

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

WEDNESDAY, 29th JUNE 2011

PUBLIC BUSINESS – resumption	4
1. Island Plan 2011: approval (P.48/2011): eleventh amendment (P.48/2011 Amd.(11)) - amendment (P.48/2011 Amd.(11)Amd.) - resumption	4
1.1 Senator F.E. Cohen:	4
Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire of St. Helier:	5
Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré of St. Lawrence:	5
1.2 Island Plan 2011: approval (P.48/2011): fifty-eighth amendment (P.48/2011 Amd.(58))	6
1.2.1 Senator F.E. Cohen (The Minister for Planning and Environment):	6
1.2.2 Deputy K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:	6
1.2.3 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:	6
1.2.4 Connétable P.F.M. Hanning of St. Saviour:	7
1.2.5 Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:	7
1.2.6 Senator F.E. Cohen:	7
1.3 Island Plan 2011: approval (P.48/2011) - as amended	8
1.3.1 Senator A. Breckon:	9
1.3.2 Deputy S. Power of St. Brelade:	10
1.3.3 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:	10
1.3.4 The Deputy of St. Mary:	13
1.3.5 Deputy J.B. Fox of St. Helier:	18
1.3.6 Senator S.C. Ferguson:	19
1.3.7 Connétable K.P. Vibert of St. Ouen:	19
1.3.8 Senator T.J. Le Main:	20
1.3.9 Deputy P.J. Rondel of St. John:	21
1.3.10 Deputy A.E. Jeune of St. Brelade:	22
1.3.11 Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour:	23
1.3.12 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:	23
1.3.13 Deputy T.M. Pitman of St. Helier:	24
1.3.14 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier:	25
1.3.15 Deputy A.K.F. Green of St. Helier:	26
1.3.16 Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier:	27
1.3.17 Connétable G.F. Butcher of St. John:	31
1.3.18 Deputy J.G. Reed of St. Ouen:	31
1.3.19 Senator T.A. Le Sueur:	32
1.3.20 Connétable D.J. Murphy of Grouville:	32
1.3.21 Senator F.E. Cohen:	32
2. North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011)	37

2.1	Senator F.E. Cohen (The Minister for Planning and Environment):	37
2.2	North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): amendment (P.73/2011 Amd.) - paragraph 2	41
2.2.1	Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:	41
2.3	North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): third amendment (P.73/2011 Amd.(3)) - paragraph 1	41
2.3.1	The Deputy of St. Mary:	42
2.4	North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): third amendment (P.73/2011 Amd.(3)) - paragraph 4	43
2.4.1	The Deputy of St. Mary:	43
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED		46
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT		46
	The Deputy of St. Mary:	47
2.4.2	Senator F.E. Cohen:	50
2.4.3	The Connétable of St. Helier:	51
2.4.4	The Connétable of St. Saviour:	52
2.4.5	Deputy G.P. Southern:	52
2.4.6	Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:	53
2.4.7	The Deputy of St. John:	53
2.4.8	Deputy A.E. Jeune:	54
2.4.9	Deputy S. Power:	54
2.4.10	Deputy R.C. Duhamel:	54
2.4.11	Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	55
2.4.12	The Deputy of St. Mary:	56
2.5	North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): second amendment (P.73/2011 Amd.(2)) - paragraph 2	59
2.5.1	The Connétable of St. Helier:	59
2.5.2	Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:	60
2.5.3	Deputy D.J. De Sousa of St. Helier:	60
2.5.4	Deputy J.B. Fox:	60
2.5.5	Deputy J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour:	60
2.5.6	Deputy M. Tadier:	60
2.5.7	The Deputy of St. Mary:	61
2.5.8	Senator F.E. Cohen:	61
2.5.9	The Connétable of St. Helier:	61
2.6	North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): third amendment (P.73/2011 Amd.(2)) - paragraph 2	62
2.6.1	The Deputy of St. Mary:	62
2.6.2	The Deputy of St. John:	63
2.6.3	Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:	63
2.6.4	Senator A. Breckon:	63
2.6.5	Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:	63
2.6.6	Senator F.E. Cohen:	64
2.6.7	Deputy S. Power:	64
2.6.8	The Deputy of St. Mary:	64

2.7 North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): amendment (P.73/2011 Amd.) - paragraph 1	65
2.7.1 Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:.....	65
2.8 North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): second amendment (P.73/2011 Amd.(2)) - paragraph 1	65
2.8.1 The Connétable of St. Helier:	66
2.8.2 Deputy A.K.F. Green:	66
2.8.3 Deputy S. Power:	66
2.8.4 Senator F.E. Cohen:	67
2.8.5 The Deputy of St. Mary:	67
2.8.6 Deputy A.E. Jeune:	67
2.8.7 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	67
2.8.8 The Connétable of St. Helier:	67
2.9 North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): third amendment (P.72/3011 Amd.(3)) - paragraph 6	68
2.9.1 The Deputy of St. Mary:	69
2.9.2 Senator F.E. Cohen:	70
2.9.3 Deputy J.M. Maçon:	70
2.9.4 The Connétable of St. Brelade:.....	71
2.9.5 Deputy J.B. Fox:	71
2.9.6 Deputy G.P. Southern:	71
2.9.7 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:	71
2.9.8 The Deputy of St. Mary:	73
2.10 North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): third amendment (P.72/3011 Amd.(3)) - paragraph 3	73
2.10.1 The Deputy of St. Mary:	74
2.10.2 Senator F.E. Cohen:	75
2.10.3 Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:	76
2.10.4 The Connétable of St. Helier:.....	77
2.10.5 Senator T.J. Le Main:	78
2.10.6 Deputy R.C. Duhamel:	79
2.10.7 Deputy A.K.F. Green:	79
2.10.8 Deputy J.B. Fox:.....	79
2.10.9 The Deputy of St. John:.....	80
2.10.10 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:	80
ADJOURNMENT	82

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

[09:03]

PUBLIC BUSINESS – resumption

1. Island Plan 2011: approval (P.48/2011): eleventh amendment (P.48/2011 Amd.(11)) - amendment (P.48/2011 Amd.(11)Amd.) - resumption

Deputy E.J. Noel of St. Lawrence:

If I may, I need to declare an interest in the matter that we are debating at the moment, although I do believe that Deputy Gorst's proposition is going to be withdrawn and replaced by one of the Minister. The reason for my declaration is that my house backs on to one of these fields in St. Lawrence.

The Bailiff:

Very well. You can declare it but it does not seem to me that prevents you from...

Deputy E.J. Noel:

No, and while I am on my feet, if I may, I would just like to inform Members I have to leave the Chamber now for a couple of hours. I have a prearranged meeting that was arranged over a year ago and unfortunately I have not been able to rearrange it. Participants in that meeting are coming over from South Africa so I am afraid I will have to be absent for the next couple of hours, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Very well. Thank you, Deputy Noel.

Male Speaker:

Before we move forward, Sir, I wonder if I can propose that we finish business today at 5.30 p.m. as we know there is a dinner this evening. I do not know whether you were going to mention it.

The Bailiff:

Yes, that would be helpful for the Assembly to know. Do Members agree that it would be convenient today to stop at 5.30 p.m.?

Female Speaker:

Could I make an advance on that and say 5.00 p.m. today, please?

The Bailiff:

5.00 p.m. Very well. I take that the Assembly agrees to 5.00 p.m. then. We return to the debate on the Island Plan and, as Members are aware, a difficulty arose at the end in connection with the terms of Deputy Gorst's amendment and it transpired that Senator Le Marquand, I think, had hit the nail on the head as to the problem. Although the Greffier had given a number of rulings, which were clearly correct, it transpired that in the end there was a fundamental misapprehension in the amendment. The Minister can explain better than I, but a meeting was held last evening to try and sort it out and my understanding is that the plan always intended and does indeed show these various fields as being in the Green Zone but it is rather misleading because they also fall within the boundary of the Built-Up Zone. So if they are, of course, in the Green Zone already, then Deputy Gorst's proposition is meaningless and out of order. The Minister, as I understand it, proposes to ask permission to lodge a new amendment which is on Members' desks. Minister, perhaps you would like to explain things.

1.1 Senator F.E. Cohen:

I think you have explained it very well, far better than I am able, but the amendment from Deputy Gorst yesterday mistakenly specified fields within the Built-Up Area. I am lodging this amendment to clarify the error contained within Deputy Gorst's amendment. It is an important issue, a belt and braces issue that needs to be clarified, and therefore I ask Members to please accept this late amendment. Thank you.

The Bailiff:

Do Members agree to accept this amendment? Very well. On that basis then, I think we were in the course of debating Deputy Le Claire's amendment to Deputy Gorst's proposition. So I think, Deputy Le Claire, in those circumstances, are you content to withdraw your amendment?

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire of St. Helier:

Yes, Sir. Following our meeting yesterday evening, it is quite clear that my amendment to the amendment of Deputy Gorst is also piggybacking on a defective amendment. So the new amendment by the Minister brings clarity and I have been assured that it is within all realms of possibility in the future to bring a proposal to rezone this site for housing in the future. I am comforted by that. I thank Senator Le Marquand for pointing out the defect and also for the Greffier for his time and also the advice of Her Majesty's Attorney General, and I support the Minister and withdraw my amendment.

The Bailiff:

Very well. So you need the leave of the Assembly to withdraw your amendment. Does the Assembly agree that Deputy Le Claire may be given leave to withdraw his amendment? I take that as agreement, and then...

Senator F. du H. Le Gresley:

Could I just have a point of clarification from yourself? In view of what Deputy Le Claire has just said, does that mean that any Member in future can bring forward a proposition to rezone a piece of land or was it only the Minister?

The Bailiff:

No, it has to be done under the law. It has to be done by the Minister, but of course if the Minister refuses to it is perfectly in order for any Member to lodge a proposition requesting the Minister to bring forward the relevant amendment to the plan. Then we still have Deputy Gorst's amendment. Do you similarly seek leave to withdraw it?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré of St. Lawrence:

Yes, Sir, I think it is just worth elaborating that the reason this originally arose is because ... and it was both myself and Deputy Gorst came to the same conclusions independently on 2 different areas and the fact that there appeared to be a lack of clarity in that certain areas are surrounded, certain green fields are coloured green and surrounded by a blue line, delineating that separation between the Green Zone and the White Zone, and the areas that have been identified in this proposition in 4 Parishes are not. Obviously the phraseology of the amendment is purportedly incorrect but we felt it was very important that this delineation was clarified because, particularly as identified last night, the interaction with policy H6 where there is a presumption of development within the Built-Up Area boundary. If those fields are not delineated, then you will enter a conflict between 2 policies, one being H6, a presumption to build, and one being the Green Zone. So on that basis it is very important that we do get the clarification and I hope the Minister's amendment is supported. Therefore, on that basis, I will withdraw this amendment.

The Bailiff:

Do Members agree that Deputy Le Fondré may withdraw Deputy Gorst's amendment? It is withdrawn. Very well. That completes the amendments.

1.2 Island Plan 2011: approval (P.48/2011): fifty-eighth amendment (P.48/2011 Amd.(58))

The Bailiff:

No, the Greffier has reminded me that we have not debated the Minister's amendment. [Laughter]
So the amendment is before Members and I invite the Minister to propose it.

[9:15]

1.2.1 Senator F.E. Cohen (The Minister for Planning and Environment):

I would prefer to follow your previously suggested procedure. I am proposing this amendment to clarify the designation of certain fields as shown on the proposals map. I have proposed the same amendment as Deputy Gorst in order to correct his error. My amendment clarifies that these fields are not within the Built-Up Area and that they are in the Green Zone. This is a straightforward amendment but an important one which will ensure that each of these parcels of land is properly protected and designated clearly within the new plan. While these sites are coloured as Green Zone within the draft Island Plan and were always intended as Green Zone, they are currently surrounded by development on all sides and there is a small risk that they could be construed as being part of the Built-Up Area. This is because there is no blue line between the Green Zone that consists of these sites and the adjacent Built-Up Area. The blue line designates the outer edge of the Built-Up Area only but not the inner edge of the Built-Up Area showing where the Built-Up Area stops and these Green Zone sites start. This amendment proposes that the blue line should be both on the inner boundary of the Built-Up Area which is in effect the outer boundary of these patches of Green Zone. It makes it clear that these areas of land are within the Green Zone and removes any ambiguity from the draft plan. It is important for the issue to be clarified. The ability to develop within the Built-Up Area is covered by policy H6, which itself refers to the proposals map. It is crucial therefore that a proposals map is accurate and there is no doubt as to what is Green Zone and what is Built-Up Area. Under the policy H6, decisions on what is within or without the Built-Up Area will be made with reference to the boundary of the Built-Up Area. It is therefore absolutely essential to be clear about which land is in and which land is out, and that can only be put beyond doubt by clarifying the boundary line. I would like to thank Deputy Le Claire for his consideration and courtesy in withdrawing his amendment and I urge Members to support this relatively simple amendment. Thank you.

The Bailiff:

Is the amendment seconded? [Seconded] Does any Member wish to speak on the amendment?
Deputy Lewis.

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

If I could just address my comments to (d), and I am very greatly relieved that this is an error. Under (d), St. Saviour fields 500, 501, 503 and 504, 508 and 623 are predominantly in the grounds of Government House. So I am greatly relieved that was an error. Also field 620, Jardin des Buttes, which is opposite St. Saviour's Parish Hall, that is administered by the Parish with volunteer jardiniers, of which I am one, also Deputy Le Hérisier. 624 is the sloping country gardens in front of the education building. So if anybody wanted to build on there, they would need the constitution of a mountain goat to get through. So I am greatly relieved it was a typo. 625, of course, is the d'Hautrée site which we spoke about the other day, but I will be supporting the Minister's amendment.

1.2.3 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I would like to, at this stage, if I may, express my thanks to the Minister for his kindness - my good friend, the Minister - and also the other people who assisted last night in trying to unravel what was a complicated analysis of the situation, especially the officers. Now, after this amendment, we will be entering into the main part of the debate. I have just learnt this morning that unfortunately somebody I have known quite well has got a funeral at 11.00 a.m. so I am going to ask if you

would excuse me for a couple of hours while I attend that, but in case it is all finished before I get back, I would just like to say that it has been a difficult debate. I appreciate that sometimes I have strayed perhaps to the line if not past it in relation to my behaviour and my shouting, but I would say with the greatest of respect to everybody else, it is the concern of the children that I have been worried about and I am certainly concerned that there is going to be a large number of children that are going to be facing significant housing problems in the very near future. I congratulate the Minister, his Assistant Ministers and especially the officers that have done a sterling job of work. They have been working until 2.00 a.m., 3.00 a.m., and your good selves and the Greffier and his staff and of course the ushers. Thank you.

1.2.4 Connétable P.F.M. Hanning of St. Saviour:

Deputy Lewis has spoken about this. Very briefly, I would just like to thank Deputy Gorst for bringing this proposition originally and the Minister for amending it. I think it now quite clearly does what it says on the tin and it provides extra protection for us and for St. Saviour that is absolutely essential. This provides a green area that reaches right down to the north of town and it provides amenity space, which I know quite a number of our primary schools use. It is absolutely essential that we protect it and I am very, very pleased that this hopefully will go through.

1.2.5 Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I am just really going to reiterate that this is pretty important although it is dotting i's and crossing t's. I trust the Minister will appreciate the free advice from 2 accountants coming at it from 2 different directions in terms of identifying this in the first place. Again, just to reiterate the importance. It is a little ironic. In the previous Island Plan some 10 years ago, about 10 minutes before the end of the debate, there was an adjournment to seek clarification of matters to do with a Built-Up Area. The credit to the Minister here is that he accepts and has been very amenable to moving on this because what happened in the last debate, which representatives of St. Clement may or may not recall, is that assurances were given about fields that had been put into the Built-Up Area, that they would be protected under policies. As I understand it from supplementary propositions that were brought later on, that was not the case and development was being allowed. That was slightly different because those fields had been placed into the White Zone and were coloured white. These are obviously still in the green but they are within the Built-Up Area boundary and that is the area we are clarifying. On that, thank you very much to the Minister and I really hope Members will support this.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak? Very well. I call upon the Minister to reply.

1.2.6 Senator F.E. Cohen:

I do not think any of the points raised need further clarification from me, but I would like to make the point to thank Deputy Le Fondré and Deputy Gorst as an accountant and thank them for their free advice, and we all know what to make of free advice. **[Laughter]** Thank you very much. I commend the amendment to the Assembly.

The Bailiff:

All those in favour of adopting the amendment, kindly show. The appel is called for. You wish to give another 15 minutes' work to the Greffier?

Male Speaker:

Yes. I am sorry, Sir. It is very important that it is recorded that these fields are in the Green Zone.

The Bailiff:

The Member is absolutely right. Very well. The appel is called for and the Greffier will open the voting.

POUR: 36		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator T.J. Le Main				
Senator B.E. Shenton				
Senator F.E. Cohen				
Senator A. Breckon				
Senator S.C. Ferguson				
Senator F.du H. Le Gresley				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Deputy R.C. Duhamel (S)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy R.G. Le Hérisser (S)				
Deputy J.B. Fox (H)				
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)				
Deputy of St. Ouen				
Deputy of St. Peter				
Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire (H)				
Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré (L)				
Deputy of Trinity				
Deputy S.S.P.A. Power (B)				
Deputy S. Pitman (H)				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy of St. John				
Deputy M. Tadier (B)				
Deputy A.E. Jeune (B)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy T.M. Pitman (H)				
Deputy T.A. Vallois (S)				
Deputy A.K.F. Green (H)				
Deputy D.J. De Sousa (H)				
Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)				

The Bailiff:

Well, then, at the second attempt, that does bring all debate upon the amendments to an end. Members might be interested: the Greffier has just handed me a note and so far the Assembly has spent over 37 hours debating these matters. It seems longer to some Members.

Deputy F.J. Hill of St. Martin:

Are we able to ask how many hours Deputy Le Claire has spoken for? **[Laughter]**

1.3 Island Plan 2011: approval (P.48/2011) - as amended

The Bailiff:

We return therefore to the debate upon the Island Plan. Perhaps I can just say this to Members. To the extent that Members have already, in the course of amendments, made major speeches, raising major points, perhaps they would be kind enough not to repeat them all if they wish to speak on the

Island Plan as a whole. I think Members have now got the main argument. Of course they can be referred to, but I do hope Members will be brief. Senator Breckon.

1.3.1 Senator A. Breckon:

Yes, Sir, and I will do that and I will refer to the generality if you like because, as I said a number of days ago - I am not sure how many it was - that when we went straight into amendments, a bit like the budget, we do not look at the generality of it. To that extent, although it is probably really accurate that we have spent 37 hours, the question is have we really discussed the Island Plan or have we micromanaged it to some extent. The other thing, and again I am not sure what day it was, but the Minister thanked those Members who had made amendments. I would turn that the other way and thank the Minister because I think it was his initiative that we were able to propose amendments. I am not sure - you might be able to correct me from the Chair - but previously I do not think Members could do that. They had to request the Minister to do it so it was the Minister who enabled us to spend 37 hours discussing this. So, if you like, he might have made a rod for his own back but I do not think that is the case. I think he is to be commended for allowing this to happen because it is an important debate and it is not just about the nearly 40 hours; it is about the work that has gone in over the last couple of years to get from the 2002 plan to this one and the consultation exercise, including the public, has been comprehensive. The Minister will correct me if I am wrong, but I think the consultation period was extended because there were people who needed more time to get their thoughts together and I think everybody who made a submission was welcomed. The other thing does contain, without going back into the detail, lots of things in there that really unfortunately we have not touched on. It is about the Island Plan strategic policy framework, general development control policies and natural environment, historic environment built, the economy, housing we have touched on, social community and open space, travel and transport, natural resources and utilities, mineral resources, waste management. There are lots of things that lie under that, lots of objectives, indicators, proposals, and the document is very, very comprehensive. I do not propose to go into any details on that but Members may wish to use this as a reference point from this debate onwards and we might all have ideas or expectations but then, if we are going to approve this, this is the blueprint that we use and there are things in there people might have a view about, farm sheds and what happens to them; there are things in there. The only point I would like to make from that is that I hope elderly care, housing and other things that we need for the future will stand out from this because, as other Members have said during the course of the last few days, it is really an issue that we need to address, the funding, the community issues, not just the built bit but the support bit as well. So for my part I hope I have been brief enough but it is a comprehensive document and I do not mean to be disrespectful to the Minister, the department or anybody else in being as brief as that but I do not want to go on too long either and I just close by just echoing some of what Deputy Le Claire has just said. We are quick to criticise people sometimes, working in the public sector and doing things, but I think this is an example how the Planning Department and the officers, along with the Minister and a lot of support from around that, and the Greffier and the people in the Greffe have made sense out of what we have wanted to do. That is to say if somebody wanted an amendment or a change, the planning officers and the Minister gave arm's length, he gave us all access to the department and officers with him being out of it. "This is what you want to do. Okay." So the officers advised on that although their advice might have been given but they knew it would have been difficult to do but they have done that and I think that is a credit. Again, with the Greffe, they have made sense out of this not just for the Order Paper and how we do that but enabling working with the officers of Planning to make the amendments and the plan itself come together. I just close by saying that and I really mean that we should be thankful for that. We have perhaps, some might consider, made heavy weather of it, but without that we would not have even got this far and probably could have taken a great deal longer. I would just say that I am fully supportive of this and there will be parts of it that we do not like or need changing but then we will have to live with that and, as has been mentioned earlier, there is the possibility in the future as the Island develops, the economy develops, the population grow

older, that there are things that we must do and this is probably the tool that we will need to do it and I will just close by just stating that and I thank all concerned.

1.3.2 Deputy S. Power of St. Brelade:

You will be pleased to know that I spent 6 weeks writing a speech that I am not going now to give because everything has been said. We are all worn out. But what I want to say is the following and I will be very, very brief.

[9:30]

At times I have irritated the Minister and at times the Minister has irritated me. I have worried, sweated and worked this Island Plan for the best part of the last 2 years and what we have today is a compromise and so I accept the compromise and I accept the will of this Assembly. I think we have achieved a lot. The amendments have achieved a lot. The negotiations that went on with the Minister behind the scenes have achieved things and I am happy to accept where we are today. It is not what everyone wants but that is what we are about. We do agree things and we do it within this Chamber and we do it in a civil way. The Minister has had to pick up the poison chalice, and the poison chalice in this case, for the large part, was full of hemlock, but I think his statesman-like qualities came through today and in the last 7 days, as did, I have to say, the ability of most of the officers up at the Department of the Environment that I have the most enormous respect for. Finally, Sir, without you and without the Greffe, this debate would have been absolutely impossible and I am grateful we are where we are today. Thank you, Sir.

1.3.3 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I was told by Senator Le Main that I should not have apologised when I am right, and I have been told that before in my political career. Perhaps there was just an element of recognition that obviously upset Members that during some parts of the debate I was raising my voice to the point where it was shouting. The Deputy of St. Martin unfortunately made a snide remark, in my view. That we should count up how many hours it was that I had been speaking. I have been speaking for as long as I thought it was necessary and I thank the Minister for allowing us to bring amendments, but unfortunately the way the plan is structured at the moment, and the way that we have debated, it needs a serious review from Scrutiny because we have been in and out of each topic on several different occasions, when in the future what we need to do is to arrange our business on an Island Plan so that when we talk about affordable housing we talk about affordable housing and then we move forwards and we leave affordable housing behind us. At the moment, what is happening, and it is going to happen now, is that elements of the debate are consistently and continually repeated. There is also a need to review the Island Plan law, in my view, in regards to how we debate things. I also think that in the modern age of Scrutiny where we have issues in relation to assessed need and projected need and demographic need, Scrutiny needs to play a part. There was an issue about whether or not this would be referred to Scrutiny and it was juggled in the air: "Whose responsibility is it?" I was concerned about housing in the main, and those issues were touching upon immigration, economics and housing. So, having spoken to a couple of the Chairmen, they were unsure as to which Panel it should rest with. Perhaps in the future we need to think about how Scrutiny Panels are formed. I have said before, and it has been confirmed by other Members recently, in my view moving forwards - and I hope that the review body take this on board - Scrutiny needs to be structured in a ladder so that the people at the top of the ladder who have not been working are pulled into the next review and there are not necessarily Panels that are set on certain subjects. I think it is inhibiting proper scrutiny. In March we had a housing debate and in March I received very little support from the States Assembly in relation to making housing more affordable. In fact I lost a proposition asking States Members to bring forward policies to make housing more affordable in Jersey and I am constantly getting shown and told by Deputy Hilton about the availability of housing and the amount of housing around that is there for the grabs:

£350,000 to £380,000. I went for a mortgage. I am earning £42,000 or £43,000. My wife is earning, I think, £7,000 or £8,000. I could get a mortgage for £250,000. Deputy Hilton said: "Well, people on average earnings can get a mortgage for £350,000." I said: "What, so I do not count?" I look in my wife's eyes and I know that we will not be buying a house in this Island and I know that my whole life is going to be like that. I do not want my sons' lives to be like that - I have got 2 sons - and I do not want their children to have lives like that. There will be problems in the future if we do not address this. There will be no equity in their lives; so when they reach the age of retirement - if they are able to retire - or if they are just made unemployed, they will just turn up at the door and say: "Feed me. Clothe me. House me. I have no assets. Look after me." We had an admission yesterday and it is, congratulations, the Minister for Treasury and Resources in the last 48 hours has committed the money from the Sunshine Hotel to refurbishing Pomme d'Or Farm. Well, that was a promise he made in March and Pomme d'Or Farm money was meant to be set aside for new housing, not refurbishment of old housing. That is the old policy. I am significantly, and continually concerned about the lack of analysis in relation to the demand and the numbers that we have been working on. I have made it quite clear to people who have been listening, and it is on record, that this plan has been drawn up with the wrong numbers; 150 heads of household has nothing to do with reality. I would like to touch upon some hardship cases, because they come quite regularly to people like myself. They used to come at all times of day and night and I, again, commend the former Minister, Senator Le Main, who used to have his telephone on, answered and his door open, regardless of the day, regardless of the time. I could go down to him, I could phone him up, I could take distraught people with me and I could say: "Here are these people. Look at the dire situation they are in. Can you please help me?" It did not matter whether it was Monday or Saturday night, Senator Le Main held his door open.

