through an existing car park. This leads on to La Pouquelaye, a mainly residential street. In summary, this relatively sustainable site, close to the urban facilities of town, would add much needed affordable housing provision in broad compliance with the overall bridging Island Plan Strategy." They

recommend it on the basis that it appears. That reflects the fact that agricultural value is one factor and the word “balance” has been used. The decision or not, I believe, involves a whole series of different elements: landscape, traffic and transport, the agricultural value, achievability, and so on. There are a whole host of factors. That is what I mean by a balance. Members are entirely entitled to take a view by one criteria only. My role as Minister is to try and get a recommendation as close as I can to the balance. It is a good site. It would yield 40 homes, approximately. The factor that Deputy Gardiner raised about the history of planning application detail regarding a building that is already on this site, where ... if I may just peer down here and read from the note. It says: “The planning application for the June that the Deputy referred to, CTV House, La Pouquelaye, was initially refused by officers.” Then it was reviewed and went to the Planning Application Committee. The planning application resolved to approve it, but decided to make it subject to a P.O.A. (Planning Obligation Agreement). That agreement has yet to be finalised, so no decision as yet has been issued officially. That P.O.A. will seek to secure funds to provide improved pedestrian and cycle measures within the local area. The problem was that the application did not give enough information to be able to do that. Hence, that is where we are. Moving on, that is just an existing building. If this were to be approved and there is a completely new set of developments then a P.O.A. would be required from the developer, which would deal with new access and probably require off-site improvements to the junction and bus services and so on. All of that, of course, would go much further than the planning application that was proposed for the existing building, CTV House. That is quite normal in terms of the planning process. The information, I would say to the Assembly, is that that matter, if it is zoned, would obviously be a feature on the absolute condition of the P.O.A. and those costs would fall to the developer. Thank you, Sir, that is all I want to say on the amendment.

[14:30]

3.2.7 The Deputy of St. Martin:

I will be very brief. We now get down to the crux of it: 610 is the total, the target we set ourselves this morning. Of those we know 139 are already secured; another 26 are sort of secured with a potential for reallocation, but we know that is not going to happen; 134 is the number suggested by the Minister in his additional list and there is no challenge lodged to those. We are down to the 311 that we have left, which have amendments. We have 49 per cent in the bag and we have made a good start. Here we are with the first site and we are facing as difficult a balance as we could possibly be. A typical balance, if I might say so. A site adjacent to the built-up area, very much so and a site within literally a few 100 yards of both a primary school and a secondary school, so no need for children from this site potentially to have to be taken to school in a car. However, as has already been pointed out, terrible traffic problems at this particular junction with La Pouquelaye and St. John’s main road. I have spoken to the Minister, who had already agreed with me, that something will have to be done if this field is allocated for housing. Just looking at the overhead on the map, it does fit in very easily to the extension to St. Helier that the Constable of St. Helier argued against. This really is a difficult one to start off with. The traffic issues can be solved. I take on board the views of the Farmers Union, highlighted by the Constable of St. Lawrence. I am going to go with this one. I decided in my heart that we have to get to this target, we have to try to provide homes for Islanders. I am going to go with this one. I ask States Members to think carefully. There is a big long list to come and we have to make some tough decisions.

3.2.8 Senator K.L. Moore:

I shall not take up Members’ time too much, because I wholeheartedly agree with the Deputy of St. Martin and the Minister on this one. It would be really helpful if Members when speaking could perhaps indicate which sites they will support. We do have to maintain a focus on why we are here. We are here to represent the people. We all know that we are facing considerable problems with the cost-of-living crisis and people who are leaving the Island because they simply cannot find an affordable home that meets their aspirations for a decent quality of life. We have to, as difficult as it

may be, accept that some of these sites should be built on. This one, I know it particularly well. I used to work in the property adjacent and it often provided the backdrop to many an interview that we would do outside the backdoor of the studio. It does not interfere with too many homes around it, although it is part of a cluster. It is neat and it makes very little impact on the landscape, because there is already a built landscape around it. It is also walking distance to town as well as the schools that the Deputy outlined just then. A shop also services people who are there in the local district. There are other amenities very close by. We do have to find some answers here to the difficult problem. As hard as it may be, I would not be able to support Deputy Le Hegarat's amendment.

3.2.9 The Deputy of St. Ouen:

Right at the beginning of dealing with this list we are struggling. I feel I am struggling, because the arguments put forward in the amendment are so cogent. However, we have to find that balance. It is a struggle. I am wondering: do other Members have the same sort of conversations with constituents as I do? Conversations that go like: "My children would love to stay in the Island, but they cannot afford the rents, so they are leaving." Or: "My daughter and son-in-law would love to start a family, but they are stuck in a small one-bed flat and anything larger in Jersey is unaffordable for them." Or: "My grandson and his fiancé want to buy a home, but the deposit they need they just cannot manage, because it would be so large and they spend their money on rents." I am told that reasonably often, but very rarely by the people who are directly in that plight. It is more so their parents or their grandparents. Perhaps that is because of the age I am that those youngsters do not feel they can easily engage with me or perhaps they are just too busy. It is something we note often as States Members that it is the older generation who engage in political discourse with us, more so than younger people in this Island. However, it is those younger people who are having those struggles. We must not forget them when we talk about our wish to enjoy the countryside and to have allotments that existing homeowners can enjoy and traffic issues and what we may like to call the creeping urbanisation. Yes, all those things are factors that we have to weigh up, but we know we have people in this Island who desperately need homes. They are in the Island already, so this is not a migration issue. These people are our people. They are here. By definition to be able to gain one of these affordable homes, they will have been here for at least 10 years. Most of the people will have been here far longer who are on the Gateway. They are our people, who are probably living in substandard accommodation at the moment. We know that substandard accommodation exists, where it is cramped, where insulation is not good, where it may be damp, where there is no outside space for them to enjoy, and they are trying to bring up a family in such conditions. I was privileged enough to bring up a family in a bungalow that we bought which had been built on a greenfield in St. Ouen. I felt very privileged to do that. St. Ouen has built, in its village developments, on greenfields. Some opposed this at the time, but it is now a feature of our village and we have a good community in St. Ouen, thankful that they have homes to live in and that those homes were built in the 1960s and 1970s and 1980s. If they had not been built, what would our community look like? How many people would have left the Island? Some might think that would have been an acceptable outcome; that we would not have had the growth in population that we had and these housing pressures. However, the fact of the matter is that whatever our view on that, we do have those pressures now. It is wrong to say to these young families: "We are not going to adequately provide for your housing, because we think the Island is too crowded." They are here now. They are suffering in substandard accommodation now. The whole bridging Island Plan strategy, which we have been working on for the last 18 months, is to bring forward sites for affordable homes that can be built to house them. The need has been assessed. That work has been going on for the last 18 months and now it comes to the crunch and we have to make these sorts of decisions. I hope we can bear in mind the work that has gone on already in bringing this bridging Island Plan forward. The issues that have been raised today have been weighed in the balance and have been considered in public hearings. Everyone has had the chance to make their representations about them. We have appointed experts in this area to guide us with their recommendations, to gain an understanding of the pressures in the Island and to

make recommendations. We need to take seriously their recommendations, because they have appreciated the consequences of the loss of greenfield sites, but they have balanced against that loss the need to house our population. They have recommended to the Minister that it is appropriate this site be brought forward. Of course, we hold the final decision, but we should give due weight to that process that has gone on and we should give due weight to the voices that are often unheard, which is the younger people and younger families who do not have adequate housing crying out for housing. I still feel so torn. However, I have to support the process we have gone through. I cannot see a valid reason to delete this field from the list when it has been through the process and everyone has had the chance to make these submissions and it has come through. I cannot see why we should let hearts rule our heads perhaps and say we will reduce the number of homes available to those who need it. It is so difficult but I think that is the way I will be going and I thank Members for listening to me.

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

I am pleased to follow the previous speakers. Since the 1960s ... I keep referring back to St. Brelade but I had the pleasure of growing up in the old Clos des Sables; these are the bungalows just across the road from Waitrose. I can still remember to this day my playground was effectively the fields that ran from the back of Les Clos des Sables all the way up to the airport and down to St. Ouen's Bay. That playground disappeared in about the space of 3 or 4 years and we ended up with the new Clos des Sables, Les Quennevais Park, et cetera, Don Farm, and it went right the way up effectively now to the airport. There have been created in that some wonderful communities and families grew up in the area and it is a great place to live, nevertheless. It does all boil down to this lack of planning and thinking ahead of the consequences of this increasing population within every decade. From about the 1970s, 1980s, we seem to have lost control. It feels now that it is a case of the chickens are coming home to roost and the harsh reality of that lack of forward planning is now a reality. I can only describe these fields that we are looking at today as fields of hope. It is the hope of 20 year-olds and 30 year-olds and 40 year-olds, but let us face it, 40 year-olds now if they are not on the housing ladder, getting a mortgage, et cetera, becomes increasingly difficult. It is greenfields for the past say 8 years on planning. For every decision we have made to put an extra bungalow in a large ground, et cetera, all these flats in St. Helier, the whole idea was that every time we did that it would save a greenfield and, yes, let us face it, St. Helier has taken the brunt of that development. So I can understand why the Connétables and the Deputies feel so strongly about more loss of their very valuable green space, but I agree with the previous speakers that there is that little balance to be had and I think here we have the opportunity to grab effectively 40 homes for those 20, 30 year-olds, 40 year-olds who are looking to get on the ladder to put down roots to build their families in Jersey. It is something that we have all become very wary of this talk of exodus and we will not know until we get census details the true extent of what has gone on, but it is a worry. I am on the States Employment Board and I am fully aware that it is becoming difficult to recruit for the Island and it is because of the cost of housing, the cost of renting and all those things that this is not the place, because of this housing crisis, to come anymore. So, we have got some real problems ahead of us if we cannot today, over the next week or so, make some tough decisions to really deliver that hope to those people who are waiting on the list. It is a tricky one and I know Members are finding it difficult to grapple with. I could not really determine as a planning application now the site I see before me. Obviously, traffic in the area is a problem. Come to St. Brelade; we have got a traffic problem as well.

[14:45]

It is undue harm, it is all those things that this will create, but just looking at balance and if the road can be agreed through the industrial side of things then that may be the way forward. I am leaning towards something in that direction. I really ask Members to reflect on that real difficult decision that we have got to make: is it homes or orchards that have the priority here?

3.2.11 Senator S.Y. Mézec:

This is the phase of the debate that I have not been looking forward to because I expect every single amendment we come to now is going to be extremely difficult and not particularly pleasant to deal with. I desperately do not want to try to contribute to every one of those debates, so I thought I would take the opportunity to get my approach to them on the record at this point and explain the rationale for the position I will likely take on most of these. I will be supporting Deputy Le Hegarat's amendment and I will attempt to support as many other amendments that I can that seek to protect open green space and agricultural land in Jersey. I do that with a degree of reluctance, knowing that we have a housing crisis and we need to provide homes for Islanders, but I have been able to reconcile that position because of the complete inadequacy of the response from Government and for plans to make best use of what we have already got. I cannot consign more of our agricultural land and green space, part of what makes Jersey so special, to be lost when there are thousands of empty properties lying across the Island that are not being dealt with properly and for which there is currently no policy in place to get back into use in one form or another. I cannot give in to this idea that the way that we provide for affordable homes in Jersey is to destroy parts of our countryside when we will not even use the land we own to best effect to maximise the proportion of affordable homes on the land the Government already owns. I think it is a poor show, frankly, to make this a first option when they have had such a weak attempt at making best use of Government-owned land. So, I will try not to reiterate those points in the following debates that will come with the rest of the amendments, but I think that the approach that the Government have taken in this Island Plan is one that, if they get their way, I think in years to come we will lament. It will just be part of mission creep where in the next phase of the bridging Island Plan there will be even more of these sorts of fields that come through and will we have made the progress in the urban areas where there is much greater potential to produce this yield of affordable homes if it is done properly and a much greater potential to use government-owned land properly if only we had Government Ministers who have the will to do so? That, I think, would be a much more preferred option and, of course, getting those empty properties back into use and finding incentives and ways to do that, which has not been done thus far. So, on that basis, I will support the amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff:

If no other Member wishes to speak, I call upon Deputy Le Hegarat to reply.

3.2.12 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Thank you to those who have contributed and in particular those who are supportive Deputies within the area. In relation to the question that was asked of Deputy Gardiner, the reason that the Planning Committee decided to approve the change of use for the gym was because it was explained to the committee that it was not a normal type of gym. There was not an endless group of individuals who were going to belong to this gym, so there would not be hundreds and hundreds of people coming and going. It was basically a specialist gym that was only going to have a particular group of individuals who were going to use that facility at the high end, so the level of traffic was not what was anticipated. Make no bones about it, we all understand the situation we are in and the crisis that we are in and it is very difficult for all of us but I do have concerns, as does the Constable and other Parish Deputies, about the urban sprawl. I value the fact that the Constable of St. Lawrence also says about the green spaces and the use of green spaces and taking some consideration about what has been provided. Yes, most green land agricultural use is going to be the best option but there are some sites where it says that it is not the first option and that is where I think we should always potentially go first. I acknowledge that the Minister says that the inspectors said that it was a good flat site and it would fit in lovely. Yes, I accept that but it then goes on to say, and others have mentioned this, about the public hearings. Well, let us get this on record, this site was not discussed at the public hearings. It was not on the agenda. For me, that is a problem. It is a problem that we have plan A and plan B because, let us be quite frank, and I think if any of us disagree with the facts, most of us

were side-lined by plan B. I would like to challenge anybody in the room, apart from the Minister potentially, who would not agree with me because most of us were not aware or were so busy with plan A and so busy bringing amendments. Let us be honest, there were over 100 of them in the first swathe. So let us be fair, most of us were not interested in plan B because we were concentrating and focusing on plan A, which is the sites that everybody was either putting forward or taking out. So, there was no public. The public have not had the opportunity to speak about H1248 with the inspectors. That was not the case, but I also at this point want to raise something else that has irritated me since this whole thing started, and that was that I and others requested to go to all of the hearings and we were denied. We were denied access to going to every single forum. We were told we could go to the ones that were involving ourselves, so I was invited to go to the discussions about Mont à L'abbé. I was not invited to any discussion about H1248. Why is that? Because it was not on the agenda at that time. It was on the agenda after the public hearings. So this idea about this is all done and dusted and everybody has had their say, no, they have not and so this is where I think fundamentally we have made errors. Grouville is a classic of it, is it not? All of these sites suddenly came through the back door and everybody is up in arms because, let us be fair, we should have said: "This is plan A and put as many sites as you like on plan A" but do not shove something in at the back, having discussed plan A and then think of plan B. I am sorry, for me that is not acceptable, so I fully accept what the Minister says about the inspectors saying it is a good site. It is a flat site, so it is a good site, but the concern is as well it says access is going to be through the current site of the old Channel Television. Well, that is just the presumption because we have not got that in writing to say we can definitely come through here. If that does not happen, we are then back into a very small, narrow lane. The other thing is when I did my opening speech the infrastructure have said that it was not suitable to have a gym but we can build 40 houses on it. Well, quite frankly, there is going to be a lot more traffic going backwards and forwards, I would suggest, for 40 houses than there is in relation to a gym. I fully accept that, yes, we are in the walking zone for schools, the junior schools and also the senior school, but also we have now said but it is only going to be suitable if we end up in a situation, as somebody said, about we are going to change the layout of the road. Well, we are all waiting for the changes that are going to come with any future new hospital. Excuse the expression, cart before horse, because I am not satisfied that this is going to happen. As I said, a number of people - Senator Moore, the Deputy of St. Martin and the Deputy of St. Ouen - rightly are against my proposition and will vote against it because they principally say we have to put it somewhere, and I think we all agree with that. I cannot argue those things and I cannot argue their points because they are factually correct. I cannot argue with that and there is very little or any point in doing so and the fact is that we have to take the recommendation seriously, but I am concerned ... and people have talked about having the opportunities themselves for first-time buyers homes and we all are fully aware of that and the need for that to happen. I think that is going to be me and whether I do or do not agree with my Constable in relation to if we do not save a greenfield for agriculture we could have a park or other green space, et cetera, that is for another day potentially. But for me at this stage we are not talking about putting trees on it or anything else. We are talking about putting houses on it and, for me, in relation to this particular location and the huge traffic issues that are there already and will only get worse with the hospital site at Overdale, I make my proposition and hopefully people will support it.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Sir, a point of clarification if I may, please?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Do you agree to give way to the Minister for a point of clarification?

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Of course, Sir.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Thank you to the Deputy. Could the Deputy confirm that the inspector's report on page 32 includes the full paragraph that I read out specifically in field 1248 and could the Deputy confirm that the existence of that list was in fact advertised in August of last year? The inquiry took place in November and so just to confirm to make that case and also that it was open to representations that were available for anybody to attend but they needed to make representation to an inquiry in order to do so.

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

I did make representation to the inquiry, because I asked to go and attend so that I was able to listen to everything that was going on. I was told that that was not a possibility. I was advised by whoever was organising it that only the people that were invited, only the people that had brought propositions or amendments or were asking for certain things, but we were not given an opportunity to all go to everything. I acknowledge what the Minister said, but what I am saying is that those sites were not ... when we went to those hearings I was only invited for the sites that I had made an amendment to and when I asked to be able to go to others I was told no. That is what I will say. I shall find my email to send to the Minister, if I can find it, but that is what I am saying. I believe that other people may be able to.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is the *appel* called for? The *appel* has been called for and Members are invited to return to their seats. Those joining the meeting by the Teams link are invited to cast their vote in the chat channel and I ask the Greffier to open the voting to Members in the Chamber. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting.

Deputy M.R. Higgins:

Sir, when the vote is announced can we have *pour* and *contre*, please?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes.

[15:00]

I can announce that the amendment has been adopted.

POUR: 23		CONTRE: 18		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator S.Y. Mézec		Senator I.J. Gorst		
Connétable of St. Helier		Senator L.J. Farnham		
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Senator S.C. Ferguson		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré		
Connétable of St. Brelade		Senator K.L. Moore		
Connétable of Grouville		Connétable of St. Mary		
Connétable of St. Peter		Connétable of St. Ouen		
Connétable of St. Martin		Deputy of Grouville		
Connétable of St. John		Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)		
Connétable of St. Clement		Deputy of St. Martin		
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)		Deputy of St. Ouen		
Deputy M. Tadier (B)		Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)		
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)		Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)		
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet (S)		Deputy J.H. Young (B)		

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

3.3 Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) – ninety-first amendment.(P.36/2021 Amd. (91)) – fourth amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)Amd.(4))

The Deputy Bailiff:

The next amendment to be debated is the fourth amendment to the amendment lodged by the Connétable of St. John and I invite the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Insert a new line “ii. J229, La Route du Nord, St. John” and renumber the remaining items accordingly.

3.3.1 Connétable A. Jehan of St. John:

I came to this process of the bridging Island Plan somewhat behind the curve. However, my predecessor had done a lot of work on it and both he and I have been ably assisted by the Parish of St. John Comité Rurale or, to give its full name, the Comité Commune Rurale de St. Jean. The Comité Rurale is a properly elected body with members elected at a Parish Assembly. It is made up of 8 laypeople from different backgrounds and areas of the Parish. The Constable and Deputy are both ex officio members, bringing the group up to 10. There is often robust debate at the comité meetings with very differing views, albeit everyone involved wants what is best for the Parish and the Island. I would like to pay tribute to this group of dedicated Parishioners for both their commitment and the quality of their work. The team have been led very ably by our chairman, Mr. Ian Touzel. It is disappointing when their efforts have not been recognised by the Minister and they and we have followed the process to the letter. Fortunately for me, I served as both deputy chair and subsequently chair of the comité for the last Island Plan, having been elected to the inaugural committee in 2009, so I was familiar with the work, the aims and aspirations of the group. The group has once again carried out widespread consultation, a questionnaire being delivered to each of the households in the Parish with a 17.6 per cent return rate. The results of that survey enabled the group to look at what Parishioners felt was needed within the Parish. In the summer of 2020 a plan was circulated as part of a 3-page article in the Parish magazine, a vehicle that has been used to communicate throughout the process. The Parish magazine is also delivered to every home in the Parish on a quarterly basis. The 3 amendments that I am bringing on behalf of the Parish all featured in that original plan. I have received one letter of complaint; yes, just one, and that was not for this site. We advertised the Island Plan roadshow again with a letter to every home as well as on our social media and members of the comité were in attendance when the Island Plan came to St. John and we displayed the results of the survey at that event. In addition, the survey results have been and are available on the Parish website. The Parish of St. John has a long tradition of providing homes for both young and old alike. Last year the first village scheme reached 50 years and some 35 per cent of the homes are still occupied by the original tenants with others having been resident there for 30 and 40 years. Just 2 years later, the first phase of the Parish sheltered housing was opened at

Maison Le Vesconte in 1973 with 12 units of accommodation, with phase 2, a further 10 units, opening in 1991. There was and is widespread support for the provision of additional rightsized properties for both rental and purchase within the Parish. The site being proposed is right next to phase 1 and 2, the first 2 phases being linked by a footpath, and the comité have discussed the extension away from the village and believe that it is the right thing to do. The intention would be to retain a border of trees to the northern and western boundary lines. The comité did meet with someone who wanted to develop fields 228, 230 and 238. These fields are directly to the north and west of 229 but the comité came to the same conclusion as the planning inspection inasmuch as they were not suitable. If I could draw Members' attention to the bottom image on page 7 of the proposition, field 608 that borders the housing on the right-hand side of the road, this is where we have our Parish allotments. The field is owned by the Parish and we see this as a natural border with no wish to build northwards from there. Our Parish slogan is "coast, countryside, community". We are more than aware of the need to protect the coast and the countryside. We are also aware of the needs of our community and the need to provide additional sheltered housing for the ageing community. I have a lot of empathy with what Senator Mézec said about government sites but I should say that we are talking here about a community that wants to stay or return to St. John. The Parish, in looking for sites, has done its best to find sites that will have a minimum impact on agriculture, fields that are too small to have large machines work them. At the planning inspector's hearings the J.F.U. had no objection to our sites for rightsizing. Indeed, the revised list from the J.F.U. sent to Members on Monday confirmed that this field was a category 4 and is listed at 12 in their combined list. Yes, it will be disappointing to lose the copse but those States Members who were able to join us at St. John Parish Hall on Saturday will have seen the area we hope to use for a community wood. We have been advised by the Minister to put a planning application in and not to go for rezoning for that community project. In addition to the Comité Rurale discussing the loss of the copse, we have also discussed this at our St. John climate group. They are excited by our plan to create a mixed wood with native species, an orchard and specimen trees about 100 yards from the current site in front of us today. The area we hope to use for the community wood is over 4 times larger than the existing copse and, subject to approval, we would hope to start planting in November. We hope that it may be possible to move some of the hazel, for example, from the existing site to our new community facility. The choice of site was made due to proximity not only to the 2 existing villages but also to our amenities. We are fortunate to have a local shop, a pharmacy, a doctor, a dentist, a butcher, a café. We also enjoy some 32 buses a day that leave for town from the bus stop at the church and, as I mentioned earlier, we also have allotments across the road. Regardless of whether this amendment is approved, we have got to make it easier for people to access the precinct by way of a pedestrian crossing. We have a new road safety panel who are looking at ways that this can be achieved as we currently have residents who drive from our sheltered housing to the shops because it is safer. The Greenwood Housing Association, formerly the Greenwood Trust, looks after the Parish sheltered housing, the trustees being the Connétable, Deputy, rector and 2 procureurs, and we have got scope to increase that to 8 members and we are looking at increasing the expertise of the team. The object of the association is to provide homes in the Parish for the elderly and to promote and encourage the acquisition, development and construction of residential accommodation for persons in the Parish in need of such accommodation and to support and encourage the zoning, procurement and utilisation of land and property for residential purposes. This is the body we will use to retain equity in shared equity properties in perpetuity. I do not come to the Assembly asking for land to be zoned for housing lightly. Hopefully Members will have seen that the Parish has done a lot of work on the subject and we have come to a considered decision to put this forward. Page 38 of the Island Plan talks about local centres and about the ability to protect the vitality and viability of local centres. This we would hope would happen with the additional sheltered homes; more people there to use and sustain the local shops, et cetera. We heard from the Minister in his opening that we need to think of the whole Island. Well, we are a small Parish and we are putting the site forward as part of the bigger picture. I would remind Members that the task in finding suitable sites for homes

is much harder in the northern Parishes due to the lack of mains, drains and infrastructure. On the first day of the debate the Minister also said that he was passionate about community planning, saying the Constables had a major role to play. Well, while I am bringing this amendment it is real community planning in as much as the Comité Rurale has endorsed the plan. If I can quote our chairman's comments from the spring edition of the Parish magazine, he states: "The Comité Rurale fully supports the Constable's amendments to rezone the following sites from development, and that these Parish-led schemes should be given priority over any other development in the Parish." I ask Members to support this amendment on the basis that there is demand, we have a site alongside our existing facility, and it has come following extensive work by the body elected in St. John for the purpose, exactly the community planning the Minister said he wanted.

The Deputy Bailiff:

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

3.3.2 Deputy S.M. Wickenden:

I just wanted to applaud the Constable for his work in his community to bring forward this plan, and the former Constable and the team that he works with in St. John. I have had chats with many people who have been part of this consultation and it is something that is supported within the community of St. John. It is near lots of amenities that will mean you would not need to be travelling into town or the likes through supermarkets, through the amazing community centre they have got there, and bus routes. I know there has been a lot of work done. There has been a lot of work in the community of St. John in looking for appropriate sites that can be agreed by that community and I will be fully supporting the Constable.

3.3.3 Deputy J.H. Young:

I enjoyed listening to the speech of the Constable, and I think Members might say: "Good, we have lost one; here is one to latch on to." Unfortunately, I do not have the luxury to make that reaction. I have to stick to the advice and the guidance that this site is not intimately connected with the village, it is on the edge, it is very damaging, very prominent, and it is not in agriculture because it is full of trees. All of the feedback I have from those who have visited this site is that this is not to be recommended. I shall of course be supporting the next amendment which we are going to talk about in a minute from the Constable, but I want to say a word about the approach to the community planning. We do not have individual delegated planning authorities sitting in each Parish. That should not happen. We have to draw up planning policies and make planning decisions at Island-wide level. Community planning means engaging with a community. Now, I have confessed already to the Connétable I was not aware that my predecessor back in 2011 established or at least gave written authority for the Parish to have a committee of that sort. I do not personally think that was in accordance with what the planning law is, but nonetheless I learnt about that recently and I am sorry because you came into it lately from your predecessor, the former Connétable, you picked that up. But obviously you have done very sterling work and it is clear that you do feel misled.