The Bailiff:

Sorry, Deputy, we have become inquorate. Very well, Deputy, please continue.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I do believe it was right for me to apologise but I do not think it is right for us not to recognise what is being said. The Constable of St. John said that we would dismiss our business in a far more rapid way if we were to get rid of the radio. Well, I am sorry; I have not been speaking to the people at home, necessarily. I have been trying to get through to Members. Now, Members have all been in receipt of emails from me. I know I have been deluging them with emails recently, but I have been copying them into some of these hardship cases that they are aware of and I am going to share some of those now with the public. For the first time I am going to tell the public the kind of things that every single States Member knows and yet they vote against making housing more affordable and making adequate provision. Every single States Member knows these issues I am about to say. Every single Member in this Assembly has had these emails from me. This one I received in January - I shared it with States Members - in regard to a young man whose mother was in a desperate situation: "I am emailing on behalf of my mother, Mrs. X. As you are aware, my father was diagnosed with bone cancer in September 2010 and died at home this month, January 2011. My mother cannot walk up and down stairs and is currently sleeping and living in almost the exact spot where her husband, my father, died. She is under Dr. X who has written saying she cannot do stairs and needs a ground floor flat, house, et cetera. On top of this, she has severe back, knee, hip problems, which are being treated by a chiropractor, and breathing problems. My main concern at this moment is her sleeping in the room where she watched her husband die. Sadly, she has no choice in this. It is heartbreaking for her and extremely depressing. I am worried for her mental state and she believes she cannot cope with this much longer. The housing..." I apologise, Sir. I am afraid I cannot continue and I am going to... I would like to be able to read these out but I am becoming over-emotional, Sir. Excuse me.

The Bailiff:

It is all right, Deputy. Do you want to take a minute?

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I need to finish this, Sir. I am sorry. I am not trying to be dramatic. I just did not expect that. I am sorry.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Sir, if the Deputy would give way for one moment, this may encourage him a little. The lady in question - we do not need to mention her name - told me only 2 days ago that she was delighted that she has now been rehoused. I do not know if the Deputy knows that, but I am sure it would cheer him up a little. Thank you.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I was going to say she has just received information; she has not yet received the key. I am wondering, because I went to see her 10 minutes after I said I was going read out this hardship case, what influence that had. I cannot do anything but praise the Housing officers in the difficult position they are in, but they have no accommodation to house these people. This email continued, if you will excuse me: "My main concern at this moment is her sleeping in the room where she watched her husband die. Sadly, she has no choice in this. It is heartbreaking for her and extremely depressing. I am worried for her mental state as she believes she cannot cope with this much longer. The Housing have offered her a place opposite the Co-op when built but have retracted as over-allocated and have no room. They then offered a place at X but this is not available yet. I am asking that my mother be moved as soon as possible to ground floor accommodation. If it is a house, me and my brother will pay for the stairlift. It does not have to be renovated." They ask if they could help in some way, the 2 brothers, in providing a stairlift and the money for that because of the shortage of flats with lifts, et cetera. That was highlighted in Deputy Hilton's speech in 2008 when she spoke about the constant calls she had on housing and asked us to support the fields being built upon, the ones that still have not been built upon, and she said it is a desperate situation. The numbers on the waiting list in 2008 when the Deputy made that plea to States Members were half of what they are now, and they are going to be significantly more by the end of this plan. Deputy Hilton said, on 2nd April 2008: "I have had to make it quite clear to one of the gentlemen involved. I understand his desire to remain in St. Brelade. He is now 70 years old and all his family live in St. Brelade. He has been living in his current home for 30 years. I had to explain to him, such is the demand in the Housing Department at the moment, that obviously there are strict criteria in how we deal with the elderly on either lift served or ground floor accommodation. There simply is not enough." I think I have probably mentioned the 84 year-old lady I know who lives in St. Helier who climbs up 3 flights of stairs. I met her 5 years ago when I came into the States as a representative for No. 3 District and she said to me: "You know, I am hoping to get a ground floor flat soon." I said: "Yes, I hope you do, too." Five years later that lady, now 84 years old, is now climbing up 3 flights of stairs to get to her accommodation and she knows and she recognises realistically she is going to have to wait for somebody to die in her block before she gets accommodation that she rightly deserves. I have another one. I have just received a call for help from a young single mother who has 2 children and is expecting another one. She is currently living in the private sector and has been waiting to be rehoused for 8 months. She is on income support. Her rent is £217 a week for a 2-bedroom apartment. The money she receives in total at the moment is £417. I am told she has to meet the costs of her utilities out of that and everything else. She has a gas bill of £642 from the recent cold weather and she is desperate for help in getting rehoused anywhere within Housing that is bigger than her current flat. She also had rats running around her flat and they had to be tackled. The flat, she said, was cold and very smelly from the dampness and very expensive. She lives on top of a noisy business: "My flat was so damp that my living room ceiling even caved in on me; finally fixed now that the landlord did something about it. Dangerous gas pipes around the walls of every room which get very hot. Kids always

getting sick because of the damp; cannot afford the bills and I am due to have another baby in July and I cannot afford to buy anything because of these bills. I do not ever ask for help but I need some now.” Then this week, after I finished speaking for so long, I received another email, which I shared with Members, about a lady who is being told that she is going to be evicted and she does not know what to do because on Thursday when the eviction comes her child and herself are going to be out on the street. So the advice that we have been telling her is: “Sit tight. Hopefully the Royal Court will be sympathetic,” if it goes to court. The Housing Department, with full admiration to the Minister for Housing, went immediately to see her and spoke to her and gave her the forms. I do not know what they have got for her but she does need to be moved. In the meantime, other Members are telling me she should sit tight. This landlady who sent her the notice lives in Australia and has a property manager, who is a friend, who has told her that if she does not want to move they can begin eviction proceedings which will cost thousands and she will be liable for costs. There are many people like this and there are many, many more that I do not know about. There are some that have not given me permission to express these issues in public.

[9:45]

I have full permission and some of them are willing to go to the media on these issues. I do not want to go running up and down the street saying that there is a housing problem to the public because they know it. The only thing that is missing in this whole equation is the public knowing that States Members know. States Members know, but they are choosing to look the other way. They are looking at their elections, in my view, and they should not be looking at their elections. They should be looking at their electorate. I apologise for shouting but there is every need for us to look very, very significantly at the housing issues in this Island and if it has upset Members, then be upset. I am sorry I have taken so long and I am sorry I have been so emotional; 3 of the sites that I brought and the weeks that I have been working have nearly worn me out. I again congratulate the Minister for allowing us to do this, but these 3 sites that I brought were the sites identified by the independent inspectors after looking at 100 different sites that were originally in the plan by the Minister as deemed necessary. Thank you for your patience.

Deputy S. Power:

Sir, before the Deputy starts, I just wish to inform you and the Assembly that I have the same funeral to go to and I will be leaving at 10.30 a.m. I am hoping we do get to a vote by 10.30 a.m. If not, I will miss voting for this Island Plan.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Sir, I think that, with the number of Members about to leave, we are at the point of becoming inquorate permanently.

The Bailiff:

Well, there must be some other Members who are not going to this funeral who are presumably outside.

1.3.4 The Deputy of St. Mary:

In a way I am glad to come after Deputy Le Claire because that is the human side of what we are talking about; so I will get on with what I was going to say. I think the first thing that needs saying is to echo what Senator Breckon said about the Minister opening up this process. Although it still rankles that he says I criticise everything, nevertheless he is to be praised and deserves our thanks for opening this up and for making life more difficult for himself, as he undoubtedly has, and for his officers. This process: although it has been lengthy, there has been, as he says, a lot of consultation. In fact the Island Plan is a model of consultation and if Members go to the website they can see all the records of what people said going back and then comment on that and so on and so on. So it is completely transparent and it is indeed a model for other departments in their ways

of working. So I think we do owe the department a big vote of thanks on that. Then, of course, it comes to the States and we have, this time, the right to amend every last bit. Now, some may say: "Well, it has taken an awfully long time. It has taken 7 days. What about the good old days when we used to whack through a complete health policy [I think someone referred to that] for the Island in 15 minutes?" The fact is that this has created engagement. It has created debate. It has created masses of column inches in the *J.E.P. (Jersey Evening Post)*, which all leads to more understanding of what we are doing or not doing in the public; more discussion. It may look messy but that is democracy and if you want it another way then roll back the clock 60 years and go and live in Europe or, in fact, in Jersey. So it is a costly process in terms of night hours and candles and so on, but I think it is worth it and the Minister deserves our thanks for that. My second point is about one of the 3 pillars of the plan, which is the quality of life in St. Helier. The fact is you can look at the number of amendments that have been brought on this by various people, including myself, and the fact is that some of us do not believe it. We see these fine words in the plan, and they are remarkable words, about St. Helier being a true quality-of-life destination, almost famous throughout the world for the quality of its living. Amen to that. Why not? As I have said, I go elsewhere and I see town centres that are totally different and not dying, as some of the traders would have us believe. It does not work like that. If we had a better environment in St. Helier there would be more pedestrians, not fewer, as we see in King Street every day, and that would increase the footfall. So I really struggle with this aspect of improving the town. We saw the comments of the Minister for Treasury and Resources on the various aspects of the plan and right at the beginning - I cannot lay my hand on my copy of the comments. Maybe someone will produce them at some later point in this debate - but I remember quite clearly his words of caution; his words about using assets for their maximum value because that would impact on the capital programme if we did not. In other words, we have to sell every last square metre in the maximum possible yield so that we can afford, for instance, the new hospital or so we can afford sewerage works at £200 million or whatever it might be. I just urge caution on that whole attitude. We have in the plan an absolute commitment that the town must be made a joyous and wonderful place to live and in certain respects we have made progress, but the commitment is there and without it you cannot fight rezoning in the countryside. You just cannot. So we do owe that to our capital, all of us who live in the gorgeous, gorgeous countryside. I am cracking up now the same as Deputy Le Claire because the next point in my speech is division. But I will finish on this aspect of this pillar of the plan. A lot what we are promised is dependent on planning gain and we will come to that in the North of Town Masterplan debate where planning gain is the golden key. We will make developers contribute X, Y, Z and that way we will pay for the things that we need: the public realm gains and so on. I just worry about that because those gains are dependent on negotiation; although I have an amendment to say they should not be dependent on negotiation, they should be fixed. We will come to that when we come to it. But just remember, when we talk about the North of Town Masterplan, this commitment in the Island Plan, this absolute commitment, to making the town a viable good-quality option to living in our countryside. My next point is division and I think we saw this in the sad vote on the Plémont amendment. Again, that makes me very, very sad because that vote was nearly won. I think the public expected us to take that opportunity. There is a massive groundswell, as Senator Le Gresley said in his speech, on these coastline amendments, to protect our coastline and yet when it came to Plémont where we are looking at a multi-millionaire - who picked up Plémont for a song as a part of a package, where he acquired property all over the U.K. (United Kingdom); all the old Pontins camps - we were not prepared to go there. If you look at the voting, a few town Members, Deputies, swung that vote, if you like. I mean obviously all the votes swung the vote. You cannot, in a sense, divide up the vote like that but certain town Deputies voted for, effectively, putting housing on Plémont. I feel that that is a pointer to the division we have in this House. We have almost a feeling that the Island is too biased towards countryside interests, or rather the States is, and so we have to vote in that way almost to spite the country lobby. That is my interpretation. People can question it. I will be glad if people do. But I sense this town/country divide, we are going to come to it in the Masterplan as well, is very, very serious

for the harmony and goodwill and well-being of the Island. Housing: the Minister referred to me and Deputy Southern as the half-empty Deputies, always seeing problems. Well, in fact any impartial observer, looking at what happened in the housing debate, would say that it was a mess. I find it pretty patronising to suggest that anyone who says otherwise is somehow deluded, prefers to see their glass half empty. I wish it was half-full so I could take a sip, but there you go. Any impartial observer, as I was saying, would say that what happened in that debate was not tidy, to put it mildly. It was a mess; amendments were popping up, policy decisions were taken 2 weeks previous in an astonishing way and so it goes. I am getting my retribution in first. The Minister has told me he is going to be nice to me in his summing up, but I just thought it should be put on...

Senator F.E. Cohen:

I said I was intending to be nice in my summing up.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

Right, okay. Well, I had better get some more retribution in first then and then beg that he is nice to me. I do not always oppose things and, of course, that is easy to verify. But he tried to make out that because I had ideals it was odd to be questioning the Island Plan, or something like that. I do object when people put me in the environment corner and say: "He rides to the bus stop and then gets on a bus," and, therefore, this is some extraordinary thing. I think that other people in the Island do that as well or they go by car and then by bus. We know this is happening and growing. But the problem is that it is pigeonholing. It is trying to say that somebody does not really matter because they are an environmentalist or, even worse, because they have ideals. Well, I will tell you some ideals. One is to have fair elections. Is that an ideal? Is that one ideal too many? Or, for example, we could have a situation where, when a department is conducting an inquiry into a pollution incident, they interview the person who blew the whistle and said there was a problem. That is what I mean by having ideals; ideals of straightforward dealing and of respect.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Would the Deputy give way for one moment? I think the Deputy clearly either did not hear what I said yesterday or misheard what I said yesterday because I made the second point that I value enormously his environmental credentials. He has a great deal to offer in that respect and I said perhaps I found him a little negative because he had been rather worn down. That was all.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

Thank you for that clarification. I nearly always - I will not say always, but nearly always - give way because I think that helps the flow of debates. But, yes, I still would maintain that using words like "ideals" and "environmentalist" is, the way things are at the moment, in a funny way, a reverse compliment. It works that way. It works to say that, if you are criticising the Island Plan because that particular section of the plan was just a bit shambolic in the way it turned out, that is something to do with this idealism thing. It is not. So let us get to the substance of it. H1 has been put off to a group, H3 has been put off to a group and the rezoning has been put off. All 3 have been put off until after the election. I just leave that with Members as a thought. This has taken a long time. When it does come to the Assembly suddenly the rabbits come out of the hat and it is all too difficult and the law officers have given some advice and we have to think about it a little more. We have a policy on population, but the consequences are so bad that they have to be buried until after the election. That is my interpretation of what is going on. If you keep bringing in people, having net inward migration plus births over deaths, of course, then the housing problem can never be solved and so we have to have rezoning *ad infinitum* and we have to have this group working like mad to try and resolve H1 and H3. But we will leave all that until after the election and Members can draw their own conclusions or just mull over those things. In addition, of course, we know - and Deputy Le Claire has pointed out - that the policy is not kept to anyway. So next week we shall be looking at that in more detail, but I can assure Members that it is a fact that with

population it is extremely difficult, using any present mechanisms... or maybe it is not difficult. Maybe the Council of Ministers just does not restrain the population in the way that they say they are going to.

[10:00]

The second point about the housing, particularly the H3 ... are we still quorate? Just about. The other thing about H3 is this funny fact that we consulted every step of the way with the industry and the architects and so on about, particularly, H3 and also H1, I think, and they attended the Examinations in Public and presented evidence and so on and so on. Then we were told in the debate, a couple of days ago - and I looked for my note of the actual quotation but I cannot find it, so I will just have to paraphrase - the Minister for Treasury and Resources, quite clearly in my recollection, said: "The Minister, my good friend the Minister [i.e. the Minister for Planning] went to the industry [I think it was a week ago] and made a presentation [I think they both went] and the industry had not quite understood the policy and now they understood it better and the problems will if not vanish, at least they are on the way to being resolved." Now, that is very funny because the S.P.G. (Supplementary Planning Guidance) number 9 or 10, I forget which, the Affordable Housing Supplementary Guidance, was published in August 2010. So there must have been time for the industry to read it once, shout, read it again, realise that: "Oh, it was not what we thought in the first place," be explained to by the Minister or his officers, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So there was time in between August and now and it was not necessary to pull rabbits out of the hat at the last minute and have groups and all the rest of it. Again, there is a question mark there as to how that did not happen, which brings me to the next point which is resources. I am not casting aspersions on the Planning Department. As people have said, they have been working their socks off on this and we get emails at strange hours of the day and night. They are matching my own emails. But there is a question of resources because I think the only defence, if a planning guidance which is controversial in that it sets a profit limit of 15 per cent... so that is already controversial. It is controversial because there is a limit and it is controversial because it is transparent. We are saying to the industry: "We want to work on an open-book basis. This is how we are going to release sites." I am not surprised they got their socks in a twist, but the fact is there was time between August and now to resolve that; or maybe there was not. Maybe the resources are not there which comes back to the issue of St. Helier, and indeed the viability of the plan. Now Members will not turn to it probably but appendix A, table A1 is the list of Supplementary Planning Guidance for this plan and there are 3 pages of... it is quite big type. There are about 24 planning guidances which will have to be developed or written over the life of this plan. I would draw Members' attention particularly to the one on housing mix and the one on affordable housing, policies H3 and H4 of which the timescale and availability is written down as "with adoption of plan". So they should be in the table here as part of the Island Plan. There are several other which are also "with adoption of plan" and I pick out residential design standards which would have helped with the amendments on noise and so on. But we have not had them. As I have said, the only defence, and it is a legitimate defence is that the resources are lacking because otherwise the Minister is in serious dereliction if he has a document where we have to have Supplementary Planning Guidance with the plan when we develop it and they are not there. So the defence must be that the resources are lacking. The alternative explanation that we had to push it off because there is an election, of course, cannot be entertained. So it is the resources and yet we look at some of the other Supplementary Planning Guidance, and I do not wish to think of these not being carried out. The public realm strategy, proposal 9, to be developed with key stakeholders over the plan period. Village plans - I think that is St. Aubin and St. Brelade among others - expected to be developed with key stakeholders over plan period. Local development plans to be developed with key stakeholders over plan period. Open place strategy, over the plan period. So will the fine words in here be translated into action? Will the Minister for Planning fight for those resources or will he go along with the 10 per cent cuts which he has told Scrutiny are relatively easy to achieve

and then we end up with an Island Plan with key supplementary guidances missing. So I think the Minister has a choice, I think he certainly has to beef up the resources to get these jobs done. These jobs which we are about to vote for. They are part of the Island Plan and we will not get the results that we seek unless he does commit to those resources being available. On this issue of whether what we will probably end up voting for produces the goods, there is a further issue, of course, beyond resources and that is the credibility of the plan particularly with respect ... the most obvious example is the coastline. There has been much comment and questions asked of the Minister about the strange way that our coastline sprouts developments which seem to be contrary to the previous Island Plan and indeed are certainly contrary to this one. Yet I have a quote from the Minister, which again, I have not been able to lay my hands on specifically. There is a limit to how much one can do. But I quite clearly remember him saying there is no rule, you cannot tie me down, I can always find an exception if the community need or some other get out clause...

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Would the Deputy give way again? I am sorry, I have not said that. What I have said in the past is that where there is an existing building on the coastline there could be a reasonable expectation in some circumstances where an owner of that property would believe that they have a reasonable expectation of getting a consent for something. Furthermore, just to correct the Deputy, I did not say that I had met the construction industry, that was not the case at all.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

Sorry, I did not quite catch the last sentence.

The Bailiff:

He said he had not met the construction industry.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

Well, I have a clear recollection and maybe that is one for Hansard and written questions and all the palaver but I clearly remember the Minister for Treasury and Resources saying that in the recent past, I think he said last week or the week before it was definitely a recent timescale.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

That was the Minister for Treasury and Resources who had met the construction industry not the Minister for Planning and Environment.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

The Minister for Treasury and Resources met the construction industry in order to explain the policy and they now are falling over themselves to say that they are happy with it, although they were not before. Yes, well it seems slightly contradictory but that is sort of taking me, in a sense, off the point of where I am now. The credibility aspect is important to the public, they are really aghast at some of the things that are going on. I think this existing building, reasonable expectation, is a huge get out loophole thingy. I am almost minded to call for the A.G. (Attorney General) to explain it but I think that is probably for another time. But I would remind Members in this context about credibility it is probably worth just saying what NE6 says so that people are aware when we vote on this Island Plan what we are saying. "The Coastal National Park will be given the highest level of protection from development and this will be given priority over all other planning considerations. In this area there will be the strong presumption against all forms of new development for whatever purpose." Now, the issue is credibility. Whether that sticks, that is a policy, whether the Minister and his successor, whoever that might be, sticks to that. I am going to pursue this a little bit because in the E.i.P. (Examination in Public) process I think that the officers took a view on behalf of the Minister which certainly raised my eyebrows. On this policy exceptions will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that extensions to existing residential buildings will not cause serious harm, et cetera, et cetera. "The redevelopment of existing

residential buildings would give rise to demonstrable gains and proposals for new or extended cultural and tourism attractions are sensitively related to the landscape character.” So those are 3 exceptions, the first 2 refer to the redevelopment of existing residential and the third is about for new or extended cultural and tourism attractions, which I think we would all support. It goes on... those are exceptions one, 2 and 3, residential, extensions, redevelopment of existing residential and new or extended cultural and tourism. Those are the first 3 exceptions. Then it goes on: “There will be a strong presumption against the use of commercial buildings [that sounds to me like Plémont] for purpose other than which permissions was originally granted.” So to switch a use from commercial to another use in the Coastal National Park will not normally be granted. There will be a strong presumption against doing that. “Exceptions to this will only be permitted where the existing building can be reused for an employment related purpose in support of the agricultural industry.” I am leaving out some qualifications. Exception 5 is that their demolition, that is the demolition of commercial buildings, and replacement with a new building for another use would give rise to significant demonstrable environmental gains. All that is to do with commercial buildings, so commercial can go to another employment-related purpose and I am struggling to see where this allows the redevelopment of Plémont. So maybe the Minister would like to cover that in his summing up. In sections 6 and 7 under this policy: “The conversion and reuse of other existing buildings for residential purposes will not be permitted in the Coastal National Park in accordance with the spatial strategy and reducing dependence on the car, and their conversion and reuse for uses other than residential would only be permitted where...” and a couple of qualifications. But that is quite clear: “The conversion and reuse of other existing buildings for residential purposes will not be permitted in the Coastal National Park.” So I would like the Minister to comment on the credibility of, in particular, the coastline sections of this plan but also on the commitment to, in particular the St. Helier pillar of this plan or the urban areas pillar I think it is, with relation to the resources that are needed to deliver. Resources both within his department to write the planning guidances that he says we need and that we are about to vote for as proposals and also with respect to resources to deliver the gains on the ground. Thank you.

[10:15]

1.3.5 Deputy J.B. Fox of St. Helier:

Much of what I could say I will keep to the North of St. Helier Masterplan but I did want to bring up a couple of things. I have had the privilege, I suppose, of being in the States for 2 sets of Island Plans, the 2002 and this one. Both have been fraught with anxiety, difficulties, promises, et cetera, probably because they both occurred just before an election and people naturally are very conscious of retaining their seat if they so wish and trying to please all sides of the electorate, which is an impossibility. The thing that I would like to say is that there were promises made in the 2002 plan when individuals were approached, property owners, et cetera, requesting were they willing to have their land, their area, considered for inclusion in the Island Plan and some said yes and some said no, and then it is a question of the amount of money that these particular owners could gain if they said yes or when they said yes and of course the part thereafter of how much they would gain and should they have a windfall tax, et cetera. Now all these things are important. The trouble is that this has been going on for 10 years and we still do not have a resolution to it. We have people that are still being made promises. Most Deputies, and probably other Members of this Assembly constantly have communication from many parents and young people wanting to have their own home, all of them in the main wanting a 3-bedroom house to cater for their future needs as opposed to flats in blocks of flats. Most of these people will not be able to afford to buy them.

The Bailiff:

Usher, please call Members in.

Deputy J.A. Hilton of St. Helier:

The Deputy of St. Mary just left the Chamber. We have sat here this morning and listened to about 30 minutes of him discussing... and then he leaves the Chamber.

The Bailiff:

Very well, we are now quorate again.

Deputy J.B. Fox:

Thank you. The reason I am standing up is that we have by necessity set aside the determination of certain principles and amendments that have been brought to this Assembly and rightly the Minister for Planning and Environment and his officers have done a sterling job in trying to steer us into a forward direction for the future of the Island. This will be my last Island Plan and so I hope you will bear with me just for a minute or so and hope that we do have satisfactory resolutions for the future of our people. All I can say to you is that when I have travelled either on holiday or through the Parliamentary Commonwealth Association, we are in a very, very lucky position. A lot of people complain about Jersey - mostly the people who live in it as opposed to the people who visit it - but the quality of life here, generally speaking is very good. The opportunities for the quality of health, education and the quality of life where we live is good but we have to remember this does not happen by accident. It happens by determination, co-operation and support. I do get very frustrated when people say: "I do not want anything in my back garden", commonly known as nimbyism, because in most cases where they live was in someone else's back garden somewhere in the past. In my particular case it was 200 years ago but nevertheless it was still in someone else's back garden. We have to, if we are going to encourage our young people to come back and fulfil the quality of life and work and the stimulation in this Island for encouraging our people to come back to fulfil the jobs, we need to support them and their families. We also have to recognise that if a Parish is being offered 10 free standalone houses that at least we should ask the parishioners about it and not just say: "Oh, that is bribery" or whatever. Likewise, if propositions like that are brought to the States I think that we should give it due hearing without criticising the people that are bringing it forward. I am not going to say any more at this present time. I am conscious that we have had a very long time. It is interesting, being vice president of P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee) that the question of numbers of States Members comes up periodically. I notice it in the last week with the amount of people... or sorry this last week with the amount of people out of the Island or out the Chamber, we seem to be surviving on 36 with one or 2 inquirates. Bear that one in mind when people say that we have got too many States Members. Thank you to the Minister for Planning, thank you to the officers, thank you to the Greffe, the Bailiff, to all the staff and to all of us, let us hope we can move things forward in the foreseeable future and hope that the next States will implement a lot of the good things that are contained in this, much of which has not been discussed in detail. Thank you.

1.3.6 Senator S.C. Ferguson:

I will just put my 15 sheets down. With regard to Deputy Le Claire's comment about ground floor flats and so on, I have just sent a message to the Minister for Housing that he should look at all Housing flats above 2 storeys or new ones should be fitted with lifts and old ones he should look at retrofitting, which would provide very much more flexibility in the accommodation that can be offered. But in the Old Testament, arguably the most important part is the Ten Commandments, which is effectively one paragraph in the whole. The Island Plan is rapidly approaching the size of the Old Testament. Does it really need to be quite so enormous? I recognise we need rules for a small community but do we really need so many? Might I suggest to the Minister that in 10 years' time, whoever he or she may be, that they should perhaps review whether we need to destroy quite so many trees in producing such an all encompassing document.

1.3.7 Connétable K.P. Vibert of St. Ouen:

I rise because I refuse to be led to a state of depression by the Deputy of St. Mary. I am afraid I cannot see life as black as he does. This plan, it was never going to be perfect but the Deputy of St. Mary himself would be the first to say that consultation is important. This plan has had an enormous amount of consultation. In fact it has been consulted upon more than any other document which has been presented to this House, and yet Members still see that there are faults in it. Yes, of course there will be faults in it, there were faults in the previous Island Plan but the previous Island Plan did last the 10 years and we did still use it right towards the end. Certainly I recall using it when I opposed the Plémont headland development. I do not believe that this plan is cast in aspic, I think it is a working document. It is something which can be altered if circumstances in the Island change then we can refer to this plan and say: "Look, what we had here was fine 5 years ago but does not fit today, we need a new proposition to amend that particular part of it, but not the whole plan." I think that the whole plan must be recommended to the Assembly. Yes, there will be elements of it which people are unsure of, but I still say it is a working document, it is something which must guide this Assembly and future Assemblies over the next 10-year period and, like Senator Breckon, I recommend it to the Assembly and I congratulate the Minister and his officers for all the work they have undertaken.