[15:15]

But I have to say, we have got a number of recommendations ...

The Deputy Bailiff:

Through the Chair please, Minister. You are saying "you" repeatedly.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Sorry, Sir. I think it is clear that I did say in my speech that you were disappointed with the outcome, obviously you have highlighted ...

The Deputy Bailiff:

The Connétable was disappointed.

Deputy J.H. Young:

The Connétable was disappointed. Blimey, nearly doing all right, but not quite. I did say that, I said you were disappointed ... sorry, the Constable was disappointed. But what I have asked the Constable to reflect is that we are going to have a number of debates on separate amendments, this is one, and that the reasons that are put forward why this one cannot be supported do stand up in the criteria of the evaluation of sites that we have adopted in the policies of this Island, which we have a whole Island commitment for, and the planning inspectors have agreed with that. So, I have to say to Members I do not think it right to go with this amendment. As welcome as it is to have additional housing, what if we end up having all the wrong sites zoned, the most damaging ones? I have the greatest difficulty with that. So please, I would ask Members to follow the recommendations as far as possible. Where a convincing case is made I will make it, but not one for convenience, I am afraid.

3.3.4 The Deputy of St. Martin:

The Minister of course is absolutely right. We cannot have Parishes making their own judgments on planning applications and sites. But indeed, here we have a case made by the Constable of St. John and I would imagine that most people in the Assembly and online were listening to what he had to say thinking: "My goodness they have made some efforts, my goodness they have got their Parish together and got organised." I guess a lot of us were probably a bit envious. I hear the Minister and I hear the reasons why he is not supporting this site, but I would have asked him to go back and have another think about this because it is going to be difficult enough to get sites zoned in this debate and here we have a Parish united behind an application; something we are not going to find very much of in the coming days. So I am going to support the Constable on this one.

3.3.5 Deputy K.F. Morel:

I just wanted to echo Deputy Wickenden and the Deputy of St. Martin's words. I hear what the Minister is saying about there not being parochial planning authorities. The Comité Rurale is not a planning authority; the Comité Rurale is a group of parishioners who work together to try to understand the best way forward for their community in many different ways. I think it is fantastic. I think St. John is to be congratulated upon having its comité and all the Constables, including the current Constable, who have been involved in that I think have done superb work in engaging their community with the Island Plan debate; whether it is previous Island Plans or the current Island Plan. I know, as the Constable said, it has been there in the Parish magazine very clearly laid out, all the fields, all the areas that were under consideration, what they were under consideration for, and I am sure not everyone in the Parish agrees, I am sure there are people in the Parish who think otherwise, but it appears to me that a basic majority in the Parish are content with this amendment and the plans brought forward by the Connétable of St. John in general. The things that I do not like about this site are the woodland that is clearly there, but I also appreciate that the Connétable said they are going to be creating a Parish woodland, though it sounds like it does not yet have permission for that but I expect that to be given. A Parish woodland which is, as he said, 4 times the size. Another thing I do not particularly like about the site is it does effectively create a small area of ribbon development as you leave the village, and obviously it isolates the large field - I think it was 230 - which was the field that was rejected, I believe, by the Minister and the planning inspectors, and quite rightly. My concern is that that field in 10, 20 years' time will end up being built on because it is becoming isolated from anything else around it and so it does look like a field that has a rather defined lifetime. But whenever a Connétable engages with their community in this way, whenever the individuals involved in the Comité Rurale give up their time in this way to try and make an effort not just for the Parish but for the Island in terms of trying to find places that they can have development that will enrich both the Parish and the Island, I think that is to be congratulated. For that reason I find it

impossible not to support this amendment. Some may say: “But it is not affordable housing.” No, it is obviously sheltered housing for elderly people and it has to be accepted that every elderly person or couple who move into the units here will be leaving a house behind which will go on to the market and will be available for Islanders and younger Islanders to buy. So, there is the knock-on effect that this will create, and I do know that there are many elderly people in Jersey who find the whole concept of rightsizing quite laughable because the market does not allow it at the moment. You can sell a house on a cul-de-sac and the money you get from that barely buys you a flat somewhere else, and what you are losing in terms of perhaps a front or back garden, that sort of thing, it does not make sense. So, this is a development that will enable rightsizing for some people and, as a result, will enable the freeing up of a number of houses around the Parish, one has to assume. So, we must congratulate the Connétable of St. John and his parishioners for finding this site and for doing the work necessary to convince me and I believe other States Members to support him.

3.3.6 The Deputy of St. Mary:

I would just like to follow with the previous speaker and the Deputy of St. Martin, and almost pick up on the comment that the Minister made about Parishes not having their own independent planning authority. My understanding is that when the idea of the bridging Island Plan was broadcast parishioners were encouraged to look around within their boundaries to ascertain whether there was any land available. Certainly, my own Parish did form a form of committee. It was not a planning committee, and I might be at odds with my own Constable as to its precise role, but as far as I am concerned it was an advisory panel which went out to identify potential plots with the aim of putting them to the Parish Assembly who might then make a formal decision. They would not then be acting as a planning authority as such but surely it must be in the interests of the Minister and the Island as a whole if they do know that sites being put forward do meet with a majority of the residents. I do take issue with the basic concept that Parishes should not be involved in that area, and as far as this particular proposition is concerned, again like the previous speaker, I congratulate the Constable of St. John for having identified potential sites, having gone out to consultation with all his parishioners. That surely is what unifying a Parish must be all about. I again, along with certain other States Members, accepted an invitation to see the consultation. That Saturday morning we were taken through it. I am more than satisfied that there has been proper consultation, and again I would have thought that the Minister should be pleased to have that input. It has not happened in all cases. On that basis I am convinced as much as I can be that it is the will of the parishioners of St. John that that is the way forward. I would have hoped that the Minister might have given it more favourable consideration. I am, therefore, inclined to support the amendment as now proposed.

3.3.7 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

I am thinking very much along the same lines as the previous speakers, other than the Minister, with regard to this amendment by the Constable of St. John. No Parish needs permission from a Minister for Planning to set up a group of parishioners to consider whether they want to put forward fields for rezoning, or to consider any other planning applications that are submitted under the current Island Plan. What we did in St. Lawrence when we knew about this bridging Island Plan was we submitted for consideration the fields that are owned by the Parish of St. Lawrence. They were rejected as being unsuitable for development and we accepted that. When I say “we” I worked with my procureurs on that. But had they been considered suitable for development then we would have set up a group, just as St. John did, to consider the best means of progressing with other parishioners to get their views on whether those fields should indeed have been put forward for rezoning. The Minister said when he spoke that Members may feel that this is a win. We have rejected one field already and maybe we could go with this one because from my point of view the J.F.U. have not said: “Do not take it away, it would be the last resort.” We know that it is not in agricultural use at the moment. I am minded to refer to the email that Members have received from Deputy Guida, who may wish to speak to this amendment, because he has said that he will mention the ecological value

of fields during this debate, presumably during the 91st amendment. The loss of biodiversity concerns me probably as much as the loss of losing agricultural land and fields. However, the Deputy in his email to us has made mention to the mitigation and compensation conditions that are used generally when planning applications are determined by the committee over ecological concerns. From my perspective, looking at this particular amendment by the Constable of St. John, as we have heard, it is supported by a number of parishioners. He has consulted with his Parish and it is clearly something that the Parish of St. John wants to see developed. So, from the way I am looking at it, it is not currently in agricultural use, the biodiversity of the area may well be impacted upon, however, during the course of the normal application planning determination, what could be done, conditions could be put on the development to best mitigate any ecological concerns that there would be with the site. So, from my perspective this is an amendment that should be supported, not least because of the work that has gone into it by the Parish, ably led by the Constable himself. I will be supporting this amendment to the 91st amendment.

3.3.8 Deputy M. Tadier:

We have just been going through on Deputy Ward's big screen about identifying which fields are which. I have asked Deputy Ward with his technology skills if at some point he could share the aerial view of this field because - as the Constable of St. Lawrence has just said - it is not a field, first of all, in the true sense of the word, it is a mini forest and it is established. It is an established ecosystem, which I hold my hands up, I did not know before I got in today what that looked like. I could not attend the Constable of St. John's presentation on Saturday because I was in his place, in terms of needing to isolate. I wish him and anyone else a speedy recovery.

[15:30]

But it is a complete folly; it is not really an interest to declare but that is my neck of the woods now in terms of my literal stomping grounds and I have started to walk around the area fairly well. There are so many open fields; I think I commented to the Deputy of St. Peter one Sunday morning when he was playing tennis and I was walking the dog - this is becoming a little theme in the speeches - and I said: "Yes, but at least we have still got some green open spaces up here." There is lots of green open space there and I am not commenting on that from a planner's point of view, I am just saying that there are a lot of fields which are not in use all of the time, but there are very few densely populated areas where there are lots of well-established trees. We might look at a different field in a moment which has got a few trees around the periphery and there will be a few different considerations. I know it is said that it does not matter because we are going to build a bigger forest somewhere else. I am using the word "forest" of course in the Jersey context, and they are not forests but they are really important natural corridors. When one walks down these country lanes and you are lucky enough to glimpse the squirrels that are running across the road and hear the variety of birds in the trees. I know that the perhaps less sentimental Members and people listening on the radio will say: "But what is more important? Surely you are here to provide homes for real people. We can cut down trees and we can build trees in another field, they will grow in time." I know those conversations that happen with constituents but I also very much keep my ear to the ground when it comes to social media, and whenever there are trees that are being threatened with removal - even if they are just single trees - there is still an uproar about those. I cannot help feeling that there are so many potential fields in St. John which if one were minded to be of that persuasion, okay, we could get away with some building there, that would much more appropriate for development. Of course, this is not to in any way criticise or undermine the work that has gone on in the Parish at that level, but I would accept that they have a determined starting point that they want to provide housing in the Parish. That is quite laudable, and of course some people put themselves forward to participate in those groups but there is only ever going to be a certain amount of viable options that come to the table where there is a willing vendor or there is somebody. So, the questions I would ask first of all in addition, I mean, I think that point about the heavily established woodland is enough for me to

vote against this, but I do think there are other questions about who owns these fields, what are the figures that we are talking about, what price can you put on a woodland like that in the countryside. Yes, this happens to be in St. John but we could probably replicate this little scenario throughout many of the country Parishes, so I am very uneasy about this and find it difficult to support.

3.3.9 The Connétable of St. Brelade:

In reference to Parish groups much has been spoken of them, and I have experience of being involved ex officio as a member of a Parish planning group. I would say they can be of great value if they support an application; they are certainly less so if not because they are not democratically ... well, if they can be democratically elected the important thing is that they are. I do not know if they have any power in law so any dissatisfied applicant for any sort of planning application may well contest that and I would be interested to know, and maybe the Attorney General may wish to comment on their power in law to influence any decision. I have just got a few more words to say, and perhaps he may wish to comment. At this stage it seems to me that the local input has been of great value and we should be listening to it. We must learn to listen to local opinion because it is incredibly important, in my view. I had the opportunity to look at the field last Friday and it is abundantly clear that the extension of the senior citizen accommodation is entirely logical. The Constable on that trip referred to the creation of a much larger area of woodland further along the Route du Nord and that would seem to be a sensible replacement if the existing copse is to be lost. The copse appear to me to be a grouping of home oaks of relatively limited value locally as we have got lots of them, but I suspect that in any planning application which would be attached to an acceptance of this amendment there would be an environmental impact study to be done which may dictate how it would go further along. So, in concluding, would it be in order to request that the Attorney General comment on the legal varies of a local planning group such as this set up in St. John?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, Attorney General, are you available to respond to the question that has been asked by the Connétable? He is not currently responding, Connétable, so we will endeavour to contact the Attorney or the Solicitor General in relation to the matter that you raise.

3.3.10 Deputy G.J. Truscott:

I will be brief because I think we are pretty much there now. I first of all pay tribute to the former Constable, I think he did kickstart the initiative and the new Constable has picked up and run with it in a very exemplary way. I do thank him for inviting Members up and I did attend on Saturday morning. I think I have one regret and that is not accepting a rather nice looking croissant and coffee; but one is trying to control the midline and it was close to lunch. I have got to say my in-laws lived at St. John for many years and I am quite familiar with the area and I know how valuable the units that currently are there are in the Parish, and I think there has been an enormous amount of community dialogue and input and I think that is just great. That is what the whole idea of the 12 Parishes and the Constables is all about and it would be a great loss if we ever lost the institution effectively. I am supportive of this. I have got concerns regarding the copse; the Constable did assure me that there will be a major planting in another area and that is so important, and plainly there will have to be some kind of study regarding the ecology of that area. But I wish him well and I hope this goes through.

3.3.11 Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I join with others just to commend the Connétable and his predecessor on the work that was done, absolutely. Unfortunately, I will be going with the Minister on both of these; in other words I will not be supporting this field 229, I will be happy to support field 236. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend his what I understand very excellent briefing on Saturday because I was not on the Island at the time. However, I think my concern on this ... in fact I agree with much of what Deputy Tadier

said, and it is in the comments that have been made, i.e. it is all very well saying ... I think the comments, all scrub and trees, it is holm oaks, whatever, it does say the loss of which - in the comments - would have an implication to the biodiversity. It is all very well saying: "Well I hope there is going to be an environmental and ecological impact done or study of the various parts of wildlife in there." But, as I have understood matters, we are basically asking to rezone this, it will become a white zone, it can therefore be built on. Any ecological study or any environmental study thereafter will be fairly pointless. That is the dilemma we are facing in all of these sites. I will describe it as woodland, it will be less than what you might see in some of the valleys but equally it has been described as important. Then also it makes the point that from a planning perspective it does form a physical and visual buffer between the coast and St. John's village. So I think on that basis I am going to go with the Minister on this one and not vote for field 229. I will support field 236. I do commend the Connétable but frankly I have quite a degree of unease if ... yes, it can be described as a field, I think it has probably moved on from that. I have quite a significant degree of unease as to the loss from the ecology point of view without having that data on it, and that is with the greatest respect to obviously all the parishioners that no doubt that the Connétable has worked with on this one. I think it probably will be voted through but I just wanted to make my position clear because I think I will in this instance be listening to the advice that the Minister has received, which is perfectly appropriate on this. Other than that I have got nothing else to say.

3.3.12 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I just have some questions for the Constable specifically about the woodland. I would like to know roughly the number of trees that would have to be felled. I understand that the Constable would be looking to replace those trees and I just wanted to understand what his understanding is of how you can replace ... you cannot replace like for like obviously because a mature tree cannot just be planted, it takes years for a tree to reach maturity, so many more trees would have to be planted to replace just one mature tree. So, I just wanted to know how advanced the thinking was in terms of replacing that important area and whether any consultation had been held with groups such as Trees for Life. I would like to support this but I am hesitating because of the woodland, and it is one of my principles that I want to protect trees because of their importance to the environment and to well-being of people. I am hesitating on that count so that is what the Constable needs to convince me on; just a bit more detail on the replacement of the trees and the numbers that will be going and the numbers that it will be replaced by please.

3.3.13 Deputy I. Gardiner:

I just would like to add to Deputy Doublet's request because I came to this debate with a mind to support the Constable and if it would be possible to hear if the mature trees can be replanted elsewhere, what are really the plants around these trees, how many trees will be lost, how many trees will be replanted, how they will be cared for. It will really help me to support this.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The Attorney General is ready to answer the question posed by the Connétable of St. Brelade.

The Attorney General:

I understand it is a question about the vires of a community planning association akin to the one I understand operates in St. John. I appreciate that I have not seen any documentation in relation to the St. John association ...

The Deputy Bailiff:

Well just to assist you, it is described in the report of the Connétable of St. John, have you seen that?

The Attorney General:

I have seen part of it but I may not have seen the specific passage.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The question from the Connétable of St. Brelade, and he will correct me if I get this wrong, is in relation to the legal status of the Comité du Rurale de St Jean, which was elected to consider the Island Plan and did so for the 2011 Island Plan and the latest bridging Island Plan.

[15:45]

The Minister for the Environment in his contribution said that although this committee was recognised by the previous Minister it had no legal status.

The Attorney General:

Grateful for that, Sir. I think that chimes with what I was about to advise. In terms of its vires to bind the Assembly I do not think it has any vires to bind the Assembly's deliberations. I think the Assembly can clearly place some weight on its views because it is very familiar with the land or properties in question, so some weight can be placed on that. But in terms of its legal status as regards the Assembly I do not believe that it has any vires to bind what the Assembly is to decide in relation to this particular piece of land. It may be that if the land is Parish property then it may have some vires as regards purely Parish property, but from how it is described I do not think that will be the case. So, I hope that answer's the Connétable's question.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Connétable of St. Brelade, does that answer your question?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Yes, indeed, and I thank the Attorney General.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak on the amendment to the amendment? I call upon the Connétable of St. John to reply.

3.3.14 The Connétable of St. John:

May I thank everybody for their contributions, starting with Deputy Wickenden. It is a team effort and that team, they do not have any legal standing as far as I am concerned, they are elected as a consultation group, it is about grassroots involvement, involving our community, and I think it is a great example of seeing that happen. The Minister spoke about advising people about latching on to new homes. This is not about numbers; this is about people. Real people. Young people who will hopefully benefit from the homes that are freed up by the older people who move into the sheltered housing. I do accept his apologies about the Ministerial Decision and I will touch on that when we talk about 1109. The Comité Rurale looks at a whole range of things, conservation, housing for first-time buyers and over-55s, traffic, recreation, the retention or creation of important outdoor spaces, and allotments. Following the 2011 plan the comité have been instrumental in the setting up of the allotments within the Parish. They were also instrumental in ensuring that the school will benefit from a playing field in the not-too-distant future as a result of the work started by them back in 2009. I thank Deputy Luce for his support, and Deputy Morel. In terms of the woodland and the northern boundary, there are 2 fields between the proposed site and the L'Auberge du Nord, so there will still be a natural break. In terms of the properties, it is affordable rental and we charge around 80 per cent of market rents, and we see people not only moving within the Parish but we see people coming back to the Parish, and we allocate the properties in exactly the same way that the Constable of St. Ouen described this morning. I thank both Deputy Johnson and the Constable of St. Lawrence, and I would endorse her words about the Parishes have got an ability to contribute to Island Plans. Deputy Tadier and others raised good points about what was described as a little forest of woodland. On my climate group I have an ecologist and on the Comité Rurale we have environmentalists, so we have given it

consideration. There is lots of work that would need to be done around a site survey, the timing of that survey we are advised would be best done around April. We do believe that we can move some of the hazel, for example, across to a new area. Unfortunately, Deputy Doublet, I do not know how many trees are there. The current woodland is not accessible to parishioners. We want to create a much better, larger, and more accessible woodland, while also setting up new homes for downsizing parishioners. Rather than a tiny and largely dead woodland next to a busy road, we hope that wildlife would be encouraged back with a purpose build larger woods. We also welcome the comments from the Constable of St. Brelade, Deputy Truscott. Senator Le Fondré, I am disappointed he is not able to support, but I am actually the fourth Constable that has been involved with the Comité Rurale. It started back with Constable Butcher, Constable Rondel, Constable Taylor and now myself, so it has been a longstanding group that have worked there. In addition to looking to provide a large community woodland opposite the site we are also looking at a school forest next to the school where it currently is, and we think that will have great success with the squirrels because there are corridors right down in Rue des Buttes, La Rue Gombrette, and we look forward to moving that forward. So I am sorry I cannot answer in terms of how many trees, but for those familiar with St. John and the north coast you will know that thousands of trees have recently been planted to the north of Les Mourier Valley. So I would hope that Members could support this proposal. I believe that it is good for ageing population, it is good for our housing crisis, it is good for the local village. I think in the long term it will be good for our local wildlife. Crucially it is good for local democracy. We are always talking about encouraging people to get involved in their Parishes, and the Minister wants community-led initiatives. Here we have a local community that has got an elected Comité and I hope that Members will do as I have done and listen to Parishioners and listen to the people who live there and love the area and vote yes, please.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Are you prepared to receive some clarification questions, Connétable?

The Connétable of St. John:

Yes, sir.

The Deputy of St. Martin:

In Deputy Morel's speech he mentioned sheltered and retirement homes and the Constable has done the same in his summing up. Could we be very clear; could he clarify for us, this amendment is only about affordable homes and nothing else?

The Connétable of St. John:

This amendment is for an extension of our affordable sheltered homes; rented.

The Deputy of St. Martin:

I am still not clear because in St. Martin sheltered homes and retirement homes are the same thing and that means over-55s.

The Connétable of St. John:

These are for over-55s, rented accommodation, on an affordable basis that we charge 80 per cent of the market rent.

The Deputy of St. Martin:

Sir, I think you may have to rule on this because all the way through this amendment it is affordable homes, and this is very different to the affordable definition we are working to in the rest of these amendments.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

In a similar vein; if this site is passed does the Connétable know, the number of homes that could be put on there, would they reduce the affordable housing targets that form this greater part of the debate?

The Connétable of St. John:

I hope so. We were told we needed 50 per cent for sale, 50 per cent for rent, and that is why we have put forward sites, one for rental and one for purchase.

The Deputy Bailiff:

This is the rental side?

The Connétable of St. John:

This is the rental side.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Would the Connétable accept that the issue of sheltered housing on sites is not subject to this policy that the amendment applies to? The amendment is for policy H5 which is for affordable housing, which the Constable's amendment reduces, and yet the issue of sheltered housing is not in this policy, it is under policy H6. Would the Constable confirm that my understanding is correct?

The Connétable of St. John:

The original amendment number 36 was withdrawn under the advice of the Minister and put into this section of the plan, so we have followed the advice we have been given. I originally submitted 3 amendments and we were told to withdraw and to resubmit it in this part of the plan.

Deputy J.H. Young:

I am not sure what to say, Sir. Have I got any right? I have asked for clarification, I have to say I am not satisfied with the answer but there we are, I do not have a right to speak, do I?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Well, the debate has concluded, the matter was approved for lodging, it has been debated, and the debate is concluded.

The Connétable of St. Peter:

Sir, may I make a comment?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is it a point of order?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

Only that I have been given very similar advice, because one of the fields at St. Peter included sheltered accommodation and I was given the same advice from the Island Plan, yes, exactly the same advice to include it within this.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Well, we are where we are. Is the *appel* called for?

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

A couple of the questions that I asked were not answered. I accept that the Constable is not aware of the exact number of trees that would be felled, but could he estimate if he has an understanding of the rough kind of area of trees that there are at the moment, and the area and perhaps the number that

would be planted. I am just trying to understand if it would satisfy ... I think the requirements to replace established trees are around 2 to 3 new trees per mature tree. I want to know whether that is something that the Constable is planning to do please.

The Connétable of St. John:

Thank you for the opportunity. The plan is to retain trees on the northern and western boundaries, mature trees, and the community wood, we are not looking at just planting woods, we are looking at planting specimen trees. So, the area is over 4 times larger than the current area so I would expect us to be planting at least 3 if not 4 times the amount of trees that are being removed.

The Deputy Bailiff:

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

POUR: 33		CONTRE: 7		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator I.J. Gorst		Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré		
Senator L.J. Farnham		Senator S.Y. Mézec		
Senator K.L. Moore		Connétable of St. Helier		
Senator S.W. Pallett		Deputy M. Tadier (B)		
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Deputy J.H. Young (B)		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Deputy G.C.U. Guida (L)		
Connétable of St. Brelade		Deputy R.J. Ward (H)		
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Deputy of Grouville				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)				
Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy of St. Ouen				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet (S)				
Deputy R. Labey (H)				
Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)				
Deputy L.B. Ash (C)				
Deputy K.F. Morel (L)				
Deputy of Trinity				

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)			
Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)			
Deputy J.H. Perchard (S)			
Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)			
Deputy I. Gardiner (H)			

3.4 Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021) - ninety-first amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)) - fifth amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)Amd.(5))

The Deputy Bailiff:

The next amendment to be debated is the fifth amendment, lodged by the Connétable of St. John, and I ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Insert a new line “ii. J236, La Rue du Cimetière, St. John” and renumber the remaining items accordingly.

[16:00]

3.4.1 The Connétable of St. John:

Can I thank Members for their support of the previous vote? As with the previous amendment, many of the arguments I have raised are relevant for this amendment. Members will be pleased to know I will not be repeating all the same arguments. In addition to demand for our rental rightsized properties, there is also demand for people to purchase homes. As our community ages we have a high number of couples who would like to downsize. Sadly, we also have a number of widows and widowers who currently live remotely in properties that are too large for them, often asset rich and cash poor; many not enjoying the level of public transport that is enjoyed in the village. We have not advertised but currently we have some 60 people on our waiting list for rightsizing in the Parish. This includes both Parishioners and people who would like to return to the Parish to be closer to family and friends. If those sites are passed, we are hoping to have a 50/50 mix with both rental and freehold properties. This project will help us in our aims to develop some affordable stepdown properties to enable people to rightsize while still holding equity in their property. We propose to utilise 25 per cent of the value of each property to assist young families with the purchasing of affordable homes, and the equity in these properties would remain in the ownership of the Greenwood Housing Association, and importantly for the Parish this would be in perpetuity. The proposed development is in a green lane. The field in question has not been farmed for over 30 years and it lends itself to this development. Again the J.F.U. at category 4, and this is listed at line 13 on their final report. Members may want to know how well I know this area of the Parish. Well, on the diagram of page 7, appendix C, at the bottom left of that drawing there is a triangle and my house is one of those in the small close. I can kick a ball from my house to the site, and as a dog owner I walk the lane regularly. It is worth pointing out that there is a bus stop at the junction of Rue Cimetière and La Route de St. Jean. Our road safety panel that I mentioned in the previous debate are looking at the feasibility of a virtual pavement from the village to the cemetery as well as the crossing. This would make it easier for existing residents and, if passed, the occupiers of new homes on this site to get to and from the village. The Minister’s comments state that access is via a Parish by-road and, therefore, has limited capacity for increase in vehicular traffic. Really? I do not think the department has spoken to the relevant highway authority for if they had I am sure there would be no objection from the St. John’s Road Committee for this modest development. In terms of the comments referencing drains not having any spare capacity, we absolutely support the provision of additional capacity as we still have too many existing premises that are not connected to mains drains. Last

Friday I, along with 3 colleagues, took the opportunity to go on the organised tour of the sites around the Island. I know many Members could not make it. We hosted a drop-in session on Saturday to give Members an opportunity to see how we have arrived at our decisions and ultimately this proposal. I thank those Members who visited and also those who responded to my invitation. With our long history of providing homes for families and sheltered housing we see this as a natural progression. There is certainly demand and we want to see some of those properties that have been occupied by families for 50 years become free again for families, and we want to see families moving into those purpose-built properties. Our vision is for the Greenwood Housing Association to use funds from this development to purchase equity in existing homes when they become available, therefore returning them into the affordable homes category, and that would be in perpetuity. We would hold the equity within the Greenwood Housing Association. Obviously for people going to those homes they would go through the Housing Gateway criteria. The team on Greenwood are currently reviewing our skillset with a view to adding the necessary skills to take on this additional work. The Minister has now stated he will support the site and I thank him for that and I would hope that we can get this approved. I propose the amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is the amendment seconded? [**Seconded**] Will you respond to a request for clarification, Connétable, from Deputy Tadier?