1.3.8 Senator T.J. Le Main:

Yes, I am going to be supporting this Island Plan although Members will know that I have had my reservations on the ability to provide more homes for local people right across the spectre. But what I would like to say, as I said yesterday, I am comforted by the Minister who is a Minister, in my opinion, with much common sense and I hope that his successor and successors will apply the same common sense when dealing with many of the issues in relation to planning. I very much welcome his recent announcements in relaxing some of the bureaucracy and some of the laws, which hopefully will make it easier for homeowners and property owners to improve their homes. This is very much welcome and I know that a lot of people that are living in their homes at the present time under the severe financial restrictions will want to do alterations and want to improve, perhaps, even more than what the Minister is trying to relax in making the homes available to meet their family needs. I would like to ask the Minister also that I would like to see more encouragement on affordable homes in the future on new build, whereby 2 beds are built with the opportunity of the third bedroom being added on in later stages, in years to come, as and when a person or a family can afford it. Finally, I think the Connétables of the Parishes should have a greater part to play in some of the minor planning issues that are a daily occurrence. In fact quite often, perhaps before the Minister has done some of his current relaxation of bureaucracy, some of the planning issues that I believe could be taken away from Government and could, like in other places, be passed on for comments from the Connétables, the Procureurs and the officials or parishioners. I would like to see more focus in these areas whereby often the Parishes, the parishioners, on minor issues on people's homes have no objections yet are stymied with bureaucracy at times that I think is quite... not the common sense that I would like to see applied. I am very, very happy to work with the Minister for Planning and I would like to say that the planning officers that I have worked with and continue to work with virtually on a weekly basis I can only say are of the highest quality and commonsensical people that we should be very proud to have in our employ. I know that they have worked very, very hard and I would also like to thank the Minister for Housing and his officers for the continued support they give to Members at any stage of the game when there are any issues, such as highlighted by Deputy Le Claire this morning. I still get many cases of hardship and queries and all that and all I can say to the Minister for Housing is to convey to his staff that we are very grateful, I certainly am, for the immediate response that I get from officers. All in all, as highlighted by Deputy Fox, Jersey is a lovely, wonderful place to live, work and bring our children up.

[10:30]

There are just these little things that annoy very much the likes of Deputy Le Claire and others who care for people that are in real, real difficulty through no fault of their own. I would like to say that this Assembly, through the Ministers for Planning, Housing and Social Security - and all Members - will continue to keep a very, very beady eye on the position of people. I believe that the Council of Ministers have taken their eye off the ball in recent months in regard to ordinary people. We keep hearing of stories of huge payouts, we hear stories of the Ministers, quite rightly - I have got no problem with Ministers, I fully support the Chief Minister in his aims of Jersey doing business with the world but sometimes the leaders in the *J.E.P* and the media concentrate too much in showing everybody that the Council of Ministers perhaps of this Government are travelling and entertaining when it really is not the case, but I think that I would urge the Council of Ministers, future Council of Ministers, to please keep their eye on the ball. There are some huge social issues that I believe that we should be addressing and, as I say, one of the issues with this Island Plan... I welcome the relaxation of some of the bureaucracy and I urge the Planning officers and the Housing officers to continue to make it available that people will be able to be housed in an acceptable manner. Subsequently, I welcome the Island Plan and the assurances given by the Minister that if these sites are not built upon - I am pretty sure I am going to win my £100 bet with the Minister for Planning, which will go to a charity...

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Sir, I would not count on it.

Senator T.J. Le Main:

I rather hope that the promises given that if States-owned sites are not built upon that the next Assembly will make sure that some of the sites identified by the planning inspectors will of course provide the homes that we need.

1.3.9 Deputy P.J. Rondel of St. John:

Firstly I must take issue with the previous speaker on the press. The press that we have been seeing over the last few years is not the press that we knew. The press are fed by this Chamber, by the Council of Ministers and their press releases on a daily basis. We are not seeing - and this is a fault of this Chamber - investigative journalism any longer. We are seeing a daily output of press releases from the Council of Ministers and that is not good for this Island. This Island wants to see exactly what is going on. I hope the written media are taking notes. We need their officers within the media to be discussing things with all 53 Members. If it is reduced to 49 or 52 or 36 in the future, they need to all be having input and that is not happening. The public are only seeing press releases...

The Bailiff:

Deputy, can I bring you back to the Island Plan?

The Deputy of St. John:

Yes, Sir, I am coming to the Island Plan. It is a whole big picture here. It is what is going to happen in Jersey in the future for the next 10 years.

The Bailiff:

I can see what is going to happen. Every Member will stand up and express his view of the media. Now, that is not what this debate is about.

The Deputy of St. John:

Well, that is fine, Sir, no problem, I can continue. I have a list of things here I need to mention. As the Chairman of the Environmental Scrutiny Panel, who was asked over the last fortnight to call this in - and I was in the fortunate position to say: "I cannot do that" - it has been well reviewed by inspectors over the last 12 months, well reviewed, but a number of Members in this Chamber were

quite keen that it be called in. I was fortunate in another area to say: “Well, 2 of my Members are conflicted” so it could not be done by my panel. It would have to be a joint panel between Housing, the Treasury and others that would have to call it in but I was not minded at all to call it in because I knew the amount of work that had taken place. We would not have had enough staff within all the departments of Scrutiny to do the review justice in what time there is left of this House between now and Christmas. As far as I was concerned, what was on the table was what we have. I am not saying that I will not recommend that this is reviewed by the next House, next Environment Scrutiny Panel, because it will probably be useful if it is reviewed because then we can pick up on areas that have been raised over the last 8 days. I must commend the Minister for the amount of work he and his officers have done on this. Members may not know but he has spent an awful lot of time, he and his senior officers, when the Parish of St. John set up St. John’s Working Party which you have all had that report on your desk 10 days ago. The Minister himself attended a number of our meetings to make sure we were setting out in the right direction. I was fortunate enough to be chairing that working party, a group of people from all walks of life whether they were doctors, lawyers, plumbers, carpenters, a group of housewives, a group of people who all brought something to the table who produced a document which the Parish of St. John is proud of, a way forward for our Parish and I commend other Parishes to do something similar. The previous speaker did mention taking things in part away from the centre that could assist the Island in the future. If every Parish had a working party - I know St. Martin has and one or 2 other Parishes are now going down that road - but by the time we have the next Island Plan, we may be in a position to help the Island by moving not in full but in part away from the centre in certain areas. In fact, the Minister’s actions a week ago by releasing certain types of developments on properties, whether it is dormers or windows to be changed on non-listed buildings, et cetera, or garages that could be used for other purposes is a step forward. I sincerely hope whoever follows the Minister in Planning is forward thinking and will not work in a silo. One thing I can say in my return to the Chamber, out of all the Ministers who have grasped what is required within this Island, this Minister has done that. He has set up quite a number of quangos, call them what you will, sub-panels, committees, where probably 50 per cent of Members in this Chamber contribute towards what is going on within Planning and that goes to the credit of that Minister. If other Ministers in their ministries, instead of working in silos, were to bring to this Chamber not on similar policies where they incorporate the views of, shall we say, Members from the other side of the Chamber, then I think it would be a good way forward. I think it is important that for our children we have seen in the last 5 years things change within Government. There is a lot of tweaking to be done in a number of areas but I think what is required is for Members, in particular the Council of Ministers and the Chief Minister, whoever he may be in the new House, takes on board that we encompass, where possible, as many groups from within the Chamber into the fold so we can work together as a team because it is teamwork and Senator Cohen has shown how teamwork can produce good quality work. There are areas in the Island Plan we have heard in this last week, 8 days, which needed really teasing out. We have got it to that point and we are now in the small roads, shall I say, before getting into the harbour and I am sure that the Senator will steer the ship into its moorings and he will have the support of the majority of people in the Chamber for the way forward for the next 10 years and I would like to thank him.

1.3.10 Deputy A.E. Jeune of St. Brelade:

This has been a huge piece of work and we have spent a lot of time on it. I know other Members have made mention and congratulation to the Minister but I must say he has to be congratulated for the way he has stepped in when he has seen that there were errors or omissions and his team have worked very hard to bring us to the position we are in now. As the Connétable of St. Ouen said, it may not be perfect. Well, we are not perfect but I trust we do our best. I am very positive about this plan but I realise it is a 10-year plan and we have, through amendments, agreed amongst other matters, local development plans, particularly for St. Aubin and St. Brelade. I trust that these will be completed in a very short time and I look forward to working with the Parish and the Planning

Department to get these finalised as soon as possible. Deputy Gorst's amendment, which had a supporting amendment from the Minister, drew attention to the plight of the Jersey Sea Cadets. They have seen several Island Plans come and go and for them with only empty promises. They have continued with their very high standards despite the dilapidated standards that surrounded them. I hope that Members of this Assembly will pull out all the stops to move this project forward. The current Governor has been very supportive of their need for their move. At least he can have heart now that there has been a significant move forward within this plan. I most certainly will support it.

1.3.11 Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour:

Under our planning system, every 10 years there is a huge opportunity to set the record straight, to look at what has worked over the past 10 years and to move forward with a very strong vision as to how we are going to do things better in the future. It is not many Ministers for Planning and Environment who are in a position to be leading that process and those who do I feel are the ones at the very forefront in making the biggest changes to the Island that can be made. I think we all owe a huge debt of gratitude to the Minister for Planning and Environment for his steadfastness and the strength of character that he has shown in trying to, for the first time, I think, in all of these plans, and in other issues, open up the process and to make it a more collaborative process and one which quite rightly we can all participate in. Other Members have suggested that in any process you are not going to get everything right but that does not matter. It is the actual newness of the procedures that I think we should be wholly endorsing.

[10:45]

Not only have we got a plan that sets out the framework for how the Island is going to develop in the future, it gives us an opportunity to have a working schedule, a whole set of procedures, to continue the pace and the work that has already been undertaken. I cannot stress enough how it is absolutely vital that if indeed this plan is going to be, as the Minister said, not his plan but our plan, that we are all involved. Looking back over past Ministers for Planning and Environment, I think the Minister might be spared blushes. He has held up John Le Sueur as being one of the great Ministers for Planning and Environment and I think certainly, as time goes by, we will all be looking back and agreeing that the Minister, Freddie Cohen, has been one of those persons who has set the Island in the right direction [**Approbation**] and for the benefit of the majority of Islanders and not just the privileged few. There are still little niggly points within the document but this is not the time to go into those. Overall, I firmly support and endorse all of the work that has gone into this document and look forward, as with others, in working to flesh out the bits and pieces that still need working on. It is a good plan and, as I say, for the first time, it seeks to share, through the work that is being done in affordable housing, the wealth and the riches that have come to this Island to a greater effect than perhaps was done before. Understandably, that is causing ripples because people being people like to make the most of their advantages but I must stress, as a final point, this Island does not just belong to a privileged few. It belongs to all of us and we must all firmly support whoever is in the job to bring about the biggest benefits to the widest number of people. I support the document.

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

I just want to add a few words and touch on some areas that I do not believe have been addressed during the debate on the substantive proposition. If we approve this Island Plan as amended, we will commit to the concept of protecting our countryside and coastline, to the concept of urban regeneration, and to the wise use of resources. I am not sure that we have debated during the 37-plus hours much or touched much upon the resources part of the 3 key commitments which the Minister commended to us in this Plan. On a quick tally, I believe there are approximately 140 proposed policies within this enormous document and Senator Ferguson made reference to the size

of the Island Plan. What we have not debated or touched upon are such policies as diverse as protection of water resources, offshore utility scale renewable energy development, supply of aggregate, and recycling centres and waste collection. These policies, of course, will shape the future of our Island. Those, I think, are the key words in this debate: “our Island”. It is the Island Plan and, in supporting it, I suggest that we all have a responsibility to ensuring adherence to all of the policies within it, policies that, as we know, were reached after very wide consultation with the public and all stakeholders and “all stakeholders” must be all residents of the Island. I have a regret that, during the debate, some Members chose to refer to nimbyism when debating issues in some of the rural Parishes. As elected Members, I contend that the entire Island is our backyard and we all have a responsibility to protect it. In echoing other Members, I commend the Minister and his officers. It seems many moons ago when we held an Island Plan Road Show at the Parish Hall in St. Lawrence and that enabled all St. Lawrence parishioners to meet officers and to have the opportunity to express their views during the very early stages of consultation. I will close by adding my support to the plan and repeating that, in my view, as elected Members, the entire Island is our backyard and we all have a responsibility to protect it, both now and in the future.

1.3.13 Deputy T.M. Pitman of St. Helier:

The Minister for Planning and Environment certainly does have a difficult job and it probably is going to be known as his “Memorial Plan” as he has told us he is not going to be with us in the Chamber in future. I only want to make a few points. To begin with, I would have to say I am very pleased that the Deputy of St. John has been reading my blog about the media. I totally agree with what he said. Who would have thought that the Island’s only newspaper would still not have told their readers about a censure motion on the Chief Minister, but there we go. I contended last week that this debate really should not take place now and I am sorry I probably have to upset the Constable of St. Lawrence because N.I.M.B.Y.ism, I am afraid, is a very real issue. There have been too many speeches, I have to conclude, and it certainly seems to be what the public who do listen - and let us be honest, most of them do not - most people think there are too many of us in here with one eye on how they are going to vote because of their electorate and I think for the future while this Minister has done his best, we have to come up with a system where this does not take place at this time and where all those would-be individuals wanting to make amendments and because they are quite legitimate, can work those through with the Minister beforehand instead of us being presented with something like *War and Peace* to work through. The Constable of St. Lawrence said that all of Jersey is our backyard. Well, she may be right but I just think it is a shame then that so many want to dump everything in St. Helier. Perhaps if that was a sentiment held steadfastly by all Members, the bit more consideration for those people who really are crammed, not planned, then I think we would all be a lot happier with this process. It is a plan, I think, that is much like Australia. It is breathtaking in places; other bits you would not want to go even on a prison ship and that, I think, plans will always be until, as I think the Deputy of St. John said, we can engage all Members a lot more. I do have to conclude that this debate could have finished last week if we had not had so many electioneering speeches that went on and on and on. People talking about me, myself and I and detracting from what they really want to help to overcome, the problems that affect our people. I would point out a final point for Deputy Le Claire because he spoke to me outside and I know he wanted to make quite clear that he did not include the St. Helier Deputies in his criticism because he is well aware that all of us face these issues with people in very difficult situations every day of every week, just as Housing do do their best and Planning does its best, but the fact is our system is deeply flawed and that is why I think we are here today. I will end by saying that the only way all the problems that really underlie this plan will be put right is when the people who are the dispossessed and the repossessed now in the present climate get up off their behinds and go to the polling stations and vote and turf out all of those who are quite happy to condone a 2-tier society because this is just a symptom of a much bigger issue. With that, I will say well done to the Minister for Planning and Environment and farewell.

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

I will start where my colleague on my right left off by praising the Minister for Planning and Environment for the level of dedication and work that he and his department have put into this report [**Approbation**] over the past 4 years and the inspectors who have held their evidence in public sessions which has enabled a wide degree of consultation and, indeed, the involvement of this House and the commitment of this House in the past now 39 hours to the detail of what has been put before us. But I have to point out some basic flaws in what I believe we are about to endorse. It comes down not to the amount of effort and before I go on, and to praise in particular the Deputy of St. Mary and the Constable of St. Helier, who have made this document, I believe, with their attention to open space and air and quality and transport issues, a much, much improved document over the past 4 or 5 days. So I thank them most wholeheartedly. But I have to go to the core issue that we are dealing with here. The Deputy of St. Mary referred to a certain element in the debate, which he regretted, which was one which was divisive. The division he was talking about was the division between St. Helier and the urban area and the country Parishes. He seemed to regret that and suggested that we should all be working together and I would support him, that we should all be working together but this plan has started from a premise... it is like terms of reference. You can get a report that says whatever you like, providing you set the terms of reference and the premise was the overriding planning issue that was to override all else was the protection of green fields. The natural consequence of that means that we are going to build in the urban areas. That is the reality and that division between the urban areas and the greenfield areas, if you like, if you want a better shorthand, runs all the way through this document. I am reminded of the phrase perhaps in the last 39 hours we have been doing something which is referred to as putting lipstick on a pig. At the end of the day, it may look a little prettier but it still grunts. Why it grunts is because the central question must be, have we dealt with what we have been told by the inspectors is a housing crisis? In voting for this document, are we confident that we are dealing with that housing crisis? I believe the answer to that question must be no. This comes back to the basic premise of we have to protect our greenfields and build in the urban areas and the numbers issue. I keep coming back and I have kept coming back to this issue of the numbers. Have we got them right? It is suggested that we are building 400 dwellings per year over the next 10 years. Is that enough? In the past 8 years, we have built, on average, 560 dwellings over that time. It is suggested that 1,000 affordable homes out of the 4,000 in the 10-year plan is the correct target and this will meet the demand where previous estimates have been as high as 1,850 to meet the demand; this at a time when our target for migration is 150 heads of household.

[11:00]

Yet we are lamentably missing that target proven by the figures and we are achieving 325 heads of household net migration into the Island on top of which, at the moment, we are running at something like 250 births over deaths. So will this policy meet that demand? Will we still see a continuing housing crisis developing through the next 10 years? I think the answer to that must inevitably be yes. The numbers in this plan simply do not stack up. We are not going to be meeting the supply. The demand will continue to rise and heaven help us when the recession is over and recovery is firmly embedded because we know what will happen then. That 150 heads of household will be raised upwards towards the 200, the 250. It will happen, sooner or later it will, because the market demands it in the way we run this Island. So have we dealt with the crisis and potential crisis in future years? No, we have not. Do we know what we are endorsing? Can I put my hand on my heart and say: "I know what I am endorsing if I accept and pass this policy, this plan"? Well, if we do not because at the last minute, despite 4 years of work, we found that we have got an H1 Policy with unclear definitions which could potentially open us up to challenge from a developer and that we need to take that away. It has been withdrawn from this plan and it is all very well for the Minister to say: "But it only refers to 7 or 8 per cent of the total housing stock" but if 7 or 8 per cent of that housing stock are not there, that is the crisis made worse if albeit by a

small amount. So that has been withdrawn and that will be brought back and it is being worked on by another working party in order to develop that as to what it means and get a clear definition that is solid in law. Yet we are asked to pass this without that particular, I believe, vital section of this Plan. Then we come to H3 and H3 again requires the Supplementary Guidance policy to be there with publication. The Deputy of St. Mary mentioned it very clearly. Alongside publication, that Supplementary Guidance policy should have been there so we know what we are agreeing to so that the construction industry knows exactly what it is agreeing to and can give its wholehearted support. That wholehearted support has been markedly absent to the extent that the construction industry only last week at a meeting on 16th June was saying: "H3 goes through and it will be the death knell for a great sizeable chunk of the construction industry. Targets will not be met because land will not come forward to be developed." Now, I do not know whether that is a correct interpretation or not but it is far from enthusiastic endorsement of Policy H3 from the construction industry that the Minister says he now has. Returning to the H1 policy, the problem is we have not defined our affordable homes and I remind Members the situation of where we are. Kelvin MacDonald himself says there is no such thing as affordable homes in Jersey. With the price of a 3-bedroom house running at 15 to 17 times the average wage, that is completely unaffordable. With a 2-bed flat even, the bare starter family home running at 7, 7 and a half times the average wage, that is not affordable. There is no way on. Even with massive reductions in the subsidised schemes that we have got in place, the deferred payment, whatever you like to call it, shared equity, we are talking about 8 times the average wage. No such thing as affordable housing. First-time buyer out of the question, should not be in the category of affordable housing. One of the solutions that the Minister has proposed if he says we start not to achieve our targets, he says it does not work, he will simply increase the densities on the States-owned sites, increase the densities of habitation, return back to the challenge of preserving greenfields, therefore building in the Built-Up Area and one of the potential answers in this document is increasing densities of habitation in the urban areas. Now, I think that is a recipe for disaster. I do not want to see that. Unless the Minister can convince me otherwise, I think I cannot support this particular plan. I do not mind whether the Minister calls me "the half-empty Deputy". He can call me that all he likes because I think this is a half-empty policy.

1.3.15 Deputy A.K.F. Green of St. Helier:

Firstly, I would like to echo some of the comments that have come forward congratulating the Minister and his officers on this very comprehensive document. I think it was the Constable of St. Ouen that said we need to view it in the light of an organic living working document which will develop over time. It is clear that a great deal of work has gone into its preparation. I would like to thank the Minister and the officers but I would also like to thank my officers for the work that they have contributed, particularly the work that has been done around housing and I will concentrate most of my comments on housing. I am pleased to say that my officers have played their part and it has been a good example of interdepartmental working. This Island Plan seeks to meet the Aim 14 of the States Strategic Plan and that is to adequately house the population. We have to do that against the reality of the background of finite land and resources. This is one of the most challenging issues which faces this Island and has faced this Island for many years. Undoubtedly, when we seek to resolve the complexities of affordable housing, we provoke another group of residents who see things very differently and it is that balance that we need to achieve. However, my main concern has to be with those seeking their first home, be it rental or purchase. Like many Members of this House, I know what it is like to try and get your foot on that first rung of the ladder. It is not easy and whether it is a good rental home or a home for purchase, everybody deserves to have a home or a place, a building that they can call home. The easiest option - I think Deputy Southern referred to this - would be to opt for the development of greenfields but, of course, in so doing, we would destroy the very thing that we love living in this Island for and the quality of the life that this countryside and our shoreline bring all of us. I have made my position quite clear on this. I do not wish to see the development of any more greenfields until we have

exhausted all other opportunities and I think this Island Plan gives us many of those opportunities, opportunities for the delivery of affordable housing and it does not matter how you dress it up, there will always be some people that will not be able to afford to buy their own home and that is why it is absolutely essential that we have available good rental homes with good security of tenure where people can feel comfortable, can feel safe, can live in a healthy environment and that is part of my role. It is not my role to provide it all but to facilitate that provision and that provision will be provided by ourselves, the States Housing Department, will be provided by other landlords and, in particular, the partnership that we have and are continuing to develop with the Housing Associations. That is essential. We all have a role to play in providing those essential homes for people. The delivery of affordable homes can come from a number of rezoned sites, so-called brownfield sites, and we need to get the H1 right around that to release those sites to have an equitable way of releasing those sites to the public good and without making multi-millionaires out of windfall sites. The policy also needs to ensure that States-owned sites come forward and I will have a little bit more to say about that in a minute. It is absolutely crucial that following this debate, we the Government, the States of Jersey, follow through and demonstrate our commitment to the people of this Island, the people that are in need of housing, by ensuring that our resources are used where appropriate to provide much needed homes in the shortest time scale. This is what good governments do and this is what we have to do. I have one voice of caution in the area that concerns me and that is our drive to ensure that we get the most out of our assets. That is fine but we need to ensure that in so doing, that we are looking after those that need homes, those that are the needy of the Island. It is vitally important that we address those social issues. These issues divide our Island and will continue to divide our Island unless we do something about them. I would like to place on record now, and perhaps a little bit prematurely, but that the new Council of Ministers that will be appointed at the end of this year must confirm its commitment it has given in this debate to deliver the housing requirements for the people of Jersey. Of course, the delivery of housing, as I have said before, must be and has to be a partnership between developers, between housing trusts and between my own department. I do not want to revisit the arguments around demand. It is quite clear and obvious for all to see that there is a demand for that housing, that we need that housing now, that we have needed it for some time. We spend too much time, I think, talking about it and not enough time getting on with the job. Indeed, I will be lodging a White Paper later on this year before the elections that will help, I think, in securing the provision of homes for Islanders in Jersey, be it rental or purchase. The proposals will bring forward regulation of housing trusts, will bring forward the gateway for entry into housing, will bring forward a new rents policy, will bring a Strategic Housing Authority that will oversee the provision and quality of housing throughout Jersey as well as how we manage our States rental homes. So Members can see that I am keen to move ahead with this plan. No plan is perfect but providing progress is reviewed annually and that we actively seek to intervene if there appears to be insufficient homes being delivered in the time scales that have been indicated by the Minister, then I am happy to support this plan. Let us get behind the Minister for Planning and Environment. Let us approve this plan and, most importantly of all, please let us start delivering homes. That could be the clearest indication that we are serious to the people of Jersey when we start delivering homes.

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

The Constable of St. Lawrence, I think, was right when she said that because we have been focused on amendments for the last 7 days, there are aspects of the draft Island Plan which we have really not given much attention to. She mentioned a couple; I will mention a couple of others. There is a whole new section in the plan about raising the standard of architecture and design in the Island and I think that is another contribution that the Minister has made that we are all grateful for, wherever we live in Jersey. I am looking forward to getting the draft Island Plan as amended on a CD-ROM, I suppose, or even better, a hard copy because I think there is a great deal in the plan that would repay further study and further discussion.

[11:15]

So I would encourage Members not to simply think of it as the bits we have amended. There is a lot more in there. I want to refer to a couple of sections, which are highlighted in the projet accompanying the document, P.48, which perhaps we have not given enough attention to. Quite rightly, the P.48 Report, in the principles underpinning the plan, starts off with sustainable development and I think again we have not perhaps said enough about it but it is a credit to the Minister for Planning and Environment that sustainability really is at the heart of this plan; it is there at the beginning. I am afraid that I am not sure the last Council of Ministers knew what sustainability meant because they kept confusing it with economic sustainability, in other words, does it pay, whereas what this is about is we are effectively stewards of this Island. We hold it in trust for the next generation. I think putting sustainability there at the beginning is very important as is, of course, biodiversity. I want to talk a little bit about the section on economy because it does say here one of the general principles of the plan is to enable economic development and diversification. I think it is probably true to say that tourism, though it has not been talked about a great deal in the debates, will be enhanced by this plan. There is no doubt about it because what tourists love about Jersey is the fact that we have such a lot of unspoilt countryside, coastline, beaches and so on. Increasingly, of course, the tourists love St. Helier as well and the Built-Up Area. They love what we are doing there too. Tourism would not have been helped if that very wrong-headed proposition, I think it was from the Deputy of St. Mary, to keep hotels in the industry, had got through and I was pleased that that got knocked on the head. Having been part of the original Planning Committee that proposed it, I know how wrong it was and I think, as I say, that tourism will be stronger after this plan. I am not so sure about light industry because we had a long debate about Thistlegrove, and I think it was right that we do not start putting our units out in the countryside as they do in Europe. One could probably say that they do it in our sister Island as well and, again, that would spoil Jersey to have large industrial sites out there. But what are we to make of the fact that La Collette 2, which was always going to be the home of light industry, has effectively been made a no-go area by the fuel farm post-Buncefield? I have already referred in my amendment to the fact that we are told we cannot go there at the moment because of post-Buncefield considerations. You cannot even jog around the outside although, inexplicably, you can have up to 100 people working in any given factory on the site. I think we really do need to wrest away La Collette 2 from wherever it is hiding at the moment. I think it is somewhere in T.T.S. (Transport and Technical Services) but I am not sure, or Property Holdings. Somebody has got a very careful hand on the development of La Collette 2, not only what can go there but what it is going to look like. There is now a proposal to do some land forming, land raising, and so on. So I think we, in St. Helier, the local Deputies as well, need to really start asking questions about this very important site, which could provide solutions for our light industry and our economy. The plan, of course, has said a great deal with the amendments about the importance of retail, keeping retail where it belongs in the town centre and that is good to see that. The plan has strengthened the hand of the markets, I think, and I just want to reiterate really my undertaking, so long as I have anything to do with it, that I do not believe it would be right to see further pedestrianisation in the town centre until we have solved the problem of access. It really is a problem at the moment for people to get into town and I hope that working with the Sustainable Transport Policy, we will be able to really tackle issues surrounding the difficulty of deliveries and, of course, that has got a lot to do with congestion, that you have got unnecessary traffic in the town centre when what you really want in there are the delivery vehicles doing their job and then being able to get out quickly. I think Senator Shenton mentioned motorcycle parking, another really important aspect we have got to tackle because more people are shifting to 2 wheels. I am quite happy to say that I think we need to review how residents' parking is operating. The Constable of St. Mary is not here to give me my usual kicking about it, which is good, but I will say it for her, that while there are tremendous benefits to St. Helier residents from residents' parking, there are disbenefits. The signage is incredibly confusing and we need to tackle these issues. So I think the whole area of transport,

particularly in relation to St. Helier, is going to require a great deal more work. It is going to require joined-up work between different departments, different Ministers, and I think that really will help us to make sure that in economic terms, St. Helier remains the powerhouse that it is at the moment. I think Deputy Trevor Pitman talked about dumping everything in St. Helier, which is possibly something I should take issue with because while I agree with him in terms of some of the things that have historically been dumped on St. Helier - the incinerator is the obvious example; we had an opportunity to rethink that and we just went and made it worse - I do not regard the concentration of new housing in St. Helier as “dumping” and I would want to distance myself from any suggestion that we are talking about housing being dumped on St. Helier. There is no sense in a sustainable plan where you can talk about sharing the housing across the 12 Parishes because that is not sustainable. That treats housing as a burden for a Parish and I do not see it as a burden, not surprisingly because it brings rates in but because, in my view, people are the lifeblood of the community and I welcome the fact that we are increasingly getting high quality developments in town which are allowing people to become home owners, to get on the ladder. A lot of young people are able to buy their first flat and I welcome their presence in the town because in terms of policing, we want our town to be somewhere where people choose to live, as the Minister said in his opening remarks. I am still waiting for him to move into town but maybe one of the apartments at Harbour Reach will take his fancy. I think it is important we pursue this, we ensure that housing is not seen as a burden; it is seen as an opportunity for the town. On the subject of housing, perhaps not enough has been said about the space. It is really important if we are going to concentrate housing in town, if we are going to focus more on apartment dwelling than on 3-bed houses with gardens and garages, it is really important that there is sufficient space in these units for the families that live in them and I said this, I am sure, in the last Island Plan debate. Simple things like making the ceilings higher. I am lucky enough to live in an 1830s house and it makes such a difference to your life when there is almost as much space as you look up above your heads and in terms of quality of life, and maybe it is just absorbing the sound people make when they yell at each other. I think high ceilings are something we need to be pursuing. I have noticed even some of the newest developments are still very short on ceiling space. Storage is another issue. I was talking to someone recently who told me that the reason why our housing estates have got cars everywhere is because the builders do not provide any storage space. There is nowhere to put your suitcase when you come back from holiday. There is nowhere to put your winter clothes and a lot of people use their garages for that and that is why their cars have to sit outside. We really need to pursue this matter of making sure that modern housing meets the needs of the people who are going to live there. I know soundproofing has been referred to but that again is absolutely fundamental as sound systems and hi-fi's, I still call them, get more powerful, so does the need to make these properties really well soundproofed. I want to talk once more about open space. People may think I have said enough about it and I should be happy that the country park proposal as an idea has got through with almost unanimous support. I am very excited by that project and I hope I will be able to be involved in delivering it. I do want to ask Members when they have time to look again at the Island Plan and the extremely opaque description of open space in the plan, in particular, pages 279 to 283 where there has been a survey done by JPC Strategic Planning and Leisure Consultants. I am just going to quote from their findings; this is paragraph 745 in the plan. They say: “Provision varies widely across the Island with differences in provision in the predominantly urban Parishes compared to the rural Parishes. However, as the Island is relatively small and easily accessible, the provision of facilities needs to be considered on both a local level and at an Island-wide level.” An extremely cryptic statement because the first sentence appears to be reluctant to state the obvious fact that urban dwellers have less ... they call it different, I call it less ... they have less access to open space than residents of rural communities. Then in 748, the main observations of the study include the statement that, and I quote: “There is an abundance of natural green space and adequate amenity green-space provision. However, the quality of and accessibility to open spaces of these types is more challenging in urban areas.” While provision of outdoor sports facilities is sufficient and I quote: “With some issues of local access, particularly in urban areas.” I mentioned in an

earlier debate that they suggest that we need to develop Jersey's standards because we cannot meet the international ones, which has got to be a wrong-headed idea. They do say there is an under-supply of parks in the Island but then they go on to qualify that by saying: "However, their provision needs to be taken in context with provision of other types of open space, particularly in rural areas. In urban areas, under-supply of parks may have more significance, particularly if future development needs are to be predominantly met in the urban areas." Well, I say there is no "may" about it. There is a problem with the amount of open space in the town area and if we are not prepared to tackle that, then we are going to effectively be doing what Deputy Trevor Pitman called "dumping in St. Helier". The open space is absolutely crucial if increased density of housing is expected to go into St. Helier and I mentioned before, the Minister for Treasury and Resources is here. He was not here before when I mentioned that my eyes greedy for open space have already turned upon the Esplanade Quarter. I know he does not agree with me about that. I want to come on now to the comments by the Minister for Treasury and Resources on the Island Plan amendments because I think they have been referred to once or twice but some of them are pretty worrying, and I would be hoping that the Minister for Planning and Environment will be robustly defending his plan against the kind of spending issues that the Minister for Treasury and Resources, to give him his due, he is only doing his job, he has to flag up these issues. But, for example, on the Eastern Area Cycle Network, there is a comment from Treasury which says that the aspiration is supported but then there are quite a few buts, practical difficulties that may be encountered, acquisition of individual parcels of land for which there is no funding; even if funding is obtained, the administration and conveyancing workload would place considerable ...

The Bailiff:

Connétable, we have just gone inquorate. Usher, could you summon Members back? Very well, we are now quorate.

The Connétable of St. Helier:

I go back to the cycle route and the Treasury comments, even if funding is obtained, the administration and conveyancing workload would place considerable strain on the resources of Property Holdings and the Law Officers' Department. Funding not currently in future budget proposals would be required to create and maintain the cycleway and so on. On open space, any presumption that says creating open space from States-owned land will reduce the value of landholdings and limit potential receipts and so on. Now, it is quite right to flag up the bottom line, if you like, but at the end of the day, it is going to be short-sighted. If we cannot deliver these things which are essentially about quality of life because we are too worried about the bottom line, then I am afraid the plan will fail. I would hope that the Minister, whatever the Minister for Treasury and Resources says and however he treats me after this comment, I hope that the Minister for Planning and Environment will accept that if the plan is to work, then things like the Eastern Cycle Route simply have to be delivered. There can be no ifs and buts. Things like air quality, which has not been referred to very much but it is a real issue in St. Helier. Better air quality has to be delivered and there will be costs to these things, I know, and that will come up in the Business Plan.

[11:30]

Some Members have asked whether all this will make any difference and I suppose that is where I would like to finish. It is disappointing, I think, that so many strategic documents and possibly the Strategic Plan itself, so many documents simply get put on the shelf. They cost hundreds of thousands of pounds. The EDAW document for example I think cost £250,000. The Urban Character Appraisal, a very important document about St. Helier cost over £100,000 I think and these documents simply get shelved. Even the Sustainable Transport Policy, which was quite an important document and probably quite expensive, has clearly slipped some Members' minds

because we have had to have another debate about Snow Hill car park even though the Minister is required to deal with that by the end of next year. So I would urge the Minister to tell us how he is going to keep this perhaps best ever strategic document about the Island Plan, how he is going to keep this current, how he is going to keep bringing Members back to it and how a future Minister for Planning and Environment will not allow a coach and horses to be driven through it when, for example, a rezoning proposal comes forward to take 11 sites in the countryside and rezone them. So I am hoping that the Minister can endorse most of what I have said about the plan. I think it is certainly putting sustainability at the heart of the document. It allows Jersey to continue to attract tourists as well as financial whizz-kids and I think that is important but I would just like to be reassured that some of the key quality of life issues in the plan will be delivered when we have all had our say.

1.3.17 Connétable G.F. Butcher of St. John:

It seems that we are at the end of a very long road and I am in danger and I fully intend to break the House rules, I am afraid. I am going to thank the Minister for all the work that he has done and his department, Greffe, and you, Sir, for the patience that you have shown during this debate for the last nearly 40 hours now. **[Approbation]** I am also going to be a little bit hypocritical and I am going to use the radio to thank the members of the St. John's Working Party for all the work that they did to put something into this plan. I certainly hope that other Parishes will come on board with this. It has been a jolly good experience. It is good work. It is good to consult with the people. I just want to say a little thing regarding nimbyism. The country Parishes are quite often accused of being nimbies. I can only speak for St. John. We have never been nimbies in St. John. We have always supported housing and I am sure we have had a good steer from the work that our group has done that the parishioners of St. John also realise that people need to live somewhere and I am sure the group, as well as myself, would support some limited development on greenfield sites. I do not wish to see my Parish swathed in housing, but we need to keep our communities vibrant.

1.3.18 Deputy J.G. Reed of St. Ouen:

Just a couple of points. First of all, I am not sure if it is due to the advancement of the Deputy of St. John's years, but I think this is probably one of the first debates I have not heard him mention mains drains. **[Laughter]** So, I thought I will. All joking apart, I think if Members would turn to page 442, which is about liquid waste management in the plan. It flags up quite a number of major and significant issues that we will need to address in the coming years. It revolves around the existing Bellozanne sewage treatment works and the fact that at times we still have a discharge out to sea. It also flags up that the current capacity is exceeded during extreme rainfall events, also, that the capability of the network to accommodate additional flows from new development or from extensions to existing properties. I suppose that is a major issue when we are talking about... and we have spoken about additional developments whether in St. Helier or elsewhere that we need to accommodate and provide for new developments in properties. We still have quite large development areas in the rural Parishes that are not served by mains drains and we also know that these can have and do have a negative environmental impact on the surrounding countryside and areas. I just would like to make it known that although I know we are still awaiting the liquid waste strategy I think that we need to be mindful of the fact that there will be and is bound to be a cost involved in dealing with this matter. Finally, the Constable of St. Helier speaks much about the need for open space and I would absolutely agree with him. Yet, he seems to ignore that we have a fantastic open space that is approximately 100 foot above our heads and directly behind us, which is Fort Regent. There is an area of land that not only surrounds Fort Regent, but leads right down to Havre des Pas. I know that the Constable is aware of this, because he is one of the Members of a steering group that I am chairing on the future of Fort Regent. We do need to pay more attention and make better use of that space for those people who live and work in St. Helier. Thank you.

1.3.19 Senator T.A. Le Sueur:

As we come to the end hopefully of this debate, to reiterate thanks which are due to the Minister for Planning and Environment, to his staff and to the staff at the Greffe also for the way in which a huge number of amendments have been collated and turned into a workable debate. It is also I think instructive that the process by which we have got to this week's discussions has evolved, to me, in a most satisfactory way. That is due to the foresight and the openness of the Minister for Planning and Environment to review that process in order to give Members the most opportunity to contribute at all stages in this Island Plan process. It has not been easy or quick to produce an Island Plan. It never has been and it never will be. But the way that this plan has been produced as a result of widespread discussion, review, public consultation and involvement by so many people, I think has meant that it has been a far better process than would otherwise have been achieved and therefore should have a much better outcome than otherwise would be possible. I would like to think that we can learn from the process that we have adopted with this Island Plan to see if we cannot perhaps do similar sorts of arrangements in terms of other major States' policies in order that again we get the best possible output. But for the moment, it is just to add my thanks and those of other Members to all who have managed to make this plan into a constructive and worthwhile document to discuss and hopefully to approve.

1.3.20 Connétable D.J. Murphy of Grouville:

Very quickly, I would just like to say that I appreciate very much the work of all the staff who put their work into this, but especially I think the Minister himself. In a situation like this however many people are working and however hard they work, you need one man at the centre who pulls the whole thing together and gets it going. I am full of admiration for him. We have had our difficulties over the last few days. That is all they were; they were difficulties. Let us leave it at that and we go forward from here. I have only one point to make and I would ask him when he is drawing up the management plan for the coastal park that he does not saddle the owners with a load of regulation and cost.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak? Very well, I call upon the Minister to reply.

1.3.21 Senator F.E. Cohen:

I will briefly go through the points raised by the various speakers and then I will continue with the general summing up. Deputy Le Claire said that he felt he would not have a house. This plan, from the figures that he gave us, gives him the chance, like many other hundreds of Islanders, of the first time having the dream of home ownership delivered. This will provide 500 Homebuy type 2 houses and 500 social rented houses of equal or similar quality. I sincerely hope that he has the opportunity of finding a house sometime in the future. The Deputy of St. Mary raised questions in relation to Plémont. I am unable to comment as he knows Plémont is the subject of an application and it would be inappropriate to make further commitments. In relation to the question of whether I was committed to delivering Supplementary Planning Guidance, there has been some confusion throughout the debate. There was never an intention of bringing Supplementary Planning Guidance at the time of the Island Plan debate. It was always intended that Supplementary Guidance would be delivered after the Island Plan debate and in relation to the affordable housing matters, that it would be in place by the end of this year and that it will. Senator Ferguson raised the question of the Ten Commandments and the Old Testament. I would refer her to there being 613 commandments in the Old Testament; 365 of which are negative and 248 of which are positive. The Deputy of St. John raised the issue of the various groups that I have formed. It is my view that each Member of this House has a positive contribution to make in virtually every area of debate and in the forming of policy and legislation. I am always and have always been open to any Member who wishes to participate in any area of the work of the Planning and Environment Department. That is not just empty speak. I can show it from the history over the last 5 and a half years. Deputy

Southern raised the issue of increased density. He seems to think that the proposals in the Island Plan are a covert mechanism of cramming poor quality housing into the urban areas. Let me assure the Deputy nothing could be further from the truth. The intention of this plan is to deliver the very highest quality development in the urban area. The combination of fine architecture, fine living space, fine landscaping and fine art and in my general comments I will go into further detail. The Constable of St. Helier raised the issue of ceiling heights and even from my position I consider ceiling heights to be important. **[Laughter]** Ceiling heights and the space of a room, in terms of its overall capacity are of great significance and any student of the golden circle will know the importance of ceiling heights. He commented on the Minister for Treasury and Resources. The Minister for Treasury and Resources sometimes gets a hard time. I like to think of him as rather like a lychee; he is prickly sometimes on the outside, but he is soft and sweet on the inside. **[Laughter]** I know him well, he is a close friend and he is a caring and compassionate man both in his public work and in his private life. He has committed himself to the dream of delivering affordable housing on States-owned land. He knows the consequences of that. He knows it means that we will not maximise value on States-owned land. He has shown his commitment to serving the Island he loves by committing to reducing returns on States-owned land in the interest of the greater benefit of the community. I will now move on to my general comments. I would like to sincerely thank the Greffier and his team. **[Approbation]** We all know that they have worked hard, but I do not think that many of us know just how hard they have had to work. They have been up late, they have had to deliver amendments overnight, sometimes on complex issues and their efforts on our behalf are simply sterling.

[11:45]

I would also like to thank the Solicitor General and the team from the law officers. They too have worked exceptionally hard, often late into the night and have always been pleasant and courteous in the advice they have given. **[Approbation]** I would like to thank my department and most notably my chief officer. This has been a very stressful time. It has been very hard sat in the back foyer taking instructions from me, usually in a terrible panic, as I usually am, and he having to endeavour to provide me with clear concise advice in the midst of considerable confusion on occasions. **[Approbation]** He has done a sterling job and I am thoroughly grateful to him. I have insisted that he and the direct team who have been involved with this take some time off from the moment the North of Town Masterplan is completed. **[Laughter]** So that could be anytime between today and the next 6 weeks. I would also like to thank you, Sir. It is easier for us, we can sneak out into the coffee room; you, Sir, are stuck here listening for hour after hour to enduring and interesting debate, but you have my enormous admiration for your patience and, of course, your competence. **[Approbation]** In my general thanks I would lastly but certainly not least like to thank the Deputy of St. John as the Chairman of the Environment Scrutiny Panel. He has been wholeheartedly supportive throughout this process. He has been practical. He has been thorough and he has guided his Panel in support, not of the plan, but of the interests of the Island. I take my hat off to him. **[Approbation]** He has never once taken advantage of his position to be able to gain political credit out of this. He has considered the Island before himself and before the opportunities that were easily available to him. I commend him greatly for taking such a view. **[Approbation]** When I began I said that this was the Minister for Planning and Environment's plan at the outset. It was. It is no longer the Minister for Planning and Environment's plan. For this is not like any other debate. The Minister proposes a starting point. We all must have a starting point. Then each Member has the opportunity to frame the plan through lodging of amendments and the participation in debates. We did our best to assist States Members in delivering amendments by providing officers and officer advice. I can assure Members that this was done openly and transparently. I had absolutely no idea of the content of the amendments before they were lodged. In fact, I was often I found out later getting advice from Members on points that were being raised in forthcoming amendments by officers that were completely the opposite of the points that were

being made by States Members. They were incredibly diligent in not, in any way, tipping the balance. We now have a plan that represents the majority view of this Assembly. It is not perfect. It will have a few errors. It is 500 pages. But for the first time we have an Island Plan that delivers real sustainability from the perspective of the community and from our environmental responsibilities. I am new to environmental responsibility. When I began as Minister for Planning and Environment I knew very little about making environmentally conscious decisions. But I have learned a lot and I have learned it primarily from my Assistant Minister, Deputy Duhamel, who has an extraordinary knowledge of environmental matters and lives and breathes environmental sustainability. Sometimes his ideas are a little in advance of the rest of us, [Laughter] but in virtually every case he is shown to be right and his rather advanced ideas become mainstream, sometimes in only a few months, others take a few years. This has been a positive debate. It has been at times slow and for some of us it has been frustrating on occasions. But it has been detailed and that is what democracy is about; each one of us taking the opportunity of presenting our case. Sometimes having a little jab at each other, usually in jest, but generally developing a plan that starts from one point and finishes representing the combined views of this Assembly. Every single contribution has helped frame this final plan. Every Member who has spoken has contributed to the final work that we are hopefully going to endorse. I have been extraordinarily impressed with the knowledge of all Members of the House. This was a 500 page document and Members have shown that they had read it, they had exceptionally detailed knowledge of it and the result was that their amendments and their speeches have changed the plan. That has been criticised to some extent during the process, but that was the process I always intended, that the plan would change. I did not predict that we would have to lodge emergency amendments, but that was also a benefit of the collaborative policy that we have progressed of a plan that has been through the most extraordinary consultation; consultation after consultation after consultation. That is a good process, but it is an enormously resource hungry process. But I am pleased that we have gone through it. Every contribution has been of merit; from Deputy Wimberley's environmentally inspired ethics to the Constable of St. Ouen's wise calm reason and from Deputy Tadier's valid call for radical thinking to Senator Ozouf's financial precision. Each in turn has contributed to the fluid evolution of the plan as debate progressed. This is an exceptionally balanced plan. In its way it is a conservative plan, because it protects the countryside. But in its way it is radical, because it changes the nature of delivery of housing and it changes how we will deliver our housing, both affordable and open market. We have committed to protecting the countryside, without committing to major rezoning. We have abolished the confusing Countryside Zones. We have increased the net protected area of the Green Zone, by nearly 600 vergées. We have established a national park; a groundbreaking change that will protect our most important coastline for many generations to come. We have introduced a novel affordable housing policy that will deliver affordable housing in significant quantity, over 1,000 homes, without swallowing up our precious countryside. We will deliver 1,140 estimated affordable homes during the life of the plan. We will extract, and it has not been easy to agree it, super profit value from land and we will apply it to the provision of affordable housing as we morally must do to support those who are in need within our community; to deliver for them the dream that many of us take for granted, that of home ownership and security. We have committed ourselves as the States to the moral imperative of using the land that we hold as trustees for the people of Jersey to deliver for them affordable housing to meet their needs. We have committed to delivering the dream of home ownership to hundreds and hundreds of Islanders at figures hopefully around £250,000 for a 3-bedroom home, which is precisely what we have proven to deliver on the La Providence site. We have set the path for the regeneration of the town, which we will discuss in the North of Town Masterplan, with spacious well-appointed homes, with high quality amenity space. We must rejoice in this opportunity. This is not an effort to cram poor quality space into poor quality design. An example of that is that I am delighted to have approved the Metropole Hotel application. This will provide approximately 200 new homes for Islanders. It is a fabulous design, designed by local architects, combining exceptional landscaping, amenity space and fabulous proposed artwork. It is a model that we should use for other schemes. Yes, it is

high density, but it is high quality. High quality and high density can go together. It is about providing well-sized units of accommodation that people can be proud to live in, that I would be proud to live in, that each Member would be proud to live in. We have established a vista policy for the first time to protect important views. We have so many magnificent vistas in the Island and so many more potential magnificent vistas. Just look up Peter Street at the image of Victoria College and imagine how significant that vista is. We have established Regeneration Zones; at the airport, at Fort Regent, East of Albert and St. Helier more generally. We have committed ourselves to promoting better architecture. We are seeing wonderful new architecture in the Island, largely from local architects. We are seeing the integration of art, architecture and landscaping rolling out all over the Island. We are seeing fabulous schemes; El Tico, the Ogier building, the Durrell Visitor Centre, St. Cecelia in St. Aubin, Wayside at St. Ouen, Greenacres, the old Ronez works at St. Ouen, La Croix St. John, and these are just the start. Jersey architecture has seen a renaissance and is now among the best. We have an unstoppable momentum with the evolution of this Island Plan. I am delighted to say that I met our first art tourist recently, who had come to Jersey specifically because he had heard of the wonderful Chris Knight sculpture. He will be the first of many as our programme of art unravels and more works are unveiled in the years to come. We have produced a policy that supports the Sustainable Transport Plan, but that does not compromise modern day living. More will be heard on that in the North of Town Masterplan. We have set new density standards and increased the space of our new homes. We have established village development plans, the Parishes taking responsibility for their own future. Again, I would like to commend the Constable of St. John, the Deputy of St. John and the working group and similarly to the group at St. Martin. This is what Parish life is about; the Parishes, the municipal officers, taking charge of the way their Parish will develop in the future. It is an example, I sincerely hope, other Parishes will follow. We have approved the principle of preserving the town centre. We are fortunate we have not destroyed our town centre. Town centres are at great threat at the moment. Matters such as the internet shopping are a threat to areas like Jersey where it is difficult to compete. We are fortunate we still have a vibrant retail centre, but we need to take care and this plan protects it. We are promoting agriculture. We are delivering a more flexible policy for listed buildings. We all know that we have too many listed buildings. However, we do not know which ones. This programme, this policy, enshrines a new system of analysis of listed buildings and we will be able to concentrate on those that are most important and allow the others to change and change over time. We are supporting schools by providing new facilities and play facilities.

[12:00]

We are providing for the improved healthcare services by providing facilities required by this essential service. We are delivering a new and vibrant allotment policy. We are promoting the use of renewable energy. I must in this area congratulate and commend the Constable of Grouville for his excellent work on the Renewable Energy Commission. **[Approbation]** We are introducing a new annual monitoring regime. We all know that politicians take their eye off things. We all do. We move to the next important issue. But in this case we will be forced to revisit this plan on an annual basis to ensure it is delivering what we expect it to deliver and if it is not, to make sure we make amendments to the process of the implementation of the plan to deliver what our community needs. This plan creates a new future for Jersey, one where we preserve our natural environment, assist those in need and protect our Island for future generations. Lastly, to those who feel a little half-empty, and we often do, please fill your glasses and take a sip, it is a bright future out there; I commend the Island Plan to the Assembly. **[Approbation]**

The Bailiff:

The appel is called for then in relation to the proposition of the Minister concerning the Island Plan. I invite Members to return to their seats and the Greffier will open the voting.

POUR: 37		CONTRE: 1		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator T.A. Le Sueur		Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		
Senator P.F.C. Ozouf				
Senator T.J. Le Main				
Senator B.E. Shenton				
Senator F.E. Cohen				
Senator A. Breckon				
Senator S.C. Ferguson				
Senator B.I. Le Marquand				
Senator F.du H. Le Gresley				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Deputy R.C. Duhamel (S)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier (S)				
Deputy J.B. Fox (H)				
Deputy of St. Ouen				
Deputy of St. Peter				
Deputy J.A. Hilton (H)				
Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré (L)				
Deputy S. Pitman (H)				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy of St. John				
Deputy M. Tadier (B)				
Deputy A.E. Jeune (B)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy T.M. Pitman (H)				
Deputy E.J. Noel (L)				
Deputy T.A. Vallois (S)				
Deputy A.K.F. Green (H)				
Deputy D.J. De Sousa (H)				
Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)				

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

I apologise not being here first thing this morning because of a dental appointment. If I would have been here I would have risen to say that Senator Maclean had asked me if the Assembly would mark him défaut excusé, as he is in the U.K. on family business on a prior arranged meeting. I apologise to the Assembly for not passing that message on to somebody else.

The Bailiff:

I see. Does the Assembly agree then to mark Senator Maclean excused? Very well, thank you.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

Before we go on to P.47, which I think is the next item, I just want to advise Members about the Masterplan; that in their pigeon holes the Greffe have put 2 sheets of paper with charts which they

will need for the Masterplan debate about traffic volumes and population. So, I would be grateful if people would self-serve between now and the beginning of that debate.