Deputy M. Tadier:

Could the Constable tell us what the current ownership of the field is, if it is in private ownership, and any other relevant information?

The Connétable of St. John:

The field is currently in private ownership and we have an agreed price with the owner per unit.

3.4.2 Deputy J.H. Young:

I thought I would speak early to try and speed up this debate. Yes, while this site went through the process of planning evaluation it was not one of the top listed sites but it did score quite well. J236 is small, relatively discreet, and it can be reasonably integrated in St. John's village. It is the better site of the others. The road access is not great, being a Parish by-road, but of course the traffic impacts of 13 homes will not be significant. If the site is approved, which I probably think is likely, the drainage system will need to be enhanced. I think this does give me an opportunity to clarify the issue that arose in the previous amendment. This particular one is also an amendment to policy H5, and I think in order to clear up this question of the tenures I would direct Members to the page in the Island Plan which is 193, policy H5, right in the middle of it and it is worth reading because this policy would apply to every site that is zoned. It says: "All of the sites should be developed in accordance with the guidance to be issued by the Minister for the Environment unless otherwise specified [that is an important point] in the proportions of 45 per cent for social rent and 55 per cent for purchase, except where is an alternative tenure split (1) can be justified having regard to the latest evidence of need, (2) enables the rightsizing of homes within the existing housing stock or can be justified relative to any other overriding justification." This is the area of the policy where my views in bringing forward such a policy is that then on a site-by-site basis the Minister for Housing and Communities, using the Minister for Environment's powers and the supplementary guidance, would have to make some guidance on every individual site by site. But I wanted to be clear that those are the rules in the policy and that would apply to every site. That includes an element of rightsizing within it but I wanted to be very, very clear and explicit, under this policy H5 - which is not for supported housing, that exists under another policy and different rules elsewhere - those rules will apply to all sites that we deal with and anything to do with policy H5. So, with that, having said all that, I believe this is a useful site to add to the margin of homes and I am therefore supporting it.

Deputy K.F Morel:

Sir, a point of clarification?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, if you will give way to deal with that, will you, Minister?

Deputy J.H. Young:

Absolutely, of course.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

I thank the Minister. I do not mean this in any facetious kind of manner; would the Minister please put in layman's terms what he just meant by his discussion of policy H5, *et cetera*, because I was very confused.

Deputy J.H. Young:

Yes, I will try. I thought it necessary to read the words of the policy because that is the procedure that we are going through, we are amending a policy that will fit all planning decisions. What does it mean in practice? Every site zoned for affordable housing under this plan will have to go through the Housing Gateway, absolutely. Early on we had a discussion about Parish, *et cetera*, it was said there are lots of different factors in the Gateway, but everybody will need to go through the Gateway. The Gateway is within the gift of the Minister for Housing and Communities, and while in the past Ministers for Planning have tried to sit here and set the rules, the approach that we have taken throughout the plan is that once the zonings are in place those details will be put into practice on a site-by-site basis by the new Minister for Housing and Communities. They will have to use the power of the Minister for the Environment, so I do not know what is going to happen but they do have to have an element of flexibility in them, and so flexibility for rightsizing of homes is important. There will be sites where rightsizing is more important than another, and so I would certainly expect in the rural Parishes there will be bigger elements of rightsizing. I also personally think there will be requests to swap between sites so that you do not end up with all one type, but those are issues that will differ on every site. I am afraid it is a downstream task. Today what I think we are debating is whether we approve these sites for the inclusion. The key thing is they are affordable, and that means they have got to be available to people who are unable to access the normal housing market, and it means that they have got to go through the Gateway. Maybe in the next amendment, if the Minister for Housing and Communities is able to hear, that he might come back and help me out with that, because that is as far as I can go at the moment. If the Deputy wanted more I would have to turn I think for advice to the Attorney General, to make sure that I have explained the legal part of what we are seeking to do in that policy.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

Thank you, that was helpful.

3.4.3 Deputy S.M. Wickenden:

I was wondering if the Constable could just tell us a bit more about the Greenwood Housing Association. It says in the beginning of the report St. John has its own housing association, Greenwood Housing Association. Is that for the Parish? Is this something that is owned by the Parish of St. Helier or is the association constituted in a different way? I would just like to know a bit more about what that is because this site is all being set up for that association.

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

Just very briefly, the Constable of St. John made mention of mains drains or the lack thereof in St. John. I make no secret of the fact I would like to get as many homes in Jersey on mains drains as

possible. There is a capacity problem at the moment. We have the new sewage treatment works coming online next year and I hope the Constable will support bids for mains drains extensions.

3.4.5 The Connétable of St. Brelade:

There are 2 parts. Picking up from the comments of the last speaker, I am not clear what the timeline of providing mains drains to this particular site might be. The response was a degree woolly and maybe the Connétable of St. John in his summing up might clarify that. Because to extend mains drains is quite a job which would involve significant trenching and cost, as the Minister for Infrastructure mentioned, so it would be useful to have a projected timeline on that. The other point was with regard to the cemetery and I did ask the Constable this on our tour of the Parish sites. The field to the west on the other side of the road, could he confirm that that is being provided for an extension to the cemetery in the force of time? I did ask the question, he did answer, I cannot remember what the answer was.

The Deputy Bailiff:

If no other Member wishes to speak, then I call upon the Connétable to reply.

3.4.6 The Connétable of St. John:

I thank the Minister for his clarification and I look forward to working, should this be successful, with the Minister for the Environment and the Minister for Housing and Communities to come up with the final details as was discussed. Deputy Wickenden, in terms of the Greenwood Housing Association, it was formerly the Greenwood Trust and was re-registered with the courts probably about 10 years ago. I am more than happy to share a copy of the association’s Articles of Association. It is basically to provide homes for the elderly and for other people. As I said in the previous debate, it was also tasked with looking to get land rezoned, build properties, et cetera. The trustees are currently the 2 procureurs, the Deputy and the rector and we are looking at whether we need to add some finance, legal and some construction expertise to that group. If we do, then we will look to elect people at a Parish Assembly for a 3-year term but I am happy to share the objects with the Deputy. I would be more than happy to support Deputy Lewis’ request for additional funds for mains drains. For the Constable of St. Brelade, there are mains drains there, it is around capacity, so it would be something to do with pumping rather than taking mains drains to the site for the first time.

[16:15]

In terms of the cemetery, we are in discussions with landowners to the west of the current cemetery about potential for expansion. Hopefully we do not need it too soon. With that, I will ask Members to support this proposal and call for the appel.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. I invite Members to return to their seats. Those joining the meeting via the Teams link, I invite them to cast their votes in the chat channel. I ask the Greffier to open the voting for Members in the Chamber. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the amendment has been adopted.

POUR: 36		CONTRE: 3		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator L.J. Farnham		Senator S.Y. Mézec		
Senator J.A.N. Le Fondré		Deputy M. Tadier (B)		
Senator K.L. Moore		Deputy R.J. Ward (H)		
Senator S.W. Pallett				
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Saviour				

Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Deputy of Grouville				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)				
Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy of St. Ouen				
Deputy 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 Trinity				
Deputy of St. John				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat (H)				
Deputy S.M. Ahier (H)				
Deputy K.G. Pamplin (S)				
Deputy I. Gardiner (H)				

3.5 Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021): ninety-first amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)) - second amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91) Amd.(2))

The Deputy Bailiff:

A further amendment entitled the second amendment is lodged by Deputy Le Hegarat and I ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Delete the words “iv. O622 and O623 La Rue de la Croute, St. Ouen” and renumber the remaining items accordingly.

3.5.1 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Members might wonder why I have diverged from my representation of St. Helier. The reason for this has nothing to do with lobbying from any various groups or anything else; I have got more lobbying since I did it rather than before. The reason I did it was I had left the Island a couple of

weeks ago and I picked up an article in the *Rural Economy* and I saw the possibility of another dairy herd losing its facility and so this is where my focus lies. Members might wonder why I am so focused on dairy herds. Just humour me a little bit, because I am going to give you a little bit of history. I was brought up as the youngest sibling of tenant farmers and my parents started their life as farmers at Grosnez Farm at St. Ouen, the home of a previous Constable, Constable Vibert. They were given the gift of 2 cows from my father's parents. He had worked for his family for probably about 10 years, probably for little or no reward, but basically that is what he was given. One of my sisters was born there and then my family moved to St. John to Herupe Farm where both my brother and I were born. Again, we were still tenant farmers and we had cattle. Now I believe in those days as part of your tenancy cattle were compulsory. I do not really know because unfortunately I lost my father 3 years ago and it was not a question I was able to ask him, but I believe part of that was probably because it was about rotation of your land so that your cattle were grazed. You obviously grew grass in order to make hay and also you would grow crops, flowers, potatoes, et cetera. When I was about 5 years old or just before I was 5 years old, something happened to the landlord, I do not know if the person died or the property was sold, but basically my family were in a position whereby they had nowhere to go. I do not recall this because obviously I was a very small child but basically everything was for sale. We were lucky to get a reprieve and were able to move ... I distinctly remember the farm horse being moved to a small building in St. Mary and my parents managed to secure accommodation for us, still at Herupe Farm but in a cottage. We remained there for 12 months until they found another property and we moved to St. Ouen. There we spent 8 years just down the road from where my parents initially started from and again we had cattle. I remember distinctly as a child walking cattle up and down the road behind us and we obviously had a very close relationship with another cattle farmer, an ex-Deputy of St. Ouen, as in Percy Le Masurier. I had a very good childhood and remember it very well, so I was brought up with cattle. When I was about 12 years old my family managed to secure and buy their own property and therefore we all moved to St. Peter so that sort of cloud, if you like, was moved from us moving. I distinctly remember my brother and I being dragged off to Sark to visit our landlord while we were at St. Ouen for various reasons and being able to probably negotiate maybe a little bit more of the house than we already occupied. But when we moved to St. Peter obviously the cattle went with us but eventually, my father not being particularly a cattle man probably, and it being a very - how can I say? - it is probably one of the few jobs which is 52 weeks of the ... or 365 days a year, twice a day, all the time that you have to care for those animals. So, I think my affinity, that is where it started, so I am very much, I suppose, a fighter for the agricultural industry but more importantly for dairy herds. That was my driver initially for the field in St. Helier. These particular 2 fields are used by a dairy farmer, a tenant farmer, and I am told that that tenant farmer probably has other land as well which may be able to be used as well. But my focus is on the fact that that land is still being used for agricultural purposes by a dairy farmer. We as an Island are very proud and it is all part of our identity and our cattle are worldwide. I remember some of my father's cattle being sent ... I think one of them might have even gone to Iran but they were spread out. I remember in the 1960s and 1970s animals being shipped abroad, so I am very au fait with all of that. So, my driver for this and asking for the Assembly today to withdraw this particular site is because it is used by a tenant farmer who has cattle. Jersey has lost ... in 1999 we had 4,549 cattle; now we have 2,631. If we continue in the vein we will end up with no cattle at all because there will be nowhere for them to be. Of course, it is critical, as I said, in relation to the sites at St. Helier, that cattle are kept near to where the farm is. So, I do not know where the land ... or the farmer may have land elsewhere but clearly those cattle are on that land. In the nearby vicinity there are also sheep and other animals because I have seen them. Of course, there is a nearby farmer who did also used to have a significant herd and that herd is no longer. There have been many discussions about this having been up previously for development and being refused whether it was on an S.S.I. (Site of Special Interest) site or whether it was not. To be quite honest, I am not going to go into that today because I think one story will say one thing, one side will say something else, so I am not going into that today. My driver for all of this is about the protection of land for dairy

farmers in close proximity to where they are. I will also remind Members that these fields are on a very small country road and, yes, I am aware that the possibility would be they would have to both be approved and developed together in order that the access would be on to Route du Marais. That is also not the best road, I would have suggested, and it is a road quite familiar to me because obviously I was brought up in the Parish, as were my family. My father was born in St. Ouen, as was one of my sisters, so I am very familiar with the Parish. My concern is, is that this is a minor road but, as I said, the reason I brought this proposition was purely because I saw that yet again we sit and say it is okay to take agricultural or dairy land away from a dairy farmer, or close by to a dairy farmer. Can we afford to take that risk of losing another one?