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

I beg your pardon, Sir. For that reason I rise before you have called P.47 to ask that in the light of the Minister not being here would it be acceptable to propose that this matter be put at the bottom of the Order Paper list for when the Minister returns in order to present the matter, if the States are still sitting or it is rolled on to the next sitting?

The Bailiff:

So, you want to propose it be deferred to the end of the list?

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

Yes, please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Is that seconded? **[Seconded]** Are Members happy that that should be deferred to the end of the list? Very well, then we have already dealt with P.65, the Draft Food Cost Bonus (Jersey) Regulations 201-, the Assembly has already agreed to defer P.71, which is the Draft Health Insurance (Medical Benefit) (Amendment No.4) (Jersey) Regulations 201-.

2. North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011)

The Bailiff:

So we do in fact then come to P.73, North of St. Helier Masterplan, lodged by the Minister for Planning and Environment. I will ask the Greffier to read the proposition.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

The States are asked to decide whether they are of opinion to endorse the intention of the Minister for Planning and Environment to adopt the North St. Helier Masterplan, dated 10th May 2011 as an agreed development framework.

The Bailiff:

Before calling upon the Minister can I just inform Members of 2 matters which have been lodged. The first is the Medium Term Financial Plan: minimum lodging period, P.120, lodged by Deputy Southern. The second relates to this debate; it is comments by the Minister on the various amendments lodged to the North St. Helier Masterplan. Hopefully, that has been distributed to Members. Yes, so, I invite the Minister to propose the proposition.

2.1 Senator F.E. Cohen (The Minister for Planning and Environment):

I hope my voice holds out, because it was failing in the last speech, but I will do my best. Edmund Nicholls' *Vibrant History of St. Helier* presented an image of a vibrant cosmopolitan environment.

The Bailiff:

I am sorry, Minister, we are apparently not quorate.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

Sir, it might be possible to suggest a short pause, whilst people collect that piece of paper. It is going to be very messy if they do not have it if my amendment that needs that documentation comes up before the break and also just to let us all take a deep breath before the next very significant debate. I am not saying it is going to be a long one, but it is very significant.

The Bailiff:

The Assembly is now quorate again. Deputy, are you formally proposing a short break?

The Deputy of St. Mary:

I think that would be a good idea. We might then be properly quorate, have recharged ourselves with 5 minutes, got the stuff out of the pigeon holes and it will all be orderly.

The Bailiff:

Is that proposition seconded? [**Seconded**]

Deputy F.J. Hill of St. Martin:

Surely Members can pop in and out and fetch it, to stop the whole...

The Bailiff:

It is a matter for Members. The Deputy of St. Mary's amendment is quite a long way down on the list, I think, to which his paper refers. Anyway the appel has been called for.

POUR: 6		CONTRE: 24		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator B.I. Le Marquand		Senator P.F.C. Ozouf		
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		Senator T.J. Le Main		
Deputy S. Pitman (H)		Senator F.E. Cohen		
Deputy of St. John		Senator A. Breckon		
Deputy M. Tadier (B)		Senator F.du H. Le Gresley		
Deputy of St. Mary		Connétable of St. Ouen		
		Connétable of St. Helier		
		Connétable of St. Brelade		
		Connétable of St. Saviour		
		Connétable of St. Peter		
		Connétable of St. Lawrence		
		Deputy R.C. Duhamel (S)		
		Deputy of St. Martin		
		Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier (S)		
		Deputy J.B. Fox (H)		
		Deputy of St. Ouen		
		Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré (L)		
		Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)		
		Deputy A.E. Jeune (B)		
		Deputy T.M. Pitman (H)		
		Deputy T.A. Vallois (S)		
		Deputy A.K.F. Green (H)		
		Deputy D.J. De Sousa (H)		
		Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)		

The Bailiff:

So, I invite the Minister to propose the proposition.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Edmund Nicholls' *Vibrant History of St. Helier* presented a wonderful cosmopolitan environment, of fine villas and houses, a mix of artisans, merchants, traders from the mainland, an exciting array of churches of different denominations and even one of the few purpose-built 19th century synagogues in the British Isles. It was a first choice place to live and to work and to trade and to take pride in. The North of Town Masterplan is specifically designed to return the north of town to the image of this era. It has been a huge effort. It was a 3-month project that has taken over 2

years. When I committed to Masterplan this area I had absolutely no idea of the enormous task that was before the team. What has been produced is the synthesis of volumes and reams of analysis and work. Like many elegant things in life it is exceptionally simple. I have a friend who is one of the best lawyers I have ever come across. He had the ability of confining the most complex legal issue to a single sheet of A4 paper that even a layman of limited ability like myself is able to instantly comprehend. That is what this Masterplan does. The Hopkins team, led by Jim Greaves, have done a magnificent job of synthesising the aspirations of improvement in the north of our town and identifying the key drivers that will deliver those improvements in a very elegant and rather simple proposal. We are indeed fortunate that we have the Hopkins team, who are one of the world's leading master planning practices. It has been a privilege to work with such specialists. They have developed a sensitivity for Jersey that is often greater than many who have been here for decades or indeed generations. They, for example, have created a view and I believe they are right of predominant heights within the north of the town. In the north of the town 4 floors is about right. There are exceptions, but 4 floors is about right. The defining architecture, predominantly 19th century should continue to define the future of the north of the town. They have proposed a plan that is about restoring vistas, restoring connections and again I refer to the special views of Victoria College and of the Methodist Church. They are stitching back the missing parts of the north of the town and not really creating anything that will be at an aggressive juxtaposition to what we have already. They are creating spaces, regenerating tired buildings and creating new places to live, to work and to play. They propose creating parks and green spaces, pocket parks, complimenting the new town park. The plan proposes the regeneration of historic buildings for community use. Like, for example, the Oxford Road studio. This is a building that the Constable of St. Helier and I share a common view on. It is an absolute no brainer. It has got to become a community building of some purpose for the people of Jersey and the residents of the north of town. Forget all the other ideas. That is the use for it. That is the place for a café if we want one. It will compliment the north of town park immensely. We are seeing in the plan the regeneration of many buildings; rising out of the ashes of the fire, we see the regenerated Wesley Chapel. It is approved, it is about to commence and it will provide spacious new apartments for Islanders around a wonderful open amenity area combined with a fabulous work of art for them and for us to enjoy. We are proposing the delivery of the highest quality new homes, well designed, spacious with great amenity, both public and private. Other urban communities do it. Other urban communities do it well. We can too. This plan delivers the keys to enable us to unlock the regeneration of the north of the town. We are proposing huge street improvements. It is not difficult to do. Beautification of streets combined with tree planting, delivered in part through a developer levy. If we improve the areas, property prices increase, property owners invest in their properties and it is of mutual benefit to the whole community. We will see probably at some point the Odeon replaced, but it will only be replaced with a building of the highest architectural merit. I urge the future Minister for Planning and Environment to resist attempts for inferior architecture and to command the very best for that site, because it is a key site. With the right architecture, with creating a future for the north of the town, through the regeneration of that site, there is the possibility that the Odeon may be lost. There are many key sites in this plan that will frame the vision. The plan now includes the Ladies College site, J.C.G. (Jersey College for Girls). It is a fabulous piece of late 19th, early 20th century stark classicism. Imagine it, however, painted in light colours, surrounded by fine new houses and apartments in the modern classical style with well designed gardens and private spaces around. It, in itself, will deliver the regeneration of that part of the north of town. It is in our gift because the States own it. The Binney/Martin plan, which was approved some years ago, is ready to go. It could start tomorrow morning. I urge those who are able to to start tomorrow morning.

[12:15]

Ann Court; Members have seen the proposals, the vision for Ann Court, perhaps 100 affordable homes set around a mini park with great artwork and parking under. The enormous Jersey Gas

Company site; imagine it as shown in the North of Town Masterplan as a piece of modern classicism in the manner of John Wood, setting out a grand set piece of architecture, but in 21st century style. Again, set around a park, although clearly we are going to have some arguments about whether it is railed or not. Imagine Ann Street brewery; a wonderful site with a fabulous listed façade. It is a huge site delivering potential for residential development, for commercial development, for retail development. It is crying out to happen and it will stitch back together that part of the north of town. Minden Place, new homes at the end of the life of the car park, set around an open space, as it once was, but with 150 car parking spaces beneath, using a stacked planning system as recommended by my Assistant Minister, Deputy Duhamel. In addition, there will be disabled spaces. This is my commitment to the Minister for Housing in relation to the amendment that we did not proceed with and I sincerely hope that the next Minister will continue with that commitment. The market; we all love our market, but it is tired. It needs regeneration. It needs investment. It needs loving. It will remain a centre of retail excellence served by appropriate transport infrastructure, which will be guaranteed through the delivery of this plan. We will be regenerating the streets with widened granite pavements inset with trees and plants. The north of town really has the potential to be a place of residence of first choice. This is a plan that is long term. It will take many decades. It will not be delivered in its entirety in the initial years. But it is a plan we need to stick to. Some of it can start straightaway. Ladies College can start straightaway, Ann Court could start very soon and Wesley is about to start. The town park will transform the area. As I have said, I am delighted to have set the tone, although not in the north of town, but as an indication of what we can deliver with the signing off yesterday of the Metropole redevelopment. This will provide, as I have said, nearly 200 spacious, well designed apartments by an exceptionally competent local architect. It is a model for urban living, with landscaping by Robert Townshend and Bruce Labey and fine art running the length of the streetscape. It will be built to the highest environmental standards incorporating separated waste, electric car charging facilities, a model of modern living. This is to be delivered and it will be delivered now. There have been many changes in this plan over the previous draft. We have increased car parking as a response to States Members' concerns. We are now providing 10 per cent more car parking than the levels that pre-existed before the town park was started. This will ensure that we provide more than enough car parking but that we can review it as time progresses as the Sustainable Transport Plan starts to take effect and we can reduce car parking future provision as is required. We have redrawn the visualisations specially for the Deputy of St. John so that he will no longer consider that we are proposing to build Wormwood Scrubs. We have now shown what was always intended, the delivery of modern classicism which complements the 19th century predominant architecture of the area. We are proposing a holistic transportation solution providing adequate car parking that responds to the changes that will undoubtedly occur over the coming years; and those changes will occur as politicians, such as the Deputy of St. Mary and Deputy Duhamel - I will get it right one day - become more forceful with their commitment to changing our transport habits. Deputy Duhamel has already succeeded with changing my transport habits. We will, undoubtedly, find changes of use in our transportation habits. Anyone who has visited places such as Malmo will see how that can very quickly change with the right opportunity. We are providing a mix of town and ring road car parking to accommodate today's need but reviewed regularly as transportation plans change. Regeneration is not difficult and I will cite a very simple example. It was spearheaded by my predecessor, Senator Ozouf, and it was the regeneration of Broad Street. He fought to invest a few hundred thousand pounds in improving the streetscape. It was a relatively small sum. It instantly resulted in an improvement in the area, in investment by the property owners in repainting their properties, in redecorating their properties and in improving their properties. Whilst there was a downturn at the time, when I spoke to the shopkeepers they had noticed that their trade had increased because it was a pleasant place to go and it was a very small investment on the part of the public, and it is an example. Of course, it was helped by the Crapaud sculpture, the Occupation sculpture trail and other things that I was involved with. This is a plan

for the future, this is also a plan for today and I commend the North of Town Masterplan to the Assembly.

The Bailiff:

Is the proposition seconded? [**Seconded**] Then there are a number of amendments so we will just move to the amendments.

2.2 North St. Helier Masterplan: (P.73/2011): amendment (P.73/2011 Amd.) - paragraph 2

The Bailiff:

The first one is the amendment of Deputy Le Fondré, paragraph 2 of his amendment and I will ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Greffier of the States:

Amendment 2, page 2, after the words “an agreed development framework” insert the words “subject to the condition that references in the draft Masterplan to the provision of affordable housing being fixed initially at a proportion of 12.5 per cent shall be amended to provide that the proportion shall be fixed in accordance with any agreed policy in the Island Plan.”

The Bailiff:

I propose, with the Members’ agreement, to do the same as we did in relation to the Island Plan, so I will invite Minister to say on each occasion whether he is going to accept the amendment. Now, Minister, will you be accepting this amendment?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Just to clarify, we are dealing with amendment one, Deputy Le Fondré’s.

The Bailiff:

Yes, paragraph 2 of the amendment of Deputy Le Fondré, yes.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

I am accepting part 2 of his amendment.

The Bailiff:

Yes, that was my understanding.

2.2.1 Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Yes, as we heard the Minister is accepting it so I will be very, very brief. The reason I put this in is that page 17, for example, of the Masterplan, refers to a proportion, initially 12.5 per cent of any residential development, et cetera, but then it does not go on to say how that might change in the future. I thought to be consistent with the Island Plan we should make reference to whatever the policy is that comes out of the Island Plan should be applied to this. I am going to stop there; it has been accepted by the Minister.

The Bailiff:

Is the amendment seconded? [**Seconded**] Does any Member wish to speak on the amendment? Very well, all those in favour of adopting the amendment kindly show, those against. The amendment is adopted.

2.3 North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): third amendment (P.73/2011 Amd.(3)) - paragraph 1

The Bailiff

We come next to the 3rd amendment and paragraph 1 of that lodged by the Deputy of St. Mary and I will ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Greffier of the States:

Third amendment, part 1, page 2 - After the words “an agreed development framework” – (a) insert the words – “subject to the condition that after the words on page 3 of the draft Masterplan ‘A development tariff will be worked up for the entire area to contribute towards public realm and transport solutions,’ there be inserted the words ‘This tariff and any other similar funding mechanisms from developers will be set immediately by the Minister, so that they will apply to any developments under the Masterplan’.” (b) after the words added by paragraph (a) insert the words “and will then be brought to the States for endorsement by the Assembly”.

The Bailiff:

Now, Minister, will you be accepting this one?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Part one, I am accepting.

The Bailiff:

Very well, I invite the Deputy of St. Mary to propose it in the knowledge the Minister is accepting it.

2.3.1 The Deputy of St. Mary:

Thank you, that is a very positive outcome and I welcome being friends again with the Minister. It comes and it goes. Yes, we have already agreed the 12, well not the 12.5 per cent but, in effect, a tariff saying that some affordable housing in a percentage, which will be agreed as a result of the outcome of the H3 process will also apply to the North of Town Masterplan. This is an additional belt and braces. It is in the Hopkins report. As I say in my amendment I make it clear that the plan already says: “A developer tariff will be worked up for the entire area to contribute towards public realm and transport solutions.” What my amendment says is that that tariff should be set immediately by the Minister. Now, the reason for doing that is quite simple, that if it is a case by case negotiation then the inevitable tendency is for slippage and for developers to try to get what they can out of the department and then the Minister, obviously, that is what they would do. I think the Minister said something very important in his opening remarks, he said, and it is a pity that Deputy Le Fondré is not here - yes he is, he has just moved out of his chair - so he will be able to hear my comment on this. The Minister said, and I quote: “If we improve the area; that is by providing the town park, then property prices increase and that is of benefit to the whole community.” Well, amen to that. Of course, the property prices have increased enormously as a result of the town park, there are huge gains and this amendment simply seeks to make sure that that tariff is set in advance and is not negotiated case by case. I mention Deputy Le Fondré simply to remind him that in the town park debate, one of the town park debates, he made the extraordinary claim that the uplift around the town park in values was not real cash and therefore we could discount it. We are now seeing that it is real, that the various landowners, on one side or the other of the park, or even landowners that we do not know about, like the Britannia Court landowners have experienced a huge gain, thanks to this Assembly, thanks to us building a park. Of course, that is not just us; there was public pressure and desire and so on. The fact is the park was provided by the public with public funds and it is right that we should claw some of that back through a tariff as Hopkins suggested. Thank you.

The Bailiff:

Is the amendment seconded? [**Seconded**] Does any Member wish to speak on paragraph 1 of the Deputy of St. Mary’s amendment? Very well, all those in favour of adopting the amendment kindly show. Those against. The amendment is adopted.

2.4 North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): third amendment (P.73/2011 Amd.(3)) - paragraph 4

The Bailiff:

We come next to paragraph 4 of the 3rd amendment lodged by the Deputy of St. Mary and I will ask the Greffier to read that amendment.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

Point of order, we have just passed both parts of my amendment, even though the Minister accepted one and did not accept the other, but I am very grateful for that, let us carry on.

The Bailiff:

No, we have just passed paragraph 1.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

There were 2 parts to the amendment and my understanding was, I mean I am being very, very nice to the Minister, is that (a) he agreed with and (b) he did not, that is what I understood him to say.

The Bailiff:

No, he has accepted your paragraph 1 of your amendment.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

Thank you. I am sorry I misunderstood.

The Bailiff:

Very well, so now we come to paragraph 4 of the amendment of the Deputy of St. Mary which I will ask the Greffier to read.

The Greffier of the States:

Third amendment to part 4 - After the words "an agreed development framework" insert the words – "subject to the condition that the funding streams resulting from the developer tariff mentioned on page 3 of the draft Masterplan and from the "contributions from private developments" and the "capital released from States development" mentioned in paragraph 29 of the Report to P.73, and from the Planning Obligation Agreement procedure mentioned in paragraph 82 of the Report to P.73, shall be used primarily to finance improvements to the public realm including but not limited to pedestrian routes, cycling routes, and improvements to urban public transport such as a hoppla service or services, as envisaged in the Masterplan, and in accordance with the Island Plan and the Sustainable Transport Policy".

The Bailiff:

Now, Minister, will you be accepting this one?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

No, I am not accepting this one.

The Bailiff:

Very well, then I invite the Deputy of St. Mary to propose it.

2.4.1 The Deputy of St. Mary:

Now, we come to the first test of whether the Island Plan we have just passed will be carried through by this House or whether we will fall at the first hurdle because that is what this amendment is about.

[12:30]

I am trying to find the comments of the Minister on this. I have got it, thank you. He says: "In my opinion, it is quite clear from the statement that the funding for public realm and infrastructure improvements, by which we mean in this context, car parking and transport, will be obtained from development and there is no need to further embellish that stated intention by accepting this amendment." So, in his view this is an embellishment. So what is my amendment trying to do? It is trying to establish what the priorities for this gain will be. What will this tariff, this gain, however it is extracted, the words do not really matter whether it is planning obligations or gain or tariffs or whatever, how is this gain going to be applied for the benefit of St. Helier and for the benefit of the Island? My amendment says that it should be used, primarily, not exclusively, but primarily, to finance improvements to the public realm including but not limited to pedestrian routes, cycling routes and improvements to urban public transport, such as a hoppa service or services as envisaged in the Masterplan and in accordance with the Island Plan and in accordance with the S.T.P. (Sustainable Transport Policy). Now I think that is pretty clear. We have, and the Constable and I spoke on the Island Plan, and so did the Minister, about how important, and others too, about how important the public realm in St. Helier was. Yet, when we try to establish priorities for the use of that gain then the implication is that car parking, the provision of car parking is on the same level, is equally important, with all these other improvements. Now, this Masterplan contains, for instance, a proposal to improve Bath Street while simultaneously saying that Bath Street should remain 2-way. But the fact is that there is a commitment there to make that street as good as it can be and, of course, it can be a lot better than it is. That is not the only street. We heard the Minister's luminescent introduction to this debate, what the potential of this area is, but we will not reach that potential unless we apply the gains in the first instance to improving things for people on the ground, for improving access, for improving the routes, for improving the public realm. As the Minister said in his introduction, the improvements to, for instance, Broad Street, have a massive impact on the quality of life and that was one small bitterly fought over event in the life of St. Helier, and what a transformation. Was that worth it? Who would go back to how it was before? No one. So, all I am saying; more Broad Streets please, more of that. Now, the other half also has to be covered in my opening remarks and that is, the other half of this equation is car parking. Now, I do welcome many of the changes in this Masterplan, in particular the amendments brought by the Minister which are quite striking, they came to our desks yesterday. There are not in the running order so I am not quite sure which order they come in and how they are going to be dealt with.

The Bailiff:

Just if it helps, Deputy, my understanding, the Greffier has been advised the Minister is not proceeding with any of those amendments. Is that correct, Minister, just so that everyone knows?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

It is correct.

The Bailiff:

So that is why they are not in the running order.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

I am sorry but that leaves me in a very difficult situation because this amendment, and my approach to this amendment, obviously depended on... and the sort of things I would say, was linked to the fact that the Minister had made very substantial changes and, in fact, had indicated almost a new direction for the plan which was a lot, lot better than what we have. It was a very great movement on the part of the Minister. Now, a day after he has moved, he has moved again and I find it rather difficult. I mean I can try to proceed but I am certainly, and I think Members must be, concerned that suddenly it is another new debate.

The Bailiff:

I did inform Members yesterday. I do not know whether you were in the Assembly but it was mentioned yesterday.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

Sorry, I did not catch that little detail, that Minden Place is now back to being underground car parking at colossal expense, that Ann Court will now be blessed with underground car parking, way in excess of what we need if we are going to carry out the Sustainable Transport Policy and so on. So this amendment is even more necessary. What the Minister has just done is condemn this part of town to the present traffic situation. He has said that we will just carry on, more or less, as we are. The Minister and even his Assistant Minister seem to have a fantasy about cars that they have wings and that they fly into car parks without inconveniencing anyone and without polluting anything and without creating any anxiety or stress and without creating the gating effect on the children who live in town because it is perfectly safe because the cars are all flying. So all the benefits which the amendments would have brought... and they, effectively, put off the issue when they said: "We will review this as we go along", which is the right approach because we have voted for a Sustainable Transport Policy which contains, within it, a substantial change to the way this Island works, a substantial change, in particular, to commuting which, of course, brings with it benefits for townies and very big benefits for the States coffers because our subsidy will go down and down, our subsidy to the bus company will go down and down if we succeed. So, it is very difficult proposing in this way. But I maintain the fact that the priority has to be public realm and not the provision of parking. Now, why do I say that? I say that because the idea that we will continue to need to put substantial resource into the provision of parking. By the way, the point about this amendment is priorities. It is which way do we think we want to see the future? In fact, what kind of life do we want to see for St. Helier, and that is why I put this amendment. It is so important that we get out of that box, that tin box with 4 wheels that controls almost our minds and says: "We have to, we have to, we have to." The representatives of St. Saviour and the Constable of St. Saviour and the Deputies of St. Saviour should bear in mind that if we were to go ahead with commuter parking on the Gas Place site, which is in this Masterplan, as a planning gain so it will be subsidised by the planning gain so we will entice people into that car park at the bottom of Wellington Road and at the bottom of St. Saviour's Hill. I thought we had traffic problems on St. Saviour's... The Constable is nodding the wrong way, you are nodding the right way, you are nodding that there are problems. Your problem is?

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

It is problems with parking.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

Parking. It is same syndrome. The cars fly into the car parks, they do not drive down Wellington Hill and St. Saviour's Road, they drive past the front doors of the constituents of the people who represent St. Saviour. I just put it to them that part of the problem - we debated amendment 6 to the Island Plan - and Deputy Le Hérisier said: "We have got to sort out Five Oaks. We have got problems with Five Oaks, first of all the youth and community facilities and secondly the traffic." I added to that: "It is not just highway improvements; there are other ways of skinning a cat. We can encourage children to walk a few hundred yards or we can encourage cycling." I think there is going to be an eastern cycle network and some of the children might use that to get to the schools and be safely seen across the main roads that the Constable of St. Saviour is concerned about. So, we can reduce the traffic going through St. Saviour, through Five Oaks and through St. Saviour in general but not if we carry on sucking, particularly commuters, into town. So, that is one aspect, it is the effect on the areas just outside town of all the people coming in and, of course, within town as well. So that is one aspect. The other aspect is that if we set aside valuable funds, and it is a question of using funds in one way or another, so if we set aside these funds, we say: "There is £2

million gain on this development, we will spend it on car parking.” Well, we have just locked Islanders in to a future where oil is going to get more expensive. I do not think anyone in this Assembly will argue with the fact that there will be blips, there will be ups and downs, but the trend is only one way. It is going to get more expensive to travel. To have a policy which locks Islanders into that is irresponsible. It is just not what we are here to do. We are here to make life better for Islanders in the future, more efficient and less costly, yet we are saying to them: “Use up more of your resources, more of your buying power on getting from your home into town”, because at the end there will be a parking space. We should be thinking not in this way, we should be thinking in a different way. So that is the second major point. The first is the traffic and the implications of that, the second is the cost to Islanders and the third is climate change, which I hesitate to mention [**Laughter**] but I have. Is it parliamentary language? Yes. Now, on climate change I did have just one ... no, no, no, no, no. But I think I have lost it, which is probably a good thing. Climate change; my goodness.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED

Deputy A.E. Jeune:

Excuse me, if the Deputy is about to change could we allow him to do so over lunch and could we adjourn?

The Bailiff:

Very well, is the adjournment proposed then? So we will reconvene at 2.15 p.m.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

[14:16]

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Vice-Chairman of P.P.C., just before we commence you wish to make a...

Deputy J.B. Fox:

It is about the process that we are going through at the moment. If we are finishing at 5.00 p.m. today if we have still got matters outstanding there is a question of finishing the business. A suggestion has been made that we have got the important session tomorrow morning where the Governor is leaving us but, perhaps, we could continue the session, if necessary, from 11.00 a.m., or thereabouts, to complete the business.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Do you wish to make that proposal, Vice-Chairman, it seems to be met with universal approval?

The Deputy of St. John:

Within that, I have got no problem with that, but I have a funeral tomorrow just before midday, which I have to read the lesson, as long as Members would allow me that.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Well, there may be those occasions.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

My diary says that the Environment Scrutiny Panel has a ministerial hearing at 2.00 p.m. with a pre-meeting.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Well, it may need to be rescheduled, Deputy. Well, very well, so the Assembly will meet at 11.00a.m., reconvene after the special sitting, and having bid farewell to His Excellency the Assembly Members will reconvene in the Chamber at 11.00 a.m., if necessary, if the business is not

completed. So we resume debate on the North of St. Helier Masterplan, 3rd amendment, part 4 and the Deputy of St. Mary you were in mid flow before lunch, I think.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

I had a phone call at lunchtime and it was about... well, before I go on, but unlike the Minister I am not withdrawing my amendment as a result of a phone call. I am not...

Senator F.E. Cohen:

I prefer a letter, thank you. [Laughter]

The Deputy of St. Mary:

The Minister had a letter prompting a reversal of 4 major amendments, well whatever. I am sorry; perhaps I should not have said that. Okay, so I had a phone call and it included the issue of shoppers' parking and I think that is probably worth spending a few moments on and how this amendment relates to that because there might be a fear in people's minds that in some way if we put a priority on the use of planning gain monies for public realm and for the improvement of public transport within the centre of town and, possibly, running around to the car parks which we have just voted should be on the periphery, like a hoppla bus service, that if we give priority to that in some way, shoppers' parking, near to the shopping centre might be adversely affected. Well, my amendment does not affect Minden Place at all. Minden Place is the shoppers' car park of choice. It is a short stay park, it is never full except on Saturdays or just before Christmas and Sand Street and Minden Place, taken together, and, of course, Snow Hill, are never completely full. So that is one way of seeing the shopping parking issue but there are a couple of other ways of looking at this. One is that we could, perhaps, use more cleverly our very, very close-in parking, our little spaces next to the market and along Broad Street and so on and just be tighter on the just nipping brigade. It is fine, just nipping is what it says, it is just nipping into a shop to get something, possibly heavy or that you have left to collect. That is okay as long as people play with the rules. I think the Constable of St. Helier mentioned that in a speech on the Island Plan that as long as these short-stay parking spaces are genuinely that, they can deliver quite a lot of value to shoppers. So I think we should look at that area. Another area is the little pockets. The little pockets of parking that are all over the centre of town, sorry all over the North of the Town Masterplan area, are referred to by Hopkins on page 27 of their latest version. They say that: "Of the 3,500 States-owned car parks, within the ring road, about 1,400 are comprised from a multitude of smaller private car parks." They add: "Cumulatively large areas of central St. Helier are currently being used as surface parking." Now, that is part of my point exactly and it is part of what we voted for in the Sustainable Transport Policy was to free up those sites and, of course, one of the uses of a commuter long-stay car park near the centre of town will obviously be for shoppers or for residents. Some of those car parking sites are really quite close into the centre and I will just give one example. I do not know how it is being used now, but there was a little car park behind what used to be the Telecoms building in Beresford Street. I do not know whether that has been leased out or what its present use is but the fact is there are 14 spaces right there right near the centre of town and if that was very short, fast turnover parking then, again, you have helped the shoppers. So there are different ways of providing for shopping and, certainly, my amendment does not affect that. Now, on the wider issue of the priority that we give to parking, as opposed to public realm, because that is what this amendment is about, we do have to be a little bit more creative than thinking we have to spend this planning gain, which will be millions of pounds, on in fact, on one site I think the Minister is calling for underground car parking on the Gas site and now he has pulled his amendments that he just lodged so I think that means underground parking at Minden Place, when Minden Place falls down and so on. So we are looking at very expensive solutions and I am calling for a more creative look over the next few years. There are 3 aspects to this, one is the data in the written answer to the Constable of St. Helier's written question back in 2010; I think it was. I only have the spreadsheets so I am not sure when he asked the question. But Property Holdings, bless

them, and bless Property Holdings sometimes, because we did not used to have this data, you used to have to ask about the States land assets and they just did not know. Here we are with the parking spaces in St. Helier controlled by the States, in St. Helier. Now, that does not all mean the centre of St. Helier, obviously it goes as far as First Tower and so on, but the fact is that in St. Helier there are 12,260 parking spaces. I cannot believe that all those parking spaces are being fully used all the time. In fact it is obviously not true. So I did a quick look through these sites, by no means a full evaluation, but there are parking opportunities here that could be thought about. For instance, the various Health sites, and I have excluded the ones where you would not think to take those spaces or to turn them into short-stay revolving sites. You have Health with 380 and I have taken off 40 for the hospital out of the 75 that are in Patriotic Street and so on. There are 150 at Elizabeth Lane, Midvale Road and Route du Fort, the site next to the Laurels Hotel, and so on. So there are car parking spaces, and Housing. The number of car parking spaces in Housing developments, over 10 spaces, over 10 spaces, I am not counting in the ones and twos because, obviously, you cannot do much with those but over 10 spaces, at a very quick tot up is 1,600 spaces. Now, I am not saying that we can use more than a fraction of those but the fact is that if we went down the route of promoting car sharing, first of all... car pooling, I beg your pardon, first of all that would reduce costs to Islanders because instead of the costs of ownership falling on them, they would simply have access to a vehicle when they needed it and this is known to produce massive savings in the space that we need for car parking. So there is a little part of the solution that would free up this money to be used in the right way, in a much better way. So that is what I need to say about the alternatives to this. Now, a few words on public opinion because I think there might be a fear in the back of people's minds that: "Well, you know, the public are not quite ready for this." On the contrary, the public are willing this. In the social survey, J.A.S.S. (Jersey Annual Social Survey) 2010 and again I think we should all be very grateful to the Statistics Unit and whoever thought up the idea of the Annual Social Survey. But in the 2010 one there is a chapter on climate change. Now, I am not going to go into climate change but this is simply what the public think, what their view is on climate change and that is a driver of transport policy. Almost 9 out of 10 people thought that climate change was a problem with roughly equal proportions saying it was very serious, 43 per cent, or fairly serious, 45 per cent. So the combined is 88 per cent think that climate change is a problem. Now, as I say, I am not going into the science of this and I think it was very interesting that yesterday when Senator Ferguson - was it yesterday - when Senator Ferguson introduced her amendment on climate change, she could hardly find a seconder. So even in this Chamber it just is not considered to be like... that we basically think climate change is real and we have to react to it. People are sort of saying things behind me but the fact is that had that been brought and had we had the debate there would have been the same majority as there was when I brought my Climate Change Copenhagen Petition proposition some time ago. But the fact is that not only in this Assembly but also the public think that climate change is real and that we should take it on as an issue. Now, that leads straight on to this amendment because it points us in that direction of less use of fossil fuels and I think that is fairly obvious. To back that up the public are not inconsistent and at the end of this speech I will be saying to Members: "Please be consistent", but the public are not inconsistent. When we look at the replies to the transport survey, which the good Minister did for the Sustainable Transport Policy, we see the answers to these questions: "Would you consider any of these alternative modes of travel, please tick one or more boxes." Cycling, 40 per cent; motorcycling, 17 per cent; walking, 36 per cent; using the bus, 47 per cent; car sharing, 22 per cent: "I already do one of the above", 60 per cent and: "None of these", 9 per cent. That is a huge endorsement of people saying: "I would be willing to consider, I would consider, using one of these alternative modes." The next question was even more specific: "I would consider using at least one of the above modes of travel, please tick one box." Less than once a week, 5 per cent - I am rounding the numbers - once a week, 20 per cent, daily, 67 per cent. I am asking Members to put a priority on the public realm on the quality of life in the light of the fact that public are already there. They are already saying, 67 per cent of them, would daily consider using an alternative mode of transport. Do not be afraid to go there because the public

have moved in response to various things in the back of their minds, they are already there. The statistics, again, it is not just a matter of what they say.

[14:30]

They are already doing it. I circulated some graphs, which Members may like to look at. The first graph in colour, which you should have got out of your pigeon holes, shows the gross traffic in Jersey, total vehicles, measured on 14 automatic count sites across the Island. So this is T.T.S.: "How much traffic is there in the Island?" and you will notice that on every site those columns are flat from 2006 to 2010, there has, effectively, been no growth in traffic over the last 5 years and this is in spite of a growth in population which we know about, no growth in overall traffic over the last 5 years. That was the coloured one. If Members go to the second sheet and look at the side which only has one graph on it, only one graph on it, this takes us back to 1992 and Members can see this is not the same graph, it is not the total traffic in the Island - this is all T.T.S. had to give me - it is a count of 4 sites, Beaumont, Rue des Issues, St. Lawrence Main Road and St. Peter's Valley, 4 sites, all day, 12 hour day, for every year from 1992 to 2004. They take these, I think, on a May or June day but the days are the same each year, if you like. Members will see that there is quite a steep rise up to 1994, then it slows down and the peak year is 1998. The peak traffic in the Island was 1998 and since then it has been flat or going down and that is in spite of a quite considerable increase in population. So the population is going up, the traffic is steady and, in fact, slightly going down for the last decade. So what I said about the social survey, what people think about climate change, what people say they will do in the transport policy is borne out by what they are doing. It is borne out by what they are doing. On the other side of that chart I chart traffic against population, just for fun, although it took quite a long time, and it shows, quite clearly, if you look at the numbers that I have written in there that, again, the peak year was 1998 for traffic although the population has been steadily rising. So, do not be afraid with this amendment, there is nothing to fear. I just want to wrap up, really, by saying a few words about transport policy and how this relates to what we are looking at here. There are 3 aspects to transport policy and we have to measure what we are doing, this is transport policy, this is: "What are we going to do? Are we going to improve the hoppla bus service or are we going to provide more car parks with this windfall money?" Efficiency, energy and equity and all 3 point in the same direction. Efficiency is the total cost of the transport system. If we promote bus use, and bus use is going up, that is another fact that Members should remember, that bus use is going up year on year even if you take out the Explorer, even if you take out the tourists, locals, year on year, it is going up. If we improve, again, yet again, our public transport system we will reduce the subsidy which means less cost to the States and less cost to taxpayers. If we increase the efficiency of our transport system we will have less cost to individuals anyway. Energy, same story, and equity. Equity, that is about division, which is what I spoke about at the conclusion of the Island Plan debate, are we prepared to put up with a continuous situation where countryside dwellers enjoy the wonders of Jersey's countryside but then drive into town as commuters, not talking about shoppers, I think that is a little bit down the road but that, too, will change, in order to clog up the streets of town and damage the environment there. I think that is an issue of social justice, it is an issue of equity which is one of the 3 pillars of any transport policy. So, in conclusion, I would like to say to Members that the public expects us to go in the direction of this amendment. I believe there is a huge latent demand for St. Helier to catch up, as I said, with other towns, not only in Europe, but also in the U.K. and I would just mention York, Norwich and Lancaster, all of which I am familiar with, all of which are tourist towns and all of which have huge pedestrian and cycle friendly centres with no car borne pollution in those large central areas. Remember Broad Street, remember that improvement, the quality that it brought to that area, remember the market, and just think: "More of the same." So that is the first point. The second point is responsibility to lead, we are States Members; we have a responsibility to lead, although, as I have said, the public are willing us in this direction. The third point is the division, we have to heal the division; we have to make town a good place to live. The

final point is betrayal or consistency. Deputy Le Claire is our consistency wallah he has spoken several times about it in the Island Plan debate. This is the first test of Members' commitment to what they voted for 3 hours ago. We voted for the Island Plan, here we have the first test, whether we will follow through and be consistent with what we said 3 hours ago and what we said on the Sustainable Transport Policy a few months ago back in, I think, December. I urge Members to support this amendment.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

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

2.4.2 Senator F.E. Cohen:

Regrettably, I am rejecting part 4 of this amendment because if I accepted it it would speed things up but, occasionally, matters are of significance and this is a significant issue. With regard to the funding of the public realm improvements, in my opinion the Masterplan is quite clear that the public realm and the infrastructure improvements will be funded through developer contributions. I do not believe it is necessary to further embellish this clearly stated intention of the Masterplan. The planning system is clear, we set planning aspirations for the area and set planning principles. We cannot stray into funding arrangements and delivery issues; this is a matter for developers and the property side of the development process. The Masterplan sets the principle of including tariffs. I cannot comment on how the funds received from States assets are used but I would certainly hope that they would be appropriately applied to infrastructure in the north of the town. As far as parking is concerned, I altered the plan, as the Deputy knows, in response to overwhelming responses from States Members. The Deputy has felt that I criticised his environmental credentials yesterday and expressed them in a negative context. That was not what I intended at all. I have great admiration for the Deputy who lives an environmental lifestyle. We all know that. We know he passionately believes in environmentally conscious decision-making and in leading a life that is constrained, to some extent, by environmental principles. In this he is joined by my Assistant Minister, Deputy Duhamel, who is similarly committed to environmentally sensitive decision making. Regrettably, I, like many others, are fundamentally flawed in this area. While I am prepared to make environmentally conscious decisions I will only make them if they do not inconvenience me too much. I am afraid that is the natural way of most of us. I am prepared to drive a fuel efficient car, to drive a small car, to make my commitment in terms of reducing carbon that way but I am not prepared to drive no car at all. Lots of us, I am afraid, are as flawed as I. I had initially hoped that I would be able to bring forward a plan that responded to aspirations of reducing car use and led the way forward in terms of forcing the reduction in car use in the town. I have changed my view as a result of hearing the views of States Members and my view is that it is not our job to dictate to the public how they should transport themselves or be transported. It is for us to set the options available and to provide choice. Therefore, we have recrafted the plan around providing 10 per cent more car parking space in the town than was previously available before the closure of what is now the town park. However, we have not lost our aspiration and the idea of the plan, and enshrined in the principle of the plan, is that there should be regular review of car parking, we should do everything we can to educate Islanders to want to use more environmentally friendly and responsible transportation methods and that if those methods contained in the Minister for Transport and Technical Services' excellent Sustainable Transport Plan, if they are successful, that we will reduce the car parking requirement on a 2-yearly basis. There are changes in relation to cars that are very unpredictable. I was privileged, when I was on the States of Jersey trip to Israel, to drive the new Better Place electric car which is the first proper sedan sized usable electric car with novel battery switching technology. It is ideally suited to Jersey. If it were to take hold in Jersey it would fundamentally change the way we travel and, because of course, our electricity is purchased largely from nuclear carbon zero sources we would be effectively driving carbon zero motor vehicles. There are all sorts of arguments around the carbon in the construction but that is the principle of the day-to-day use. That could have one effect. If that type of transportation is not

successful and fuel prices increase, we may all be forced to use scooters, we may all be forced to use bicycles, we may all be forced to walk, but at the moment we should not be forcing anyone to do anything. The principle of this plan is to set the options available. As far as the Deputy's comments in relation to car parking, particularly in Minden Place, the plan makes it clear that the aspiration for Minden Place is that at the end of its life, which is approximately 15 years, the States will make a decision on what should be done with it but the current recommendation is that it should provide homes, an open area which will enliven that area of town, call it a public park, and 150 car parking spaces using a stacking system. Stacking systems are not expensive. A stacking system spearheaded by Deputy Duhamel; he has had to bash heads against the wall to get people to look at it but the reality is that they work everywhere else. The modern technologies involving texting to retrieve your car makes them highly workable in Jersey, perhaps not for commuters but certainly for shoppers. Providing everyone does not have to get into the car park at exactly the same time, it is a very elegant solution, it is relatively cheap, it is certainly nothing like the cost of usual underground car parking and it takes up little streetscape surface. So, I think that that is the way that we should be going forward, that is how the plan is designed. It is around the realisation that we cannot force Islanders to use particular forms of transportation but we can provide information, hopefully through the eco-active programme, that will encourage Islanders to respond. We know that Islanders respond well and if they do respond well and they change their habits then very simply, as the plan matures we will, every 2 years, reduce the amount of car parking that is required to be provided. Before I close I must make an apology. In my closing speech in relation to the Island Plan I inadvertently referred to the Solicitor General. I had meant to refer to the Attorney General and to thank him for his exceptional effort in relation to very hard work on the Island Plan, working late into the night to provide Members with amendments that were properly checked by the Law Officers' Department. The Solicitor General is a first class chap, no doubt about that, but in the case of the Island Plan the majority of the work was carried out by the Attorney General and his officers and I am most grateful to him. Regrettably, I must urge Members to reject this part of the amendment.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

Can I ask for a point of clarification of the Minister? I just wanted to know if he says: "every 2 years we will review the need for parking", would he just point Members exactly to where it says that in the Hopkins Masterplan because it is not in the proposition.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

No, I cannot without fumbling through the Masterplan. I will get the details and send it over to the Deputy shortly but that is most clearly the intention.

[14:45]

2.4.3 The Connétable of St. Helier:

I have found myself getting somewhat irritated by the unnecessary length of the proposer's speech. I hope he does not mind me saying that. We have just spent I do not know how many days in here debating transport policy among other things. Last December we adopted a Sustainable Transport Policy so why are we having the debate all over again? But now of course I find myself getting irritated with the Minister who I think was inordinately long in his speech. I would urge Members, unless they want to spend the whole of the summer here, to hurry through these amendments. Quite honestly I do not have a view about this; it seems to me to be hair-splitting to say that - I think what the Deputy is saying is - every single penny of money that is generated through whatever means must primarily go into the public realm. That is a very laudable view but it is somewhat unbalanced because I want to see some of that money going into the provision of shopper parking. I think we should be looking for a balanced approach, which I think the Minister has in his Masterplan. I think we should be looking to an early release from this Chamber in time

to pursue other things that we do in our lives and if the Deputy will not withdraw this amendment, I would urge Members not to speak so that we can go to a vote. **[Approbation]**

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Could I apologise for being so lengthy; I thought I was being rather short.

2.4.4 The Connétable of St. Saviour:

That is a great aspiration but I do not think everyone is going to follow you. I commend the Minister for this Masterplan. Following the way he has taken up the wishes of people who need to come to town with cars and providing parking, I think it is realistic. I am afraid the Deputy of St. Mary lives in cloud cuckoo land. It would be wonderful to follow his aspirations but, as I have said before, an increasing number of people will depend on cars as they become less mobile, as they live to a greater age. There is no use pretending this is not going to happen. Unless we have a quantum leap in public transport whereby buses go past everybody's doors, we are not going to be able to do everything with public transport that people can do with cars, and they want their freedom. So, it is their choice. They want to be able to come to town. If we do not do this, what is going to happen is that the town will suffer. The shops will suffer commercially. People will not be using it. The spirit and the atmosphere of the town will die and this will not be the sort of town that we are hoping this Masterplan will produce and this will be counterproductive. What I think the Minister is doing is providing a logical scheme whereby we keep the bulk of the cars around the edge. The Constable of St. Helier has worked very hard and has been successful, I think, in providing extra disabled parking. The problem is that as people get older it is not just people who qualify for disabled parking that need to be able to use their cars. They are not going to carry heavy shopping for miles to get to a car park; they need to be able to use them. It is no use pretending they are. Fine, if you are young and fit and you want to use a bicycle; that is great, but not everybody is going to do that and certainly when you get to 60, 70 or late-70s you are not going to be cycling into town to do your shopping, so pretending anything else is a nonsense. The other point; the Deputy of St. Mary says: "Oh well, we have this terrible trouble with commuter traffic." Yes, in St. Saviour we have problems with commuter traffic but it is relatively short-lived in term. The problem we have is school car traffic. That is the real problem. T.T.S. will say 50 per cent of the extra traffic is caused by cars taking people to school. That is fine on an Island basis. Around St. Saviour they admit it is up to 40 per cent and if you look at peak time - and I have done counts at peak time - you are looking at 80 or 90 per cent of the cars are caused by people dropping off children at school. Now, we might be able to change that with changing people's habits for going to school but we will not eliminate it entirely because we have not got the transport system to cope with that. So, we have got to live in the real world. This plan I commend because I think the Minister has been successful in what he is doing. It will improve the north of town and I would hope we would all support it and reject this amendment.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Just for further information; to the Deputy of St. Mary, the parking review in 2 years is on page 3, 2nd paragraph, column 2.

2.4.5 Deputy G.P. Southern:

Once again we pull out the cheap jibes that the Deputy of St. Mary is not living in the real world. St. Mary, apparently, is not the real world. I rise to my feet to object to the words of the Minister saying we are "forcing people" on to buses, "forcing people" to walk, "forcing people" to ride a bike, when doing nothing of the sort. Read the words of the amendment. The amendment says: "... shall be used primarily to finance improvement to the public realm, including but not limited to..." So it can be parking; it is not limited to pedestrian routes, cycling routes, improvements to urban public transport such as a hoppa service or services. Listen to the over-60s when the hoppa service was running and when it was withdrawn and you find out what they think of that; a very useful

thing for getting into around town, perfect for the over-60s and for the over-70s. We are not talking about forcing you on to a bicycle; we are saying consider using the hoppa. As envisaged in the Masterplan in accordance with the Island Plan and the Sustainable Transport Policy the Deputy is totally correct when he says and points out that this is the first chance to put our nice words into action. Let us do it.

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

While, of course, I shall be supporting the Deputy because it gives me more money in my department, it goes without saying, but in practice I think there are a couple of points that do need to be made. In terms of the graph produced, I think we must be sensible and take into account the increased price of petrol which inevitably has driven the figures down. I would like to think that was not the case and that our policies had been successful and I think that next year will be more indicative from that point of view. With regard to the link to the hoppa bus service, I think that is absolutely essential in the town and we hope to be developing that in the new bus contract in 2013, not only to link the essential areas of town such as the hospital and so on but I think one of the areas it does need to link into to satisfy the Constable of St. Saviour is the schools in the St. Saviour area and that is critical. But the suggestion that it be financed from developer gain, I think, is difficult because it is a revenue item rather than capital and it is an ongoing revenue need, so I would see difficulty in continuing with that linkage. I think it would have to be financed in other ways. The other point, which I think is of consequence in terms of benchmarking, is that my department is proposing to move towards innovative car parking and charging mechanisms and that will give us the ability to incentivise parkers in going to various car parks either at their closest side of town for whatever reason or depending on the time of day and whatever is going on. I think that is crucial to effect behavioural change. I am also very conscious, as has been mentioned by previous speakers, of the affect on the commerce of the town. Driving shoppers out of town will have a disastrous affect and we have to be ever-conscious of the footfall in the town centre. We need to maintain that, if not increase it. The provision obviously of bike and cycle parking is essential to maintain this and I think we continue to encourage that, so while the Minister, I know, had suggested the idea of perhaps a stacking system under Minden Place, I have to say that I am apprehensive. We have seen barrier mechanisms in previous car parks with the delays they can cause, particularly arriving and leaving and I think I would want to see further work done on that before being convinced. I think that I would, on the basis of the splitting of hairs which has been alluded to by the Constable of St. Helier, my inclination is that really, in fact, I cannot see any reason why the Minister should not support this amendment.

2.4.7 The Deputy of St. John:

I do not like disagreeing with my Vice Chairman from the Environment Scrutiny Panel but I think we need a balanced approach. We heard this morning or some time in the last day or so that we are going to have an additional 200 homes within the North of Town Masterplan on the Metropole Hotel site. Obviously there is going to be additional traffic and people do want cars with their homes and that is what is usually designed. Even those people in town; I think it was the Constable who said that he wanted to get cars off the road, off off-street parking. I am not sure if the Metropole Hotel is on the St. Saviour side or if it is on the St. Helier side of the north of town but either way there is an element within the...

The Bailiff:

It is in the north of...

The Deputy of St. John:

Yes, it is. I have got the plan here. It is shown in the plan, if this book is correct.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

If I could just help the Deputy of St. John? The Metropole is shown but it is not strictly in the north of town. I was merely using it as an example of regeneration and the sort of project that we are likely to deliver. But it is inconsequential anyway and I think it is perfectly appropriate for the Deputy of St. John to talk about the Metropole as an excellent example.

The Deputy of St. John:

That said, additional homes are going to be built and we know there will be additional pressure within the north of town. I think we would all love Utopia and unfortunately it is not going to happen. We have to be realistic. We have got to build what is on the table today or when we start building in 3, 4 or 5 years' time, whenever. We have to do what is right now for the people living here today and the people who will be living here tomorrow. We cannot wait for ever to get Utopia. I think we should be moving on. I am sorry, Vice Chairman of the Environment Scrutiny Panel but we have to be realistic and live within our means of today.

2.4.8 Deputy A.E. Jeune:

I think the Minister and other speakers have covered what I wanted to say predominantly but I do believe the Deputy of St. Mary, in his criticism of Senator Ferguson; I believe he said the Senator's amendment was not seconded. That is completely incorrect.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

I do not think the Deputy did say that. He said she appeared to struggle to get a seconder. There was quite a long silence, I think, before a seconder to that probably.

2.4.9 Deputy S. Power:

I briefly want to express my support for the Minister for Planning on this one. I think it comes down to what the Constable of St. Saviour said and, indeed, the Constable of St. Helier as well. It is this; we cannot dictate to people how they want to live their lives, particularly as to how they get to and from St. Helier. If people want to sit in traffic between 7.30 a.m. and 8.30 a.m. then that is their wish. That is their right if they want to sit in traffic. We cannot dictate to people, we cannot condition them how to live their lives. The Deputy of St. Mary's wish is to divert scarce resources to resources other than providing additional car parking in the town area. I think that is the gist of it. Then he spent quite a bit of his time talking about the bar charts that we were given some time ago. My interpretation of the bar charts, particularly the one chart he referred to which shows 4 pinch points of traffic from 1992 to 2004. That, to me, reflects not so much a static indication of traffic on the Island; it dictates to me, if you interpret it, the decline of the tourism industry, the decline of the car hire industry, the decline of the coach and bus industry and an increase in private traffic. While he also refers to the 14 monitoring stations on the other coloured chart, I can tell him from personal experience that the stack system at Beaumont roundabout has gone from 20 to 8 20 years ago to 10 past 7 now. The other thing is that traditionally the main Corbière Road would have had lots and lots of hire cars and coaches throughout the week and at the weekend; it does not happen anymore, they are all local cars. So, I think his interpretation of traffic patterns on the Island is incorrect. I just wanted to say that and I do support the Minister for Planning on this.