The Deputy Bailiff:

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

3.5.2 The Connétable of St. Ouen:

Firstly, I would like to address directly the concerns that Deputy Le Hegarat has expressed about dairy farming. Of course, I agree with her, dairy farming is a vital industry for this Island. As one of the regular consumers of its product it would be a great shame if it ever disappeared and we need to support that but, as always, the devil is in the detail. The St. Ouen's farmer concerned, whose only significant commercial activity is milk production, has precisely 11 cows: 8 milkers, 2 heifers and a calf. If field 662 is approved for development - I should mention that 623, the farm does not have access to 622 because it is rented to a farmer who grows potatoes on it - he will lose precisely 3 vergées of land which he rents. However, without this land, he still has at least 26 vergées left available to him and that does not include land that he uses on an informal basis, which I would have to suggest is probably sufficient for his current herd. This of course is a matter for him but the point being that the loss of this rented land would not, in my view, render his operation uncommercial as has been suggested by the Deputy. Indeed, some of his other land is overgrown and could be brought back into use and is right next to the farm, so access would be easier and indeed might avoid some of the unfortunate traffic collisions that I have had to attend to that have occurred to his cows when he brings his herd along the unlit lanes at dusk. In summary, and in the context of the amendment, I would contend that the loss of this land to the dairy industry will have little or no impact neither to the farmer nor the wider industry. I am sure Members will appreciate, Mr. and Mrs. Blackmore, who wrote to all Members with a petition, overlook the site that is proposed for the development of affordable homes. I understand and appreciate the strong views they may hold about this proposed development. I am aware that they have consistently sought to resist any development on 622 which has been the subject of previous proposals. Of course, any development proposals on these fields have taken place at a different time within a different context. As they suggest, field 622 has an extensive planning history and has been reviewed relative to development potential on a number of occasions. This was first in 2010 when a planning application for 19 homes on the site was refused as it represented a departure from the Island Plan at the time. As the Minister for the Environment has said on a number of occasions, we are now in a different position where planning policy framework for the new Island Plan has been reset. We have a very significant demand for homes and indeed are priceless in that respect. Unlike previously, a considerable amount of work has been undertaken by the Parish of St. Ouen to identify and assess sites around the village that might best help to meet the need of homes in the Parish while contributing to the Island-wide need. As a result of our not-inconsiderable work, a large number of sites, 27 in total, sponsored by those who own them, were put forward for consideration as part of the Island Plan review. From this process and the additional process of assessment, those sites considered the most appropriate to help the need for affordable homes have been brought forward in the draft plan. The Minister has commented that the draft plan seeks to ensure that most of the Island's development needs are met within the existing built-up area but in order to meet the extensive and pressing need for affordable homes, it is being

proposed to rezone land to provide 600 affordable homes on greenfield sites for about 14 per cent of the available supply of homes.

[16:30]

The remainder will be delivered within the Island's existing built-up areas. The whole process has been independently reviewed by planning inspectors, again, as required by law, and in the case of fields 622 and 623 these fields were considered to offer potential to help meet the Island's housing needs relative to others that have been proposed by the Minister for development. They, as with the other 2 fields proposed for development in the Parish, very much fit the planning criteria that new developments must be near the existing village sites, which of course 622 and 623 are, as you can see from the map, to avoid ribbon developments and spreading of further future developments to join up with these satellites. The value of these fields for agriculture has been considered as part of the overall assessment involving consultation with the agricultural land controls. In addition to the commentary provided by the Jersey Farmers' Union at the public examination where their value was recognised and acknowledged by the planning inspectors, neither field has any agricultural conditions attached to them and, as previously mentioned, one is used by a small dairy farmer. I have also had confirmation from the farmer that cultivates field 622 that its quality is average. I think he described it as "boulé" which somebody who farms will probably understand, and is telling he is content that this field is used for first-time buyers and over-55 housing. As the Deputy mentioned, it is recognised that Rue de la Croute is a narrow rural lane and the development of field 622, which can only be accessed via Rue de la Croute, is problematic in this respect. However, the addition of field 623, which is immediately adjacent to Route du Marais, affords an opportunity to create a direct access for both sites on to the primary network. There has been comment that this would site the entrance on a blind bend on Route du Marais. The details of securing appropriate site lines would be addressed as part of the planning application process. It is worth mentioning that a current smaller development, Clos la Croute next door to field 623 which has appropriate site lines, accesses on to Route du Marais without issue. The road is relatively straight at this section and is currently subject to a 30 mile-an-hour speed limit. Similarly, the impact of any development here upon any ecological interest, the detail would need to be the subject of detailed assessment with the appropriate mitigation as part of any detailed development proposal. The fact of the matter is that both fields are in agricultural use and do not enjoy any wildlife designation and neither does the adjacent land. While the field to the west of the site may be wet, it is not recognised or indeed designated as a key marshland habitat and does not, as has been suggested, enjoy any formal designation as a site of special interest, neither is it proposed as such. If you look on the S.S.I. (Sites of Special Interest) website you will see that the nearest ecological S.S.I. site is in St. Ouen's Bay and is indeed the sand dunes. Neither does the site suffer any recognised flood risk and the suggestion that the run-off water from any new housing site on 622 and 623 would run down Route du Marais and create such an issue, completely ignores any planning requirement for sustainable drainage on any new site which would prevent this happening and would of course be the first time that any such development would have been allowed to proceed on that basis. I think I have addressed the issues and concerns circulated to all Members by Blackmores. I shall now like to add a few more comments of my own. St. Ouen's, through its Affordable Housing Committee set up with the approval of a Parish Assembly, has worked tirelessly over the last 3 years talking to landowners throughout the Parish to see if they are willing to put sites forward. Indeed, as I have already mentioned, we put forward 27 sites into the "call for sites" process, all with the consent of the owners. We have 173 families on a first-time buyers' list who are desperate to get on the housing ladder. These young people are our future and if we do not provide them with homes that they can afford in which to raise their families then, as we have already seen, they will probably leave and go where they can settle and afford to buy. We have also another further 167 Islanders on our sheltered housing list, so the demand for St. Ouen alone is there, and not considering the wider housing Island concerns that we already know about. I would just like to read out a few selected quotes from some of our younger families on our list and it starts: "We have recently left

our rented property so that we could save up for a deposit and we have moved back with the family as it is so tricky to pay rents and save at the same time. We are very excited by the prospect of being able to own a home in the Parish which we consider home.” The next comment: “The Parish schemes are now our only hope of being able to afford a home in Jersey.” The next comment: “We would love to be able to buy a property in St. Ouen. I was born and raised in St. Ouen and my families all still live in the Parish. We have not yet been able to buy a house as we are still first-time buyers and are waiting to buy an affordable home in the Parish.” The next comment: “I have been on the first-time buyers’ list since 2019 looking for a house since then. We have a child on the way but it would be an honour to be able to purchase a house in the Parish and have our family there to continue our strong family roots within the Parish. It is very difficult to find a house that is within our price bracket due to the housing crisis being so high in Jersey so I hope we are lucky enough to afford a house in the Parish.” Next comment: “We have been waiting for an affordable home for about 5 years. We are currently renting but are wanting to purchase a property in the near future in St. Ouen which we will feel will be the perfect place to carry on raising our 2 children.” Next comment: “Myself and my children are in unstable accommodation. We would love to make a permanent home in St. Ouen. We have lived there for 7 years with both our children attending Les Landes School. We have many friends and family members in St. Ouen or close by. It is our home and our community.” The owners of fields 622 and 623 are willing to sell and the Island planning process and subsequent examination by the inspectors has identified these 2 fields as being suitable for development. If developed, fields 622 and 623 would blend into the existing village which has a direct walkway to the village centre. Of course, I appreciate the concerns of residents who are neighbours to the development, if approved, and those who have been behind the campaign to stop the development going ahead on the grounds that these greenfields should not be sacrificed. I particularly understand this because I am in the same position myself as the development of fields 594 and 595 is directly behind me on my back and, if built, would undoubtedly impact on the value of my property. However, I am quite happy to make the sacrifice for the greater good. They have set out their concerns in the petition, which Members have received, and no doubt Members will give those views due weight. However, and I do not use this word lightly, the “crisis” is upon us. We only have to look at soaring house prices and rental costs to see that no action will result in our Island becoming largely unaffordable to most of the next generation to me with all the attendant issues that this will bring and which we are already starting to see emerge. Furthermore, the Parish has followed the interim planning process exactly as set out and the sites, including 622 and 623, have been selected and approved by the inspectors on merit alone. I therefore urge Members to vote against this amendment and take a big step towards providing affordable housing stock, and by that I mean the 77 houses that could well be built as a result. I thank Members for their attention and I hope that they will support me.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Connétable of St. Saviour, you have a question. Is that for the last speaker?

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Yes.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Are you prepared to respond to a question, Connétable of St. Ouen?

The Connétable of St. Ouen:

Yes.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, Connétable of St. Saviour.

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Did I understand the Constable correctly that they put through 23 other sites which were rejected and just these 2 fields were secured?

The Connétable of St. Ouen:

I thank the Constable for her question; I am just trying to look at my notes. I believe we submitted, yes, 23 sites of which fields 594 and 595 were accepted and field 622 and field 623 were accepted.

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Lovely, thank you.

3.5.3 Deputy J.H. Young:

I am hoping I will not need to say too much because I think the Constable has covered it with a very comprehensive speech. Members may have got the impression from the previous debates that somehow I am disregarding Parish community work. I praise the Connétable and the work that they have done in the Parish to bring us to a point where we do seem to have a majority of community support for something which is essential. I picked out one word in the inspector's report - I think page 35 if Members feel like they want to look at the detail - but it says that the Connétable pointed out that there had been no major housing project in St. Ouen since 2006. I think this for me was also the thing about, not just dealing with our housing crisis, but how we allow the villages to breathe and be able to accommodate their young people, so those working, living, a living community. I think it is really an important element that we should not dismiss, that we do need to keep the villages that were the product of the 1970s and 1980s very much alive. This is quite a substantial site but already the Connétable has indicated that we can achieve pedestrian access into the middle of the site. I think due to the planning brief that can be done, we can end up with a very sensitive and a very useful site and a contribution both to the village and indeed to provide homes, so I am very supportive of the Parish. I do not think I need say any more than that.

3.5.4 The Deputy of St. Ouen:

Listening to the Connétable of St. John in proposing the 2 amendments he has made this afternoon, it struck me really how the development of both our Parishes proceeded along much the same lines. Of course, I am proud of my own Parish, as the Connétable of St. John is proud of his. I see that both Parishes have, over time, developed sheltered homes for elderly people and carried out village developments for first-time buyers. Our sheltered homes consist of 39 homes built in the 1970s and 1990s but none since and similarly our village developments were some decades ago, nothing recently. Like the Connétable of St. John mentioned that many of our village developments are still occupied by people who were those first-time buyers but, as I feel, they have grown old, as we all do grow old, they are still valuable members of our community. But in St. Ouen we are struggling sometimes - not at the moment - but sometimes to find sufficient people to serve in the Honorary Police, to serve in the Youth Club as workers, in the sports clubs that exist in the Parish and in the uniformed organisations such as scouts. There is a risk that a community such as ours would lose its vibrancy or, as the Minister just mentioned, it needs to breathe; that is so important. The community will change if it has insufficient young people in it, if it develops a stasis and nothing happens and its inhabitants largely grow older. But of course, those first-time buyer homes in the village developments do get sold eventually but progressively they do not get sold or unlikely they get sold to first-time buyers because those homes are now, in many cases, fetching £800,000 or more, not affordable to first-time buyers. So, I hear again those conversations from grandparents and parents that I have mentioned in a previous speech this afternoon about why their children and grandchildren cannot afford to live in the Island or why they are moving away. We hear the sort of remarks that my Connétable has just read out in his speech. So, recognising this, the Parish has long sought to create new homes in the village centre, accepting there is an Island-wide need also, and we have been

supportive of Deputy Gardiner's proposition to say it is not just for parishioners we are seeking to do this but for the Island-wide need also. We have particularly sought in the last decade to build some sheltered homes, and those were the previous applications mentioned by Mr. and Mrs. Blackmore in their letter that were made in respect of field 622. I was heavily involved each time as a Procureur du Bien Public and, yes, those applications were refused.