[15:00]

2.4.10 Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

I think the Minister's comments are well-placed and in essence are asking this House to support the retention of the flexibility within what is being suggested. I just wanted to make a couple of comments as to the pace of change and how some propositions are, on the face of it, innocuous but are potentially pushing us into a direction whereby we are straight-jacketing ourselves from considering changes that may or may not happen. The 2 areas I am thinking of at the moment is one of internet shopping. We have already had a number of companies... indeed it is causing us problems to some businesses in terms of lost sales as companies are moving to allow the purchaser

to make those purchases online from any terminal anywhere. In some ways it is just the beginning of the process because the programmes that are being offered are fairly boring; who wants to necessarily go through a list showing cans of baked beans or dresses or whatever and to choose from in essence what appears to be a club book type facility? In order to make the process more interesting, because there is a social side to shopping, new programmes are beginning to come on to the market and I thought, as I am particularly keen to keep an eye on these areas, that I would share one of those areas - this area - with the House. In order to make shopping a little bit more interesting it has been suggested that in line with the enormous work in terms of creativity and application that has gone into computer games, that you don an internet personality and turn yourself into whatever you want to look like, which has got some benefits, certainly for the women perhaps, in not having to undertake large periods of titivation and putting on make-up or whatever before they go shopping, you can don your internet personality and you go shopping as a game. Now, that sounds a little bit far-fetched I know but you can walk down the aisles, you can pick up goods, you can read interesting information snippets as to whether these items are Fairtrade or not, you can go into any further details to determine, in the case of a purchase of wine or whatever, interesting facts as to where the grapes were grown and all the rest of it; you can do all this online in the comfort of your house or wherever you are and to add to that you can speak to other members. We have already seen the meteoric rise of Facebook and Twitter and all the other social internet facilities which are making it very, very simple in order to communicate with other people without having to be in the same place. So the point is if we are trying to introduce policies by way of a planning process in order to limit the use of vehicles in one shape or form, I would venture that it is best practice to look at all the drivers that would encourage us to come forward with the best solution. In that sense it is not right for the Deputy of St. Mary or anybody else to automatically suggest that the only way to shop is by hopping on a shopper hoppa and doing it in an old-fashioned process. There may well be better ways which solve the problem to a greater degree in a more sustainable fashion and those things have to be considered. If one restricts oneself to only looking at a narrow set of solutions to a big problem then we are only going to get ourselves deeper into those problems. Likewise, the Deputy has been known to be suggesting for a long time that the majority of the public, the commuter, takes a bus in order to come to work. What happens if indeed on the back of this internet process that we start to see a greater take-up, which is already happening among a number of businesses in the Island, the process of video-conferencing? How many times have we been to conferences in far flung places and been somewhat embarrassed when we have had to talk about our carbon footprint in going to those places? We have travelled on planes, on trains, on buses, on a whole load of different vehicles in order to get to a conference which, at the end of the day, could quite easily have been undertaken from the comfort of your armchair in your own home by way of the video set. Again, it is early days and some of these facilities are not as good or as flexible as being there and seeing the people and shaking their hands and touching them and all the rest of it, but things are changing in that regard. So, all I am saying is that before we jump into solving the problem in a limited fashion, we should take into account a lot of the things that perhaps we have not really thought about that will be not necessarily forced upon us but will happen because that is the way society wishes to move in. They are very difficult to predict by and large but we have only got to look back over all our experiences over the last 10 or 15 years and some of the communication equipment that we use nowadays just did not exist then. So, the pace of change is getting faster and faster and I think if we do not need to make amendments to the plan in a particular form which do not really add a great deal to the quality of the solutions that might well be undertaken, then I think that we should really not vote for those things and certainly not to introduce them for debate. We are where we are; we do have this extra proposition which the Minister has said just embellishes what is going to happen anyway. Let us give the Minister the flexibility he is calling for and vote against the Deputy of St. Mary in this instance.

2.4.11 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

First of all I think it is probably slightly unfair to say, as the previous speaker suggested, that the suggestion of the Deputy of St. Mary's was limited to hoppa buses. The wording quite categorically states "including but not limited to" and then has quite an extensive list, which includes the hopper service which is simply one suggestion that the Deputy is putting forward. We also heard about internet processes being mentioned there. The Deputy is quite right, this will potentially and already has changed the way that we communicate but following on from the way in which we can share information about where we are going and possibly share lifts to work, et cetera, which only seems to suggest that, in fact, more car sharing will mean less spaces are required for car parking in St. Helier, as has been previously mentioned in other debates. For example, this is one area of technology, which the funding that the Deputy of St. Mary is trying to seek, could be used for. That is an extremely good example of an imaginative way in which the State can work with individuals to take responsibility for their own transportation and perhaps also work with private providers of transport. Who knows what that will entail in future years to encourage people not to necessarily use unsustainable or illogical, come to that, forms of transport? My colleague in St. Brelade said that if people want to sit in traffic in the morning rather than necessarily use other forms of transport, they should be able to do that. I thought he was going to say that we should be encouraging them to do that. Clearly that is something that we are doing, not something that we should be looking to do. I think that a lot of the arguments I am hearing this afternoon for this proposition are saying: "We agree with what is going on here; it is being done already." I think the Deputy of St. Mary is just asking for a greater commitment to long-term sustainability. The Minister was very honest, I think, in his summing up of the different approaches that, in reality, individuals take to not simply transport issues but to environmental issues in general. I think it is true to say that we live in somewhat of a dichotomy when we come to the issue of the environment in the sense that most of us believe that there are very strong issues facing the environment to do with global warming, to do with climate change, to do with peak oil. I think we ultimately believe in them but at the same time we do not believe in them enough to let them affect the way we live our lives because, as the Minister said, and his honesty was appreciated, we prefer just to do things which are convenient in life. So, we will make an effort to be green, we will certainly take the aluminium out if there is a recycling bin nearby, if there is a kerbside recycling scheme we will collect them but we will not necessarily make the effort to go down and dump them ourselves; we prefer to put them in the bin. I make that argument simply to say that convenience is an issue and that is exactly where Government comes in. It is because the public and indeed States Members, myself included, who should know better, will not simply make those decisions, even though they know they are logical, unless the State does provide both the carrot and a stick. I think this is essentially what the Deputy St. Mary is trying to provide the encouragement for here, so I have no problem in supporting this amendment.

The Bailiff:

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

2.4.12 The Deputy of St. Mary:

The first thing to say is that this amendment is necessary and I am fairly amazed, I think, I can see that there is a case, there is always a case for saying: "Well, we do not need to talk about this," but we do. The other thing that has been said, first of all, people have said this amendment is not necessary and, then, we should not introduce things like this for debate. Let us just get on with it, and it just embellishes what the Minister would do anyway. As things stand, in the Masterplan, the clear implication is that the money will go on car parking, this planning gain, which is massively expensive and which will gobble up the lion's share of any cash or obligation available, and I would remind Members of the scale of the T.T.S. parking fund. It is £10 million or so, £12 million, whatever, it is around that sort of figure. Providing the capital cost for car parking is hugely expensive and Members should have no illusions about that, and they should have no illusions either on the fact that this is where the money will go if we do not vote for this amendment. The

idea that this is an embellishment, that this is just some sort of little thing that Wimberley has added to make the debate longer, makes me quite annoyed. I point out in my report that paragraph 48 of the Minister's report to P.73, the Masterplan, says that the Jersey Gas site: "The site will be required to deliver 138 car parking spaces for general public use. The site will be required." So the planning gain will go to the priority use of providing car parking. I would remind Members that Hopkins themselves say that that is too far from the town centre for shoppers. We have heard about the difficulties of carrying your shopping a long way. The Gas site is too far, say Hopkins, for shoppers, so that would be commuter parking. I just find that quite odd. Paragraph 71 of P.73 says of the brewery site: "The site will be required to deliver up to 110 car parking spaces for general public use", and again those will be expensive spaces. I also point out that the States have passed the Sustainable Transport Policy for all the right reasons because it will reduce traffic, encourage sustainable transport, improve our health, which itself is a saving of millions, make for a better environment, great reduction in resource use and cut the cost of using fuel which is set to rise and I point out that this is a win/win/win strategy. So to say that this amendment is somehow unnecessary has got to me somewhat and I would urge Members to think that this is an important matter. The second thing I want to say is no choice, no choice, we are trying to take away choice. Two speakers referred to behavioural change and I found that interesting. One was the Minister for Transport and Technical Services who rightly said that he is attempting, using clever modern technology, to incentivise parkers to park short so that when they have done what they want to do they go, which liberates the space by obviously charging per minute instead of per block of time. He wants to incentivise them to use the correct locations, again using technology. Why does he want to do this, his words, to effect behavioural change? Government, quite legitimately is in the business for the public good of effecting behavioural change. The Constable of St. Saviour said that in respect of school travel we should try to change people's habits around the school run.

[15:15]

Quite rightly; he is the Constable of the Parish which is stuffed with all our secondary schools. That is a bit unparliamentarily, but it has all our secondary schools within the Parish, a vast concentration of them. He is concerned about changing people's habits and that will be done, presumably, by various means including an improved school transport service which will be part of the new research going into the new bus contract. The idea that there is no choice/no choice and that the Government has nothing to do with this is completely flawed. The Government provides the choices. The Government effectively provides the traffic jams for the buses to get stuck in or it provides other methods of solving issues so that people do genuinely have a choice. I do take exception to the Minister who again tries to put me, having been warned that that annoys me and stops me being his friend, he again said that I had environmental credentials and he admired me and I live an environmental lifestyle, implying that nobody else gets on a bike or goes on a bus, and that was the implication.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

I said Deputy Duhamel did.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

I am not prepared to give way. The Minister can respond and ask me clarifications afterwards if I say anything that is untrue or not right. He said that most people are not prepared to drive, or I think maybe he said he himself was not prepared to drive no car at all. Our family has 2 cars. My wife drives, I drive. That is normal in our society and it just gets me very annoyed and it should upset Members too when this kind of nonsense is talked in the Assembly. It really is not the point. The point is what sort of choices are we providing people to live in St. Helier? Are we providing a choice of a decent, good traffic free, where possible, environment, or certainly less traffic or not? Negative: I have the word negative down. Negative. We heard the Constable of St. Saviour. Oh

my goodness, he wants to keep the town at half its potential. We do have a nice town. If you look up, if you stop worrying about being run over, then you look up and see very nice buildings and there are certain glorious places in our town, and it could be so much better. I said specifically in response to what he said, but I said it first, that we should deal with just nipping. We should deal with people who need to have close access to shops. I suggested the clever use of small paths like the one behind Telecoms, near the middle of town, optimising the use of short-short stay spaces, and Deputy Southern mentioned the hoppa bus and how that served the elderly and how cross they were when it was withdrawn. So there are different ways of looking at this issue of providing access to the town centre. For goodness sake, let us catch up with other places that have solved these problems years ago. I had to laugh when he jokingly said 70 year-olds cannot go shopping by bike. Well if he would just take a trip over the water, he would see plenty of 70 year-olds cycling around doing their shopping. I am not saying all, I am just saying that is a fact of life, and I just wish people would have wider horizons. I was accused of living in cloud cuckoo land and I think I have covered that already in my comments to the Minister. In fact there was something that is relevant to that. The things I pointed out about the rising bus usership, and the number of people who are going out on the bus is increasing all the time. Somebody said: "Well, maybe less people are driving because the petrol price is going up." Well of course, that is what I am saying. There will be fewer people driving around because of the cost and also because some people have principles, and also because the bus service is getting better, and also because it is more convenient. You can do your work and listen to the radio and read a book, and I have seen people doing all 3, not at once, on buses. How many people here read their latest novel as they drive into town? Not many. There are advantages in going by bus. There are certainly advantages in cycling. You feel a lot better at the end of the journey but that is another issue. The idea that nobody is doing it except the Deputy of St. Mary is just nonsense. You just look at the statistics and the fact that more people are walking to town, more people cycling, and it is just very peculiar, and one has to wonder about the motives of the Minister. Maybe he is on... well, I will not go into his motives. In conclusion, there are 3 aspects to what the Minister's response said that need to be emphasised. One is the expense. I have talked about the fact that if we do not put this amendment through, we are booking a future of gains to provide or subsidise the provision of more car parking, and in fact we have a lot of car parking and if we are clever with it and if we have some oomph with it then we can use that car parking better. We hear constantly from the Ministers about the need to constrain expenditure, the need to be clever with our money, the need to save our costs and yet here we are, now that the Minister has withdrawn his amendments as well, we have a colossally expensive transport solution in front of us. I cannot square that with what we hear the rest of the week and the rest of the month. The second is that it is a total dereliction of duty to try to lock Islanders into an expensive fuel dependent future. The Energy Policy says we must go the other way. The Sustainable Transport Policy says we must go the other way and so does the Island Plan. He says we cannot force Islanders, we cannot dictate to the public. Oh yes we can. We can spend our money on providing a hoppa bus, and on providing the Constable of St. Helier continuous walking routes and continuous cycling routes, or we can put our money into encouraging people to use their vehicles more than they otherwise would do, and I am just asking for the priority to be set at what the Minister says he believes it. I ask for the appel.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

The appel is called for on the amendment, dealing with amendment 4 of the 3rd amendment. If members are in their seats I will ask the Greffier to open the voting.

POUR: 11		CONTRE: 27		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator A. Breckon		Senator T.A. Le Sueur		
Senator F.du H. Le Gresley		Senator P.F.C. Ozouf		
Connétable of St. Brelade		Senator T.J. Le Main		
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Senator F.E. Cohen		

Deputy R.G. Le Hérisssier (S)		Senator S.C. Ferguson		
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		Senator B.I. Le Marquand		
Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire (H)		Connétable of St. Ouen		
Deputy S. Pitman (H)		Connétable of St. Helier		
Deputy M. Tadier (B)		Connétable of Grouville		
Deputy of St. Mary		Connétable of St. John		
Deputy T.M. Pitman (H)		Connétable of St. Saviour		
		Connétable of St. Clement		
		Deputy R.C. Duhamel (S)		
		Deputy of St. Martin		
		Deputy J.B. Fox (H)		
		Deputy of St. Ouen		
		Deputy of St. Peter		
		Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré (L)		
		Deputy of Trinity		
		Deputy S.S.P.A. Power (B)		
		Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)		
		Deputy A.E. Jeune (B)		
		Deputy E.J. Noel (L)		
		Deputy T.A. Vallois (S)		
		Deputy A.K.F. Green (H)		
		Deputy D.J. De Sousa (H)		
		Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)		

The Deputy of St. Mary:

A lot of Island Plans are put in the shredder.

2.5 North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): second amendment (P.73/2011 Amd.(2)) - paragraph 2

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

We come to the second part of the second amendment in the name of the Connétable of St. Helier. I will ask the Greffier to read the amendment 2.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Page 2 - After the words “an agreed development framework” insert the words – “subject to the condition that the plan to create environmental improvements in Bath Street and David Place by making these roads one-way will be subject to further investigation and consultation before being discounted”.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Minister, this is what I understand you are willing to accept.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Providing the Connétable is short.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

The Connétable too will be a model of brevity after this Connétable.

2.5.1 The Connétable of St. Helier:

I will be a lot quicker than the Minister was in replying to the last amendment. This is an important amendment but it does not mean I need to spend half an hour proposing it and 20 minutes summing up. One of the key things that has been offered in the drawings of the Masterplan are wide leafy

pavements and indeed the Minister repeated that promise in his opening remarks. If we abandon so quickly the idea that David Place and Bath Street could have wide, leafy pavements just because of issues about traffic flow and Minden Place and so on, then we are going to short change the people who hope to benefit from the plan, and I think it is self evident that we continue to work to achieve this. I would also like to echo the Minister's praise of one of the former Ministers for Planning, Senator Ozouf. He was one of the first politicians who commended me as a Deputy for pushing for widening of pavements in places like lower Bath Street outside the department store. I remember him contacting me to say how much that had improved life in town and indeed the York Street scheme around the Town Hall had the same effect of allowing people to enjoy walking in the street, to stop and look into shops, to stop and converse and so on. Wider pavements are far too important in David Place and Bath Street to abandon at the first hurdle and I am pleased the Minister accepts my view.

The Bailiff:

Does any Member wish to speak?

2.5.2 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

In 2002 I had the pleasure of bringing in an amendment which was supported to widen the pavements in Val Plaisant where at the time opposite Jason's, the hairdresser, little plug there for my hairdresser, the pavements were 12 inches wide, 12 inches for women with prams and children on their way to school. I think the Constable is demonstrating again his concern for the pedestrians in town and I congratulate him and support him.

2.5.3 Deputy D.J. De Sousa of St. Helier:

I just want to say can we please include Midvale Road in this please?

2.5.4 Deputy J.B. Fox:

I am all to encourage the Constable in widening the pavements, et cetera, but can we please police the amount of signs and everything that we put on these pavements because in many cases, with increased use of wheelchairs, et cetera, people cannot use the pavements. They are having to use the roads again because of the amount of obstructions, if you would just bear that one in mind? Also for the people that are blind or semi-blind, it is very difficult to go through St. Helier's obstacle courses because of that and not forgetting the fact that when people have these lovely eating places on the street they start to grow outwards, or the people start using them by growing outwards, which again causes obstructions. They are very nice to have but they do need some policing to be able to be effective and successful.

2.5.5 Deputy J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour:

From this plan the 2 concerns I had, one was the parking for shoppers in particular, the provision at Minden Place, and the second was access in and out of the road out of town by making Bath Street one-way, and therefore I am inclined perhaps not to support this amendment. However I do note that the Constable has put consultation in there, which does not mean that if this is accepted Bath Street will automatically become one-way, but I just want to make the point, as I have, it is all about access in the town, being able to get in and out quickly. Again if you change the traffic flows you are just making it more difficult for people, more difficult for businesses there, but because the word "consultation" is there I will probably have to support the Constable.

2.5.6 Deputy M. Tadier:

I am not going to speak on the desirability of the one-ways themselves at these locations because that is not what the amendment is about. It is simply about consultation before them being discounted. Nonetheless I think it is important to say that whilst a one-way system may or may not work for traffic, it certainly does not work for cycles in St. Helier. So I would like to say that if it is decided ultimately that these areas should be one-way, perhaps with the improved and widened

pavement structures, there will be facilities for bicycles and pedestrians to coexist in a safe way so that cyclists don't have to go right round town, providing absolutely no incentive for them to use bicycles and I am sure that will be in the forefront of the Ministers, the Constables and the Minister for Transport and Technical Services' minds when they come to look at these issues.

2.5.7 The Deputy of St. Mary:

Just 2 points: one is in response to what Deputy Maçon said when he was talking about making sure that we preserved access into the town centre, and in a way Deputy Tadier's speech pointed up what I was going to say. We do have to make sure that we see these things in the round and I feared that Deputy Maçon was just thinking in terms of cars, and I hoped that he was thinking in terms of people on foot, people cycling, people delivering and all the rest of it because it is so easy to get this blinkered view of what transport in a town should look like or how it could be if only we could be a little bit progressive about it. The second thing is I am beginning to take exception to the notion that the main thing that matters in the debate is when it finishes.

[15:30]

2.5.8 Senator F.E. Cohen:

Firstly may I begin with an apology to the Deputy of St. Mary? I was trying to compliment him and if he is upset by the comments of my complimenting his environmental credentials, I do hope that my Assistant Minister is, who I similarly complimented, also not upset with my comments. A key feature of the Hopkins Masterplan from the outset was to calm the traffic in Bath Street and David Place to create a better environment for pedestrians. Members will recall some of the images produced by Hopkins of how Bath Street and David Place could look in such an event. Whilst Minden Place remains however, the one-way system is not recommended by the traffic engineers and reluctantly the Masterplan has decided to keep Bath Street and David Place 2-way. Minden Place car park has 10 to 15 years of life before it needs to be replaced, which rules out any opportunity to significantly change the traffic system in the way previously suggested. Accordingly I would agree with the Connétable that further investigation concerning this element of the plan should be undertaken and I accept this part of the amendment.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Does any Member wish to speak? I call on the Connétable to reply.

2.5.9 The Connétable of St. Helier:

I thank everyone who has spoken. Midvale Road, referred to by Deputy De Sousa, has already been approved for a traffic study by T.T.S. That was part of the transport policy amendments and that is due to be done by the end of next year. To be done, that is the feasibility work is due to be done. It has been shown that it is simply too narrow to accommodate the volume and speed of 2-way traffic that it currently has. I agree with Deputy Fox. There is no point in widening pavements if you then clutter them up and the Parish employs a full-time streets inspector as well as benefiting from honorary roads inspectors who do a great job in reporting the numerous infractions that take place. Deputy Maçon perhaps fell into a car-centric mode but that was quickly corrected by the Deputy of St. Mary, and he rightly pointed out that this is a modest proposal asking for consultation and investigation, and is not asking the Assembly to agree that Bath Street should be one-way. Deputy Tadier, I think rightly pointed out the needs of cyclists, which are currently, if you want to be a law-abiding cyclist, you have to go on long detours to get from A to B, which does not incentivise that as a mode of transport. I might just take issue with the Minister for Planning who finished the comments, he said that according to traffic engineers, and I have to be careful not to be seen to criticise them, while Minden Place remains this rules out the opportunity to change the traffic system in Bath Street. I say no, it does not. This amendment requires us to consult and

investigate ways of getting those wide pavements down Bath Street, and that includes down to Minden Place. I cannot wait 15 years to see an improvement in the very difficult and dangerous conditions that currently exist at the bottom of Bath Street, and I believe this amendment allows the investigation to go ahead, and it means that hopefully we can keep Minden Place and still make improvements in the streetscape so everybody will be winners. I thank all Members for their comments and maintain the amendment.

The Bailiff:

All those in favour of adopting the amendment, hands show. Those against? The amendment is adopted.

2.6 North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): third amendment (P.73/2011 Amd.(2)) - paragraph 2

The Bailiff:

We move next then to paragraph 2 of the 3rd amendment lodged by the Deputy of St. Mary and I will ask the Greffier to read that amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Page 2 - After the words “an agreed development framework” insert the words – “subject to the condition that in relation to the Ann Court site, a full consultation with relevant stakeholders will be carried out with regard to the site being used, in whole or in part, for social and/or market housing for the elderly, and that if the consultation outcome is positive about the scheme, that a feasibility study will be carried out to progress this use of the site”.

The Bailiff:

Minister, will you be accepting this?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Yes, I am accepting this.

The Bailiff:

Very well then. I invite the Deputy of St. Mary to propose it.

2.6.1 The Deputy of St. Mary:

I am very glad that the Minister is accepting this. My attention was drawn to this by the various amendments around the multi-storey car park proposal in Ann Court, and then I think there was a proposition about the use of Ann Court for elderly housing or that was wrapped up in that same debate. Of course it is not just about Deputy Martin and her campaign, which the Minister refers to in his comments. It is just the right thing to do. Certainly it is the right thing to consider and we should use sites for their best use. I do have to make the case here because inevitably this site, the temptation will be to turn it into the maximum value and what this amendment says - and I am glad that the Minister has accepted it - is that there be consideration and formal evaluation and consultation about the use of it for elderly housing. We must use sites for their best use. We must put social considerations first. We must have the elderly in the best place for them to live. Heart of town, ease of access, there are obvious reasons for doing this. My only concern is that in his amendment which now he has withdrawn, but his amendment said that: “Any redevelopment of the Ann Court site should provide at least 100 units of social rented accommodation.” I think we would all welcome clarification of where this now sits now that the Minister has withdrawn an amendment that would have made my amendment even more telling and more specific, but as I say, I am glad that he has accepted it. I welcome his comments on the fact that he has withdrawn an amendment that would have worked in tandem with this one and I put forward the amendment.

The Bailiff:

Does any Member second it? [**Seconded**] The Deputy St. John.

2.6.2 The Deputy of St. John:

Within this particular amendment, will the Minister take on board, firstly for at least 3 years that Ann Street site will be needed by the Public Services Department, or T.T.S. as it is known now, because a shaft needs to be drilled there so we can couple up the north of town sewerage systems, given we have to separate the rainwater from the sewerage systems, a job that was started in the early 1990s when we built the Cavern. We ran out of steam when we got to Peter Street and Ann Court, whether it was steam or whether it was money I am not sure, but that job needs finishing and as long as that is taken into account by the planners of the day when we are going forward that T.T.S. need that so we can encompass that in our Liquid Waste Strategy and the funding will, I am sure, all be in place as and when. While on the Ann Street site, I must say it has changed considerably from the Wormwood Scrubs-looking building to, I think I would now probably call it a Spanish holiday village appearance and the Town Park I would say not dissimilar to that probably at Costa Del Sol flats, but I would like to know what the kangaroo is doing in the bottom left-hand corner of the photograph.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

It is not, it is a leopard.

The Deputy of St. John:

But that said, I hope they will take that on board.

2.6.3 Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

Very briefly, just to reassure the Deputy of St. John that his much loved expansion to the sewer network, which will connect the cavern to the area of town which flooded recently, is a high priority within the Council of Ministers, and it has been, together with Pomme d'Or Farm and the Sea Cadets, put as a high priority in terms of finding a solution. The Minister for Health is looking at me with difficulty, she already has her money for the health projects. We just have not found the solution for Phillips Street. It is recognised that Ann Court cannot be progressed before Phillips Street is done, which is why we are trying to find the money for Phillips Street to ensure that that can be done so that we can then get on with developing social housing and we are doing just that.

2.6.4 Senator A. Breckon:

Regarding the housing for the elderly in Ann Court, I think certainly Deputy Power and Deputy Le Hérisier will remember the Scrutiny, part of the review we looked at this, and Deputy Martin is not here, but I cannot remember but I think somebody went to have a look. It was a scheme in London. I think it was 23 storeys. I am not suggesting that 23 storeys is required in Ann Court, but it has been in existence for over 20 years and is over-subscribed, and it is a sheltered elderly housing scheme which has one floor taken out, and there are facilities in there and health services go in, hairdressers and all sorts of things. There are communal areas and it does work, and the other thing is if we think where Ann Court is, you can get a pint of milk or a prescription or a paper, that is really what it is about and we should not necessarily think about the over-55s and putting people in fields and out of the way. This is the ideal thing and I think this amendment gives this some focus again. I am not sure, I cannot remember the name of the scheme in London, but it does exist and I know in the Scrutiny office there are some background papers which could assist when somebody comes to look and review this, because I think some of the work has already been done.

2.6.5 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I would like to congratulate the Minister and the new work designs that are appearing in the booklet because the vista that is showing now from the corner of the Royal Bank building up towards Victoria College on the hill, now it gives us a much better overall flavour of what we should be

looking at. The new design, I concur, is much better. I go back to... Deputy Le Fondré asked me earlier if I was going to support his original intentions to maybe relocate offices on this site, and I would like him in the next amendment to withdraw it. The States has now sent a clear signal that we are building affordable housing on States-owned sites. This is a Housing-owned site and we need to build affordable housing there, and if we do not build affordable housing on this site in the next 2 years we are back in the fields.

2.6.6 Senator F.E. Cohen:

Just to be clear, the Deputy of St. Mary's proposal that large developments be consulted on and feasibility studies undertaken is good planning practice, and therefore I am prepared to accept the amendment.

2.6.7 Deputy S. Power:

Very, very, very quickly; it is only right and fitting and proper that the Ann Court site is retained for social housing. In this part of town the Housing Department have played an enormous role in trying to maintain this. In actual fact, one would say that had they not had to demolish the buildings that were literally falling down it was probably the worst thing they ever did to demolish these buildings because every Uncle Tom Cobley has now been looking at the site with covetous eyes for all sorts of different projects. It has to be retained as social housing and the sooner the Minister for Transport and Technical Services gets his money to sink his shaft so that things can move on quickly the better.

The Bailiff:

I call upon the Deputy of St. Mary to reply.