[16:45]

On the last occasion it was not refused because the application had absolutely no merit, a planning inspector refused it, or did not recommend it, but essentially told us that we could not demonstrate that we had assessed all the possible sites around the village for suitability for development. We had gone too early to concentrate on one site. We, as a Parish, accepted that finding and we were urged to work with the Planning Department, which the Parish has done so, as my Connétable has mentioned, for the best part of a decade. The Constable called a Parish Assembly to ask if this work should be done and a group was formed to take forward the assessment of sites. There was research and consultation with owners and occupiers and submissions made to the process of the bridging Island Plan for the numerous sites around the village. All the scoring is listed in the *Housing Land Availability and Assessment of Sites* document that has been produced by the Planning Department. If the Parish can achieve its aspirations, we would like to develop field 622, in particular, for those sheltered homes I have spoken about because, although we presently have 39 sheltered homes, they are much in demand; there is a waiting list referred to by the Connétable. It is that field that gives direct pedestrian access to shops, pharmacy, post office and other village amenities without crossing a road. Fields 622 and 623 are adjacent to our residential development in the Parish at the edge of our built-up area and inspectors have said it forms a logical extension to our residential village boundaries. Of course, I well understand that we would be losing agricultural land and were it possible to achieve housing to house the population that we need to house and still maintain all the land that we have in agriculture, I would love to do that, but we know there has got to be that balance and that compromise achieved. So, there is opposition to these fields which we must recognise and Deputy Le Hagarat has brought forward her opposition on the basis that she does not wish to see a loss, particularly to the dairy industry. We have also received a letter from the organisers of a petition who live close to the sites and seen the petition itself which, let us face it, is impressive in the number of signatures it has garnered. But I think the petition did disappoint me because I think it is right to say, if it is to be creditable, the statements made by its promoters should be accurate and, regrettably, those statements were not accurate; well, at least some of them. It has been said that a dairy farmer will lose his livelihood. But this dairy farmer will lose the 3 vergées that he has been a tenant of if this plan proceeds but he has the use of a further 26 vergées or more of land, much of which is in his ownership and around the farm. The farm was purchased by his grandfather, farm and land around it, inherited by his father and now inherited by the current farmer. He does not have a large herd, it is 11 head of cattle, 8 of which are milking cows. So, it is my view certainly that his herd could easily be sustained on the remaining land that he has available to him and there is no risk that he would lose his livelihood if field 623 was no longer available to him. Now of course it is for the farmer to decide when he chooses to cease farming, because the farmer is now in his 60s, he may well be thinking of that, I just do not know, but the fact is he will not be forced, if these fields are developed, to cease farming. It is quite conceivable, because there has been considerable media interest too, that many have signed the petition on the basis that a dairy farmer will lose his livelihood which, were it to be the case, would perhaps cause me to think again because I also recognise the value of the dairy industry. But here that will not be the case; there are 8 milking cows affected which can be adequately tended on remaining land. But it is also said that this land is adjacent to a site of special interest, which regrettably is not true because both fields do not enjoy any designation in that respect. The land to the west is wet, sometimes called the marsh, because it was once more marshy than it is now. Work decades ago culverted many of these streams across it, so it is not recognised or designated as key marshland habitat and it is not proposed for such. The nearest S.S.I.

is in St. Ouen’s Bay and the Island’s flood-risk map confirms that the site does not suffer from any recognised flood risk. It is a beautiful spot, it is what many locals call “Hydrangea Avenue”, and that is maintained by the Parish. The grass is cut, the bushes are trimmed, the trees are pruned and that will continue whatever happens on this field, but there are no particular features about that land that warrants or have been granted any S.S.I. status. Again, this has been a feature on media and I wonder if many who signed the petition might have been swayed by that. This land 622 and 623 together have a potential to achieve 77 homes for those who need it. Some we hope will be for rightsizing, others for first-time buyers, and I think it is an appropriate land to achieve that balancing exercise that we need to do, to weigh up the loss to agriculture against what we need to achieve in housing our population. So I do urge all Members to reject - and it is appropriate to do so - Deputy Le Hegarat’s amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff:

If no other Member wishes to speak, I call upon Deputy Le Hegarat to reply.

3.5.5 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Not really many questions here to answer for me. It is interesting from the point of view of it is a small herd, 11 cows, but that is probably about how many we had when we were kids. Sometimes, as an Island, we forget that it is not only important to make sure that we protect large herds but also the small ones because it is the same as we have a lot of big farmers but surely we need to protect small farmers as much. So from my point of view it does not matter whether the farmer has 11 or 1,100, that to me is not the issue. I cannot say how many vergées of land - I probably should have asked my daughter because she was working it out recently - you needed for a cow, how much land you needed for a sheep and how much land you needed for a pig but I did not do those sums so I cannot answer that question. But of course, as a farmer, you will need to not only graze your cattle during the day but you will obviously need to provide them with hay of a night-time, you will also maybe give them silage. Also, I would assume with such a small herd of cattle that you are not going to have that as your only means of income, so you will probably have, as I said, your potatoes, your flowers, your parsnips, whatever, I do not know. But my driver for this, as I said - and I did apologise to my 2 colleagues in the Assembly - because I did not negotiate with them prior to putting in my amendment because I saw the article and for me the driver was the loss of the herd. Therefore, that is my line, and it is about protecting agriculture, protecting something that has been part of Jersey’s history and identity since the 1700s and I would hate to think that we could or potentially may lose another herd. This field is opposite the farm, it is right opposite, so I will leave that to Members to make that choice.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is the *appel* called for?

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Yes, please.

The Deputy Bailiff:

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 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 to the amendment has been adopted.

POUR: 22		CONTRE: 18		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator I.J. Gorst		Senator S.C. Ferguson		
Senator L.J. Farnham		Senator K.L. Moore		

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

3.6 Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021): ninety-first amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)) - third amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)Amd.(3))

The Deputy Bailiff:

The final amendment to this amendment is the third amendment lodged by the Connétable of St. Saviour and I ask the Greffier to read that amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Delete the words “viii. S341 Bel Air Lane, St. Saviour”.

3.6.1 The Connétable of St. Saviour:

This was originally on plan B and it has kind of upset me a little bit because I figured that St. Saviour was already quite loaded with homes. It is on the Safer Routes to School, it is in the middle of where there is a school, well 3 schools to be honest with you, and it has not been easy. I think we have done enough and this is an absentee landlord. We did ask if we could purchase some of the land originally because we were going to see if we could have a safe route to school on that side of the road. Contacting the owner of the land, they said, no, they were not interested, and so we agreed with what they had said. So, we then thought we will try and see if we can go it alone and so we did. We have been very well-received by the people in that area, and it is a very safe route to school. At the end of the road we have had permission to break into the wall so that the children can go straight into the wall into the Granville playing area.

[17:00]

The children can then go to Granville School, they can go to the Convent FCJ and so it was a very safe route to school and then all of a sudden we get this where someone wants to put 17 homes, and I could not see the point. It is a lovely breathing area, and I appreciate that the Minister has said that

it is very useful, and I thought he was going to drop it, but obviously he has not. But I just think it is very important that we have these lanes going to schools and St. Saviour is very, very built-up. The people who live in the housing estate opposite and there are quite a few on the ... if you are coming on the road on the left-hand side there are quite a few housing estates going up to Victoria College grounds. So, they said that they thought there was enough building, and I thought there was too, because it will then take you into a little lane which I do not know ... sorry, I was going to say something. It is a dead-end because you have got to approach it, if you want to use it, by coming through Granville Reservoir and doing a big U-turn and coming up a little lane which just fits a car. Halfway up it becomes a no-go area. So, we have got enough and it is totally unnecessary to put another 17 homes on an area which we have dealt with for safe routes for school to make sure the children can travel safely, whether they are cycling, whether they are walking, whether mums are pushing prams. I just think it is so important that the children also have a breathing area. We have got bollards, which is quite interesting, because one day when I was coming back from work a lady was parked in the bollards on the area where the children can walk safely waiting for her child. I had just come up from seeing my cows in the valley and I said to her: "I am sorry, you cannot park there." She said: "I am waiting for my child." I said: "Yes, but this is a safe route to school and I cannot have you there." She said: "Do you have cop in the Parish?" So, I said: "Yes, I am the Connétable" and she was not quite sure because I was not dressed like I normally am when I go anywhere, I was on the farm, but she did move in the end. But nobody seems to care about children's safe routes to school, they want people to walk, they want people to cycle, and when you put things in place, somebody thinks: "I will put a home or I will do something else." I do not want this field built on. I have had I do not know how many phone calls from people in the area. I have a petition and so I would like the people in this Assembly to think very, very hard about once again putting more people, cars into St. Saviour's Parish because we are at saturation point. I will leave it there and let the Assembly decide whether they want to support the Parish or whether they want to support the Minister.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is the amendment seconded? **[Seconded]**

3.6.2 Deputy J.H. Young:

Yes, I did say when I was proposing the amendment, and I will maintain that I will accept this amendment, not only in the interests of speeding it up, I think the Connétable has made some sound arguments and I believe it is important to listen to debates, so therefore I will be supporting that.

3.6.3 Deputy K.C. Lewis:

I thank the Minister for the Environment for accepting this. Infrastructure and myself as a local Deputy have been working with the Parish on this. We have done Safer Routes to School, we have recently done Bagatelle Lane and Infrastructure paid for that. The Parish have taken the lead on Bel Air Lane. It is much, much improved and long may it reign and I thank the Minister again for accepting the amendment.

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

I just want to echo the previous speaker but I also want to thank the Connétable, all the Parish team and all the members of the public who have stood up for this, that has convinced the Minister for the Environment to accept the amendment. Let that be a lesson to us all. So I pay tribute to that and, for everybody else who is listening, it is worth speaking to your local representatives. But I just wanted to make that point because we still have a long way to go.

The Deputy Bailiff:

If no other Member wishes to speak, then I call upon the Connétable of St. Saviour to reply. Connétable.

3.6.5 The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Thank you so very, very much. I would like to thank the Minister for that and I would also like to thank the Roads Committee because myself and the Roads Committee and Parish people here have worked very, very hard for this. Yes, it has been a lonely road but myself and the Roads Committee have worked very hard that we have this and I thank the Minister with all my heart for withdrawing. Thank you very much.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is the *appel* called for or do Members ...

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Yes, please.

The Deputy Bailiff:

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. 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 to the amendment has been adopted.

POUR: 37		CONTRE: 1		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator I.J. Gorst		Deputy of St. Martin		
Senator L.J. Farnham				
Senator S.C. Ferguson				
Senator K.L. Moore				
Senator S.Y. Mézec				
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
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 S.M. Wickenden (H)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)				

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

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Thanks to everybody who supported me; very, very grateful.

3.7 Island Plan 2022-25: Approval (P.36/2021): ninety-first amendment (P.36/2021 Amd.(91)) - as amended

The Deputy Bailiff:

We now return to the amendment as amended, so the ninety-first amendment as amended. Does any Member wish to speak on the amendment as amended?

3.7.1 Deputy I. Gardiner:

I requested in the chat to speak because I would like to check with the Minister if he would be taking fields in separate votes because we have 8 fields or maybe 6 fields left, I am not sure how the ninety-first amendment exactly looks now. I personally would like to hear, if possible, from the Constable of St. John regarding field J1109. I have my concerns about the bats at that field. So, the first question for the Constable of St. John on the views of the Parish, and for the Minister when he will be summing-up, if he would be willing to take the fields separately for voting.

3.7.2 The Connétable of St. John:

This field has caused me sleepless nights. It has caused me the most problem out of the whole bridging Island Plan. I have to constantly battle my head and my heart. I can recall debating this site back in 2011 with the Comité Rurale that we spoke about earlier. At that time, we supported the redevelopment of the Methodist Church next door into homes or a commercial facility, the committee taking the view that it was better to develop existing sites rather than go on to greenfields. Fast-forward 11 years, we now have a very nice development of the old Methodist Church that has become home for a number of families, albeit none of those properties would fall into the affordable criteria. The Comité Rurale carefully considered this field again as part of a bridging Island Plan process. As we have already discussed, St. John was looking for fields that would have the least impact on agriculture, selecting small parcels of land. It should be noted that this land is of a reasonable size and also provides an important home for local wildlife. Indeed, when the church next door was repurposed it was vital to take into account the bats that roost in the area. Therefore, we did not consider this site to meet the criteria. The Parish preference was also for sites near the village and amenities to support our existing facilities. The only facility we currently have in Sion is a bus shelter. However, we have this proposal before us and the proposal has the support of the Minister. I continue to have reservations about building on field 1109. However, I have come to the decision to support the development, to do our part to alleviate the housing crisis. This site is not ideal. But

we are in a crisis. The Government may be uncomfortable with the semantics but the facts remain, too many young people find it too difficult to get on the housing ladder. Too many local families are leaving, never to return. In St. John we have over 200 names on our affordable homes list. Many are disappointed with the criteria set out in the Housing Gateway that requires you to have a dependent living with you to qualify for a 3-bedroom home. I would ask the Minister in his summing-up if he would include an element of 2-bed properties within the proposed scheme for those couples who do not or cannot have children. While we welcome the Minister's requirement for open space on this site, from our previous experience this needs to be more thought through. Across the road in what is called Sion Village there was a playground and sadly that was removed by the company who developed the site rather than the area being passed on to the Parish. If this site is approved, I would ask the Minister for the Parish to have control of this open space. This would ensure that whatever is there would be maintained. The open space should be substantial, notwithstanding the requirement to maximise the site. The Methodist Church used to be a community hub for local residents at Sion. A youth club was based there, as was a very successful nursery. That only closed once the Parish school offered free places. That was the start of the end for the chapel as without the revenue coming in from the nursery it was not possible to maintain the building. At present, there is a lack of community space in Sion. Do we give up what could be the last opportunity to have a focal point in the area for the community? As I said, until recently there was not even a bus shelter. A bit like buses, we now have 2 right next to each other. I have asked I.H.E. (Infrastructure, Housing and Environment) about the possibility of closing the bus layby to erect a bus shelter for those wanting to travel north and especially for the youngsters who use the school bus in the morning. An E.V. (electric vehicle) bike park alongside would also be a great addition. So how do we make a decision? Is it the heart or is it the head? We are often told we do not have enough data, this despite millions being spent on technology. Several Members have mentioned the lack of census data. I remind Members the census was 12 months ago and, while I fully support the need for the Stats Unit to remain independent, surely we are the customer and we could have expected at the very least a forecast ahead of this important debate. Just a couple of weeks ago I bumped into a friend in town when I was on my way to the Assembly and she told me she was off to an event being hosted by Locate Jersey for all local estate agents.

[17:15]

I joked with her that I had wondered who was going to live in all the new expensive apartments that were being created: "What about the locals?" I asked her. She told me the market is crazy. The market is indeed crazy. My own home has increased in value by some 50 per cent over just 4 years. While that may be attractive to some, but what about our youngsters? Youngsters who love their Island. Youngsters whose families and friends are here. What are we doing for them? Are we doing enough? I do not think so. I hear from youngsters, parents and grandparents, perhaps I am a little younger than the Deputy of St. Ouen, but regularly about the need for us to do something for youngsters. Just one example I have had this week, they wrote: "Andy, we cannot afford to move back to the Parish unless we can afford £850,000." They go on to say: "It is just so upsetting that I cannot live within the Parish where I grew up and live close by to my family in the heart of the Parish due to it being unaffordable for us youngsters who want to start a family. We would like to be close to our family for that reason." Every day for the last couple of months when I have gone into my office at the Parish Hall I have looked at a summary of the Comité Rural's questionnaire results pinned to my noticeboard above my desk. 17.6 per cent of householders returned a questionnaire. 81 per cent accepted the need for development with just over half of the respondents, 52 per cent, saying we should develop less than 100 units, 37.7 per cent preferring 101 to 200 units, and surprisingly for me there was 8.6 per cent support for over 200 units. In terms of who should develop, 80 per cent agreed or strongly agreed that the Parish should develop. Some 83 per cent stating the Parish should have influence over future development. Add to those statistics the number of people on our affordable housing list being 202, this I should say is without the Parish actively promoting

the list in recent years. We are currently allocating 16 3-bed homes in St. John on field 525, a project that was years and years in the making. My predecessor finally getting approval for the scheme. The community of St. John supported that scheme for 2 reasons, firstly these are the first affordable homes created in the Parish for 20 years and because of the new facility for the school, so a win-win. I said earlier, when we have a Minister who says he is passionate about community planning but he has not really engaged with us, we have been repeatedly asked to follow the process and we have to the letter. The field in question was added by the Minister without consultation with the Parish, even though we are due to have key stakeholder status. The Ministerial Decision mentioned by the Minister earlier today, MDPE20110067 had 2 actions. The second of these being to continue to liaise with the Parish of St. John working party and other stakeholders as necessary to progress the development and adoption of supplementary planning guidance. Sadly, this has not happened. But I would ask the Minister that this Ministerial Decision is given his urgent attention. I entered this Assembly with a view to finding solutions. We certainly have a problem. Notwithstanding all of the associated issues, we need to find a solution. I would urge the Minister in his summing up to agree to work closely with the Parish in the following areas should this be supported and prior to completing design specifications. That the Parish has full involvement in the development. That the development has a mixture of 2 and 3-bedded units. That the Parish be involved in the design of what he describes as a key planning issue, the provision to be made for public open space. I take a pragmatic view and I will reluctantly support this amendment. We will want early engagement with any planning application and I urge the Minister to work with us in the spirit of the Ministerial Decision.

3.7.3 The Deputy of St. Martin:

It may have been noticeable to Members; I was the only person who voted against the Constable's last amendment. I did so because I am trying my best to find some homes for youngsters. We voted on the potential for 158 homes so far and we have accepted 24. I would just like Members to think about that. But the reason I have risen here is just to talk very briefly, if I may, about (vi) and (vii), the schemes in St. Peter. I would just like the Minister, if he could, to clarify what he can say about the comprehensive scheme that is mentioned in both those 2 parts. Members may know, or may not know, that in the days when I was the Minister for Planning we have had schemes proposed in this area. While parishioners may have thought I voted against the scheme, I have been fighting tooth and nail to make sure that a large field close to the junction is retained for a village green. In St. Martin we are very, very fortunate to have the most fantastic village green facility. I have always thought that this potential building, a large amount of house-building in the heart of St. Peter, this was the last opportunity that St. Peter will get to retain green land in the centre of their village. I have been desperately keen for them to have that. I made the point to the Inspector and he tended to agree. So, I would just like the Minister to tell me what he can about those words, which do appear in (vi) and (vii), the comprehensive scheme that is going to be brought forward in St. Peter.

3.7.4 The Connétable of St. Peter:

Perhaps I can talk about that comprehensive scheme. I do not need to remind Members of the urgent need for affordable housing. I hope the Parish of St. Peter can play a small part in assisting to address that need for the Island. Prior to the Island-wide call for sites, we had already formed our Parish Island Plan Committee and very early on we identified fields P558, the subject of my amendment and included in this amendment, P632, already included by the Minister in the Island Plan, and field 559, the subject of Senator Moore's amendment, as among a small number of fields that might meet the criteria to be rezoned for affordable housing. We then undertook our own call for sites at that time and all 3 sites were submitted by their owners along with approximately 30 other sites. We carefully considered all the sites brought forward, looking at those with the relevant criteria, and ultimately we submitted around half a dozen fields into the plan on behalf of the owners. What is important is that the sites submitted were those that were adjacent to existing development in the village, were close to services and offered the flexibility to provide affordable family homes, which

is including those for rightsizing, which would allow those nearing retirement to find alternative accommodation and free up their own house. Also included in field 558 we suggested one and 2-bedroom units. Unfortunately, the fields in question are greenfield sites and if rezoned will be lost to agriculture. But we also have to meet our housing needs. We know that the use of some fields is unavoidable. What is important is that, if we lose agricultural fields, we make the best use of them when they are developed. That is why, when I spoke earlier, I am keen that St. Peter's development meets the Island-wide need and not necessarily just that of the Parish. Infrastructure in the area, we are well aware, will need to be upgraded. This will have to be considered at the planning stage. But this is also a problem that will be faced by a number of the other sites we are considering across the Island. Field P558 is immediately adjacent to the Parish Queen's Jubilee Homes, where we have already had some success in rightsizing, although this was not necessarily the intention when these houses were built. Some residents have moved there from the adjacent 1970s Parish developments. By selling their original family home, they have made it available to a young family. However, I would point out that primarily the units are allocated on need. It should be noted that the houses in those 1970s developments were so popular with the original residents that it is not unusual that this is the first time that the property comes on to the market. We are lucky that in the vicinity we have the Parish Hall, church, primary school, Parish preschool, youth and community centre, the small village green by the Parish Hall, a café, 3 supermarkets, a shoe shop, dentist, doctor, chemist, and 2 public houses, a further licensed restaurant, Manor Farm. They are all within a 5 to 10-minute walk from the site. It is also well served by buses as there is a regular service running with a bus stop and shelter immediately outside the Queen's Jubilee Homes and adjacent to the site. The new development would allow St. Peter to continue to be a vibrant local community. Like the Deputy of St. Martin, I am very keen for there to be a village green incorporated into the comprehensive site and have stated this for the last 4 years. I know that from my discussions with Andium Homes, and I will come to that later, they have allowed for this when looking at the overall development and I am very pleased about that. We accept that the bulk of the Island's housing needs are of course met by St. Helier. But we cannot allow our rural communities to slowly decline as a result. It is important that we have both local parishioners and those from other parts of the Island in our development. Access to this development would be controlled and managed by the Housing Gateway. Again, I spoke about this earlier. Early discussions with Andium Homes indicate that fields 558, 559 and 632, together with fields 655 and 656, the subject of a separate proposition, would be taken forward as a single development if they were allowed to do this. There would, as the Minister perhaps hinted at earlier, be some trading between the various sites, the separate fields. I do not see this as a traditional Parish development like those in the 1970s, but one where the Parish works with Andium Homes to meet the Island's needs. It is essential that the Gateway is used for allocation. As the Minister said, there are some criteria within the Gateway that allow for some form of Parish connection. Nevertheless, using the Gateway ensures fairness across all developments in the Island. It is very important that those where there is an urgent need for housing are given priority. The owner of this particular field is keen to support the building of first-time buy affordable accommodation and is willing to sell the field at a substantial discount in order that this may be achieved. I estimate the value that he places on each plot to be around 40 per cent of the current value of such a plot. He has met with Andium Homes in the last 2 weeks and they have shared their vision of how the overall development, the comprehensive development over all fields could be developed. As part of that, we are looking to see how his aim can be achieved that that discount is transferred to the benefit of those purchasing a property. In their view, and this may not necessarily be the case, but again this is where we could have trading between the sites to achieve the aim of rightsizing, houses for purchase, and rental properties in one development.

[17:30]

They see this field as possibly being more suitable for rightsizing. It is immediately adjacent to the Parish's Queen's Jubilee Homes and it is close to all the facilities that someone who is retired or is

approaching retirement would require. I have no doubt that, if such a development was built, it would attract people who wish to downsize, not just from the immediate area, but from across the Island. So, unlike our Queen's Jubilee Homes, which are primarily for parishioners, again this would be a site where those who wish to rightsize from across the Island could either purchase or rent properties. In undertaking this comprehensive development, the Parish has a unique opportunity to assist the Island-wide need for housing, working with Andium Homes. I ask Members to support the rezoning of field 558. I hope I have reassured the Deputy of St. Martin that a green area in front of the site is one of our priorities and I believe that this is possibly something that the Minister for the Environment also supports. Please ensure that when we vote on field 991 you vote to accept P558 within the development and the Island Plan.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Point of clarification. I did not quite understand when the Constable mentioned that the landowner was willing to sell the land for 40 per cent of the value, 40 per cent of the value of what, is that land if it was on the open market?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

I can answer that. We are aware perhaps of the price of similar plots. The price that he is suggesting, which I am not going to reveal, is around 40 per cent of the value of a similar plot. So, it is substantially cheaper than you could go out and acquire a plot at the moment. I would say that when the Queen's Jubilee Homes were developed, the family sold that land, again probably roughly at 40 per cent of the value they were offered for it. So, it is a substantial discount on a field next door to it that would be passed for the same type of development.

The Connétable of Grouville:

So, if you sold a plot on the open market for an open-market house, that would be a massive cost. But if you sold it for an affordable house plot that is considerably less of a sum, and I was just wondering what the 40 per cent was.

The Connétable of St. Peter:

No, we are talking the 40 per cent of an affordable house plot, a plot of the same type, not comparing it to an open-market plot. So let us say a plot rezoned within this Island Plan that was next door to it, we are looking at a value of approximately 40 per cent of that.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Point of clarification. So that is the price of something for affordable housing. But this is an agricultural field and how does the value that you are getting compare if it was sold as an agricultural field?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

That is going to be the same for every single plot, every single field that is rezoned, it will have a higher value once we rezone it. We cannot avoid that. But once we rezone these fields we will no longer be talking about agricultural values. Now the value of a plot is determined by a number of factors. For instance, where a large amount of infrastructure is required, then the value of the plot will be lower. So, I am not going to enter into exactly what value plots might have, because that is commercially-sensitive information.

Deputy M. Tadier:

The clarification I would seek is that he has volunteered information about how it compares to the plot of an ordinary affordable housing plot, saying we are getting a bargain, but what we do not know is that if we did not rezone it and if it remained as agricultural land and someone was buying the field

to keep it in agriculture, how much would that cost in terms of what is the percentage difference in terms of that?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

So, what you are really asking is what is the difference between an agricultural field and a field that we rezone as part of the Island Plan, that is what you are asking, and that is not something that I necessarily can answer. I can make comparisons from information that I have, but that to a certain extent is commercially sensitive. I do not think here we are supposed to be allocating the value. I have gone as far as I can. I am not revealing what the owner has suggested and I am not revealing what information I may have been given on a commercial basis.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, you are not being asked to and I think you have given the clarification that you can. Point of order, Deputy Wickenden, before the adjournment is proposed.

Deputy S.M. Wickenden:

Are we going to be voting on all of the Roman numerals individually or are we going to be voting on (a), (b), (c), and (d), do you know? Because the difference is that there is an amendment 40th that falls away if (vii) is debated. I want to know how I can vote on this.

The Deputy Bailiff:

It is a matter for the Minister and I am sure that he will tell Members tomorrow how he proposes that Members should vote. But it is a matter for the Minister as it is his proposition.

Senator K.L. Moore:

May I propose the adjournment unless the Minister would like to answer that question?

Deputy J.H. Young:

Do you want me to answer it now?

The Deputy Bailiff:

No, not right at the moment, necessarily. When you make your speech in response, you can tell Members how you propose to deal with it. One thing I can say, Deputy Wickenden, is that the Greffier will circulate tonight this amendment as amended with all the Roman numerals corrected, so we all know exactly where we stand tomorrow when the debate resumes.

Senator K.L. Moore:

I propose the adjournment.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes. Is that seconded? [**Seconded**] The States stand adjourned until 9.30 a.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

[17:37]