2.6.8 The Deputy of St. Mary:

I am not sure that sinking his shaft is parliamentary language, but anyway. It sounded curiously funny, I do not quite know why. I thank all those who spoke. Let us hope they are not too costly shafts. And that is another question, what is actually underneath that. But anyway, the key question here, I mean everyone has been supportive, even the Minister agrees with this. The Minister is happy to consult and I think the amendment says a full consultation with all relevant stakeholders and so on. I do remember, I tied it down so he could not just ask a few people, have a few letters and then decide something else. I really welcome the 2 people, I think, who said that how valuable this site would be for - 3 or 4 mentioned it - how valuable this site is to be retained or certainly to be looked at for elderly housing and for social housing. It is such a wonderful site for that purpose and in a small island... I mean I do say in my report that in a small island it is difficult to find sites as good as this for accommodation for the elderly, which offer nearness to shops, nearness to open space, nearness to community facilities where they can socialise. In fact, which offer quality of life and the possibility of continuing independence. The case is there for a study and then a feasibility, but my worry is, and I have to put it before the House, it is a we shall see. My worry is that there is an alternative use, which is sell it for the maximum value and the question before Members then is what is the value? What is value?

[15:45]

What are we going to choose? So I hope that when we do vote for this, which I hope we will, I hope that Members hold the Minister's and his successor's feet to the fire on this so that he does not decide to use it for any other purpose; genuine consultation.

The Bailiff:

Very well, all those in favour of adopting the amendment, kindly show. Those against. The amendment is adopted.

2.7 North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): amendment (P.73/2011 Amd.) - paragraph 1
The Bailiff:

We move next to part 1 of the amendment of Deputy Le Fondré and I will ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Page 2 - After the words “an agreed development framework” insert the words – “subject to the condition that, in relation to the Ann Court and the Jersey Gas sites, the draft Masterplan shall be amended to permit the redevelopment of these sites for mixed-use (to include housing and office development) in addition to the uses currently proposed in the draft Masterplan and in accordance with any final agreement between the Minister for Housing, the Minister for Treasury and Resources, and/or the Council of Ministers.”

The Bailiff:

Minister, will you be accepting this one?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

No, Sir, I will not be in view of the commitment [**Approbation**] that was given as a result of the petition brought by Deputy Martin.

2.7.1 Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

If it helps, I have taken the view that I really do not have the energy to deal with the very dogmatic attitudes I am getting from 2 Town Deputies, which seem to be working on a silo mentality that this site is ours and it is not part of the strategic view. I take the view I was bringing this in good faith to allow flexible approach for future use. The Ann Court site is not going to be available for at least a year, a year and a half, because of the Phillips Street thing. We do not know where we are going to be in that time. Three years, thank you. In that time things will change, I am sure about that. That is why I was putting in 2 words of “mixed use”. The other concern I have, if one looks at things like the central market, which I am a great proponent of, which is in the North of Town map is that if the footfall continues to reduce in town because of the shift away to Esplanade and all that area, then I think in future the town is going to deteriorate. People disagree with that. We have been in here a long time. At the end of the day, I am going to withdraw the proposition. I will say that I did discuss these proposals with the Connétable and, at the time, my impression is that he was highly supportive of them, because of the regeneration aspect that can come through. But, given that the Minister for Housing and the Assistant Minister for Housing, even though if one refers to their response in written question 12 some time last week that they gave to me, do not seem to know the details of how their own estate works but say they desperately need this and it is the only site that is available in the short term around. I will withdraw the amendment because I think we are all tired and we have had enough.

2.8 North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): second amendment (P.73/2011 Amd.(2)) - paragraph 1

The Bailiff:

Very well, thank you, Deputy. So that is withdrawn. Then we move on to paragraph 1 of the second amendment lodged by the Connétable of St. Helier, and I will ask the Greffier to read that.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Page 2 - After the words “an agreed development framework” insert the words – “subject to the condition that any plans for the redevelopment of – (a) the Ann Court site; (b) the Jersey Gas site, shall take into account any requirements in the new Island Plan that sufficient amenity space and parking for shoppers and residents be provided in the area of the Masterplan”.

The Bailiff:

Minister, will you be accepting this one?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

I am pleased to say I am accepting this one.

2.8.1 The Connétable of St. Helier:

Perhaps he may change his mind, when I have finished proposing it. I think the Minister may have misunderstood this amendment because I was surprised he was willing to accept it. I suppose the wording is a bit ambiguous. What I am seeking to ensure is that before we build on either of these sites, and it is a shame that Deputy Le Fondré has withdrawn his amendment because I would like to have explained why I think his provision had merit. But anyway he has. But before we build anything on Ann Court or the Jersey Gasworks site, we should look at the requirements for amenity space and parking in the area of the Masterplan. Not just on the Ann Court site, nor indeed on Jersey Gas site, and the comments from the Minister seem to imply he is assuring me that yes they will have sufficient amenity space on Ann Court. They will have sufficient amenity space on the Jersey Gas site. What I am suggesting is that if a study of open space in St. Helier indicates that we are radically short of open space then I am suggesting that we should not be building on either of these sites and we should be having more open space. Certainly several of the residents I have spoken to in the area of Ann Court are really quite enamoured of the idea that outside their houses, outside the Arts Centre, perhaps with the addition of underground parking, there should be another park. Is that such a terrible thing to say? But that was what I was driving at, but maybe I did not get the wording quite right. In any case, the Minister appears to accept that before we build we must make sure that there is enough open space, and I think that is uncontentious. I think it conforms with the Strategic Plan, it conforms with the Island Plan that we have just finished, and so, on that basis, I think having made what I was trying to do fairly clear, I will propose the amendment.

The Bailiff:

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

2.8.2 Deputy A.K.F. Green:

I just want to make it quite clear that while I will support this amendment I will be supporting it in light of we need to build sheltered housing on this site. I use the term “sheltered” because I think there is an ideal opportunity to build proper sheltered housing here. Housing that will be supported perhaps even 24/7. This is an ideal site to do it. Of course we need to provide the right amenities around there. It can be open for other people but this is a site that is desperately needed for sheltered housing, certainly for social housing, and I make quite clear now that this site will go to other uses over my dead body, and I know some people can say that might be arranged. Having said that, this site will go for sheltered or social housing with the right amenities, with the right design, I am quite happy with that, but it remains for sheltered and social housing.

2.8.3 Deputy S. Power:

I would like to agree with the Minister for Housing. I would robustly oppose any attempt to use this site for open space. I do not have a problem with any study to suggest that there may need to be more amenity space in St. Helier, but again I repeat what I said 10 to 15 minutes ago, there are covetous eyes looking at this site, which has always been a social housing site, and while the Housing Department had to demolish those buildings, because they were defective and not fit for use as they were, it seems to me that when suddenly there is a flat open site in the middle of town there are lots and lots of people who have got lots and lots of different ideas as to what to put there. What we need to put there is social housing. We need to put it back. We need to put over-55 there and whoever is the next ... whoever he or she is, whoever is the next Minister for Housing, they have my support as long as I am in this Assembly on rebuilding Ann Court.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

My comments have just been covered.

2.8.4 Senator F.E. Cohen:

I think the Connétable is being rather unfair and he has used his secret weapon against me. The Connétable is a Cambridge graduate in English and he has clearly used his excellent command of English language to his advantage and my disadvantage. However, I am not so sure he is right because reading his amendment carefully I do not think it delivers what he has just suggested and therefore I am prepared to continue to accept on the basis that I had previously accepted.

2.8.5 The Deputy of St. Mary:

I only speak because of what I heard Deputy Power say. It is crazy, is it not? We are just going to ... we see every site. I do not necessarily say that this site should not go for elderly housing, although that has to be consulted on now in regard of my amendment. To me and the Minister for Housing it is the obvious use for the site. But I do worry about the implications of what Deputy Power said, that any space in town has to be built on because we need those houses, and I will just ask Members to remember that when they debate population next week.

Deputy S. Power:

That is not what I said, I said we need to rebuild Ann Court. I was quite specific.

2.8.6 Deputy A.E. Jeune:

There appears to have been an emphasis on open space amenity. Surely we should be thinking about amenities in general. If we are talking about sheltered housing, housing for the elderly, why are we not thinking about amenities such as health centres, doctors' surgeries, moving some Family Nursing Services services there, other community health services? We seem to be hung up on open space and I am not sure that is the right thing.

2.8.7 Deputy M. Tadier:

Just to come back on that; it reminds me of a quote earlier, which I did not come out with, it is from a film called *How to Get Ahead in Advertising* and it talks about trains and the reason that this individual does not like trains is because they do not consume. I think that is the difference between... that is why certain Members in this House and a certain section in our society, they do not like a green space because it does not provide any money essentially. It does not consume, it does not force people to park cars which consume petrol, which pollute. It does not force people to buy useless rubbish that they do not need to clutter up their houses to pay somebody else to take it away. It just sits there. Green grass just sits there. It grows hopefully, if it is watered, but what it does do is it provides a valuable breathing space and it provides a great way to clear one's mind. I think we all appreciate, whether we live in town, in urban areas or in the country, we all appreciate the benefit of having open spaces, which usually have greenery round them because it does rejuvenate us and it does provide a way to relax after the hustle and bustle of everyday life, so I quite understand exactly where the Town Constable is coming from.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak? Then I call upon the Connétable to reply.

2.8.8 The Connétable of St. Helier:

Deputy Green and his predecessor at Housing are robustly of the view that the site of Ann Court must have sheltered housing on it. That presumably means that if a better site in the town centre, better connected to services were offered to them that they would still insist on building the homes here. I think the purpose of my amendment is to keep minds open so that when this site is released by T.T.S., and it has not been released yet, but when it is released then we have those discussions. We do that review. I do think it is important and that is why I opposed the Deputy of St. Mary

perhaps with a little bit of irritation earlier on in this debate when I felt he was trying to tie the hands of the future Government in terms of how they spend the money that comes through the developments. I do not believe in tying the hands. These amendments try to keep those hands untied so that we can make decisions about the future of Ann Court with all the information we have, when that site becomes available. I am not for a minute minimising the need to provide good quality sheltered housing, social housing in town. St. Helier has of course fulfilled its obligations in that regard in past years and will continue to do so because it makes such good sense for people in the latter half of their lives, which I guess now includes me, to be located in the town where they have access to the facilities that they need. Senator Cohen and I are going to have to have a discussion afterwards about the semantics of this and exactly what the proposition means. Certainly it did seem to me, and I think my report backs it up, that on page 3 of my report I think it makes absolutely clear that there has been no rigorous or systematic examination of the amenity space requirements of this densely populated area of St. Helier. This part of St. Helier is already densely populated and that is why I believe that this examination of open space requirement should be done. Of course, this debate we are having, it has not been mentioned yet, but it applies to the Jersey Gas site as well as to Ann Court. No one has referred to the Jersey Gas site, the one that I thought really deserved the Wormwood Scrubs description that the Deputy of St. John, when the initial housing scheme was proposed for it. We need to remember that the Jersey Gas site was suggested by the, I think, one of the people who thought of the Millennium Town Park in the first place, the then Deputy Syvret, as being a good extension of the town park eastwards towards the escarpment of St. Saviour. Again, that proposal may sound absurd and bonkers to some Members but that proposal is kept open by this amendment. It is still possible to have a discussion in due course about the Jersey Gas site and whether that should be a densely packed housing site with parking or whether it should not be, indeed, an extension to the open space on the Millennium Town Park site.

[16:00]

So this amendment is about keeping our options open and so anyone who votes against it is basically saying they want to close our options and tie our hands and tie the hands of future Councils of Ministers. Deputy Jeune from St. Brelade suggested I was hung up on open space requirements for town. Well, yes, I suppose I am and, in a way, so should she be because everybody who uses St. Helier deserves a standard of open space requirement that is at least comparable to other densely populated towns. However, she did suggest that the Ann Court site might be suitable for health services, which I thought was interesting, and again another reason why we should have had the debate on Deputy Le Fondré's amendment. He was trying to open up the possibilities for that site and not tie the hands of future Councils of Ministers, of future Ministers for Planning. But anyway that is in the past. I do maintain the amendment and ask Members to agree that it is about keeping options open and making sure we do not short-change St. Helier in terms of open space. I ask for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel is called for then in relation to the amendment lodged by the Connétable of St. Helier. I invite Members to return to their seats and the Greffier will open the voting.

POUR: 25		CONTRE: 9		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator A. Breckon		Senator P.F.C. Ozouf		
Senator F. du H. Le Gresley		Senator T.J. Le Main		
Connétable of St. Ouen		Connétable of Grouville		
Connétable of St. Helier		Connétable of St. Clement		
Connétable of St. Brelade		Deputy R.C. Duhamel (S)		
Connétable of St. John		Deputy of St. Ouen		

Connétable of St. Saviour		Deputy A.E. Jeune (B)		
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Deputy A.K.F. Green (H)		
Deputy of St. Martin		Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)		
Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier (S)				
Deputy J.B. Fox (H)				
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)				
Deputy of St. Peter				
Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire (H)				
Deputy of Trinity				
Deputy S.S.P.A. Power (B)				
Deputy S. Pitman (H)				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy of St. John				
Deputy M. Tadier (B)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy T.M. Pitman (H)				
Deputy E.J. Noel (L)				
Deputy T.A. Vallois (S)				
Deputy D.J. De Sousa (H)				

2.9 North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): third amendment (P.72/3011 Amd.(3)) - paragraph 6

The Bailiff:

We come next to paragraph 6 of the 3rd amendment lodged by the Deputy of St. Mary and I will ask the Greffier to read that amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Page 2 - After the words “an agreed development framework” insert the words – “subject to the condition that the commuter parking proposed for the Le Masurier Bath Street shall be deleted from the Masterplan.”

The Bailiff:

Minister, will you be accepting this one?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

I will not, Sir.

2.9.1 The Deputy of St. Mary:

This is a curious inconsistency on the part of the Minister. We have just voted in the Island Plan, there were 2 votes we took, I remember clearly that we voted for, in fact in TT10, we added the words: “In order that long-stay off-street public parking can be limited or reduced and the proportion of short-stay off-street parking increased.” That is what this amendment is about, to reduce the long-stay off-street public parking, the future provision because it is not even there yet, and to increase the proportion of short-stay shopping parking. We also voted for putting car parking on the periphery and not having new car parking in the centre of town. I beg your pardon, new long-stay parking in the centre of town. So the Minister’s opposition to this amendment is extraordinary. What this amendment is doing, is it is saying that in the Le Masurier site, as and when it becomes developed, that the 210 parking spaces there should not be split 110 commuters and 100 shoppers, but should all be shoppers. The Hopkins report says on page 3 200 shoppers. It goes through a list of all the sites in terms of transport and it says 100 parking spaces here and 200 there. It says 200 shoppers on the Le Masurier site. But on page 6, and on page 16, these have changed into 100 shoppers and 110 commuter spaces. On the page where they detail all the

parking implications on page 21, there is a table that quite clearly says, with accompanying text, that what is proposed is 110 commuter spaces and 100 shopper spaces in the middle of St. Helier, halfway down Bath Street in complete contradiction to what we have just voted for in the Island Plan. New long-stay parking halfway down Bath Street, so you can kiss goodbye to your improvements to the environment of Bath Street because you have just sat...

The Bailiff:

Deputy, I think we may be inqorate. Please carry on, we are all right at the moment.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

We would be if we agree with it as it stands, we would be sucking in extra commuting, peak hour traffic down Bath Street, which is against what we have just agreed and what we agreed in the transport policy. I would just remind Members before sitting down of what the inspectors said about this, although obviously their advice varies in its acceptability. They said that: "Policy TT10, as it stands, implies that parking standards for the North St. Helier Masterplan might be driven by motorists and pressure groups' desires for more spaces, something that is likely to be open-ended and upwards. This would be contrary to the plan strategy and that in the Sustainable Transport Policy, both of which look to check and reduce the peak off-flow of vehicles in and out of St. Helier. The Minister's further amendment [which we have voted for] clarifies that the intention is to review standards in the light of the plan and strategic transport policy aims." This is a matter of consistency again. It is a matter of whether we stick with what we said 5 hours ago and we stick with that these spaces should be shoppers and not written into the plan as half commuters and half shoppers.

The Bailiff:

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

2.9.2 Senator F.E. Cohen:

I am grateful to Members and to members of the public who have produced many thoughtful and encouraging comments, particularly on the need to retain parking. The overwhelming message from all respondents was not to damage the available car parking for shoppers, residents and commuters. I have listened to this feedback, the final version of the plan takes on board this feedback. We need to be cognisant of the needs of today, while keeping an eye on the future. I have already explained to Members that this plan is designed to be reviewed every 2 years. That every 2 years we will make a reassessment, it is contained in the plan - and I hope the Deputy of St. Mary has found the reference - every 2 years we will review the car parking and if the Sustainable Transport Plan has succeeded and if transportation habits have changed and if Islanders have responded to the wishes of the Assembly in relation to reducing their carbon footprint, by changing their methods of travel, then the amount of car parking can be reduced. But when I proposed this to States Members at the last presentation in relation to the North of Town Masterplan, the only supporter I think that I got was the Deputy of St. Mary, and it was because of that, and because of representations from members of the public, that I changed positions and agreed to provide in the Masterplan that I put before the Assembly basically the same car parking plus 10 per cent as existed prior to the commencement of the town park. I am afraid that this a very worthwhile and understandable objective, but it is not the right time for it. If Islanders reduce their car usage and reduce the demand for parking in the town then the plan can be amended within its life, and as we have already said in relation to Minden Place, nothing is going to happen there for 10 to 15 years anyway. I am afraid I will be rejecting this amendment.

2.9.3 Deputy J.M. Maçon:

Just very briefly, I would remind the Deputy of St. Mary that when he is quoting the Sustainable Transport Policy he has to remember the document needs to be taken as a whole and we did put in provision for those commuters where the private vehicle is the only mode of transport in order for

them to get to work, et cetera. Therefore within this area of town, I mean, I am already receiving complaints from various people the fact that the Gas Place parking has gone and they are expressing their concerns to me for the workers in that area. However, I think if that is taken out completely, for the Minister to state that this does need to be a staged approach although ultimately accepting that, there is always going to be a situation where for some people, it does not matter what one does, that there is only going to be one practical solution.

2.9.4 The Connétable of St. Brelade:

While the Deputy of St. Mary is absolutely right, it is totally impractical and in the short term, commuter parking in the north of town has to be provided for and this is the short-term solution. This is probably the project nearest ready to go of those proposed in that area. I would concur with the Minister's views that a review needs to be taken. I suspect that the eventual outcome will be that it will be 100 per cent shopper parking.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

Can I ask a point of clarification from the previous speaker? I am a bit puzzled because I think there might be a misunderstanding. He has said that this is a short-term solution when the Odeon Cinema is still standing there and this is a long, long way away. Maybe he is talking about something else.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

No, in practice, there are various sites which are due for redevelopment in the north of town some of which incorporate parking, and I suspect this is probably the one that is closer to fruition than others and will achieve the requirement for continued commuter parking in the area, rather than commuters having to travel across town. I feel the short-term solution is achievable.

2.9.5 Deputy J.B. Fox:

I can understand that when one is regenerating that sometimes you do have to have some short-term - it sounds a ridiculous way of putting it - but short-term for long-term commuter parking while you are juggling around all the sites, et cetera, but the logic of having commuter parking within the inner part of what I would call an inner ring road, just does not make sense. The whole object of having the ring road around the peripheries and having the gyratory systems connected to it was that the long-term parking could be contained within this ring road area and a short walk of commuters into town. The priority obviously for the shoppers and especially the traders is to have your shoppers' parking as close as possible and right from May 1971, when the big warehouses in James Street went up in flames, I know I was there. [Laughter] I did not set fire to them. It was always assumed that they would be replaced with commercial development of some sort and they have been lying there under-utilised for parking ever since, which is a total waste of a valuable resource, and therefore the Minister for Transport and Technical Services is probably right with the town park; he does need to keep as much commuter parking within that part of town, but I hope that he is only looking at it for the short term and in the longer term that this area, if we are having parking it should be shoppers' parking.

2.9.6 Deputy G.P. Southern:

I suppose it is a pale echo of what the previous speaker just said, but there is a case to be made for pulling into town shopper parking and vehicles into town, there is no case for pulling in commuter traffic into that part of town, past the new town park, up and down Bath Street, therefore precluding about what we are doing with the pavements or whatever. This just does not fit in with any coherent rationale, I do not think. The principle was that we were to keep commuter parking on the periphery of town and ask people to walk for a short time to get to their office or their shop. This amendment makes sense and Members should be voting for it.

2.9.7 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

When the architect from Hopkins came to speak to us at St. Paul's I mentioned during the presentation to States Members that I had long held the belief that the Gasholder site on the east end of the Talman site there could be utilised for a car parking solution. We have heard this afternoon, and we have agreed to the Constable's amendment that we consider the open space issues, and we have heard about the need to consult widely and yet we are predetermining the use of a site which has been held back, much to my dismay. I think it was a significant opportunity for an investment at a time that was critical, in my view, that has been held back so that the waterfront will bubble up.

[16:15]

A significant investment on behalf of Le Masurier is I think in relation to long-term commuters parking is, I do not think, personally what is needed. I think what is needed, and I have said this, and the architect from Hopkins agreed with me. That putting a car park on the ring road where the Gasholder is now would be the perfect solution. That type of thinking, going along with the architects who proposed walkways from school through town vistas, opening up town, enabling people to walk and enjoy walking, which we have all signed up to, that was the ethos about what was going on. We have also heard about these things that Deputy Duhamel has been driving forwards, the stacking car parks. Well, the previous Constable of St. Helier, Robert Le Brocq, was talking about stacking parking systems when he was Constable. I cannot even remember when that was. So these new things that are on the horizon are very, very much old and known issues and times to access car parking, et cetera. The fact of the matter is, if you give over that Gasholder site to a very high density site, such has been agreed in principle at the Metropole, then all you are doing is stacking many, many, many more people into an area which is already overloaded. You are giving them less ... we saw something like 45,000 more square feet of residential space, or something like that, in answers to questions I put to the Minister in relation to the North of Town Masterplan and only one vergée more of open space. A just ridiculous increase in residential opportunity and people's opportunities as a business, the people that own the gas company are jumping up and down with glee, and yet we knock people who own glasshouse sites for sitting on them for ever to enable them to be turned into housing sites, and yet here we have a multinational company that is sitting on a Gasholder that needs replacing, that needs resiting, that has been asking for space at La Collette, that we are not giving them, that could easily be relocated and set up and we could provide a traffic solution and a long-term commuter solution on that Gas Place site. That is what really annoys me, is the mantra that has been used to put together this Masterplan and the view of the architect, which agrees with me about these issues in these instances, is dismissed. I think we need to support the Deputy of St. Mary. I think he is right. I think that we should not be having long-stay commuter parking inside town. I would just like to finish by saying one thing and one thing only, because I live literally, even though I am not a fast walker any more, 90 seconds away from my front door. Members have to get to realise this is where we live. It is not where we shop or where we walk through. It is where we live. It is where we live. It is where our children live. At the moment they have got nowhere to go. They have got nowhere to stay. All Members seem to be concerned about is how they are going to get in and shop. Modern technology, as pointed out by Deputy Duhamel, is now at the point where people can go online, shop, buy clothing, have it sent to them, try it on, return the stuff they do not like, and there is no cost. That is where we are at today. It is not just CDs and DVDs, which you can download, which are going to disappear. It is a modern step-change in how we do things. I am sorry to say, unless the States gets wise about the future we have got no future. This town is not just a place to shop. It is where the vast majority of residents in the future are going to have to live. Live. Not shop. Live.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak? Very well, I call upon the Deputy of St. Mary to reply.

2.9.8 The Deputy of St. Mary:

I thank those who have spoken. I am going to start with and probably finish with Deputy Fox who said this should be shoppers' parking. I take that out of context, he said a lot before he said that. But he did end up with via a few circles to saying: "This should be shoppers' parking. It does not make sense to have commuter parking here." He hopes it is only a short-term solution. I hope Members remember that when they consider how to vote, and I also take on board, and I think Members should harken to what Deputy Le Claire has just said about this is where people live and what kind of environment are we trying to make for people? How are we trying to square all these different aspects? The Minister changed his mind. He changed his mind because a few Constables surrounded him at a meeting where he briefed us on Hopkins and said: "We have the right and our constituents have the right to drive into town and not only do our shopping but also commute to work." He stood the plan on its head. Eventually he had an apotheosis, one of those things where the light goes on in your head. **[Aside]** An epiphany, not an apotheosis. That is where you go up, I think. Anyway, an epiphany. He produced some amendments that brought this plan into the 21st century and then a few hours later he pulled them, which is very sad. He said something very interesting; he said this plan can be amended within its life. So that if we vote against this then we will have 100 shoppers and 110 commuters and if things change then we can always roll back on that and change the split. Exactly the same goes the other way round. We go for 200 shoppers, which is what everybody says all the time: "We need more shoppers' car parking, especially near the centre of town" and then if things change and people do not continue to increase going on the bus, and we are talking about a doubling of bus commuting remember. We are talking doubling the capacity of the buses in 2 years' time, so why on earth are we talking about ... we have a strange thing in this Assembly. We say save, save, save, be clever with the money, really be careful with the money, and then we propose to do 2 things simultaneously which costs money; provide commuter parking and provide extra spaces on the buses. It just does not make sense. It just does not make sense. Finally, the Minister said that he received feedback on the issue of car parking. I have no doubt he received 1,204 communications; I bet he did not. But the Sustainable Transport Policy had that number of people replying to the question about car parking. The number of commuter parking spaces, public and private, in St. Helier should not be increased. Strongly agree 23 per cent; agree 33 per cent. So the total agreeing and strongly agreeing is 55 per cent. The number of short-stay shopper parking spaces in St. Helier should be increased and the total of the 2 is 55 per cent. It is exactly in line with this amendment, what the public are saying is not what... well, the Minister had a very, very, very small sample, which he is touting to us as what we must obey, but in fact a far larger sample have said the opposite. They have said in line with this amendment, please support this. Please be consistent with what we voted for 5 hours ago. We said put commuter parking, if we have to have it, on the periphery and we said increase the proportion of shopper parking and reduce the proportion of commuter parking. It is as simple as that. Anyway, this can be reviewed, as the Minister has told us, so please vote for common sense in this amendment.

The Bailiff:

The appel is called for then in relation to the amendment of the Deputy of St. Mary, that is paragraph 6 of the 3rd amendment.

POUR: 9		CONTRE: 19		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator F. du H. Le Gresley		Senator T.J. Le Main		
Connétable of St. Helier		Senator F.E. Cohen		
Deputy J.B. Fox (H)		Senator S.C. Ferguson		
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		Connétable of St. Ouen		
Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire (H)		Connétable of Grouville		
Deputy S. Pitman (H)		Connétable of St. Brelade		
Deputy of St. Mary		Connétable of St. John		

Deputy T.M. Pitman (H)		Connétable of St. Saviour		
Deputy T.A. Vallois (S)		Connétable of St. Clement		
		Connétable of St. Lawrence		
		Deputy R.C. Duhamel (S)		
		Deputy of St. Martin		
		Deputy of Trinity		
		Deputy S.S.P.A. Power (B)		
		Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)		
		Deputy A.E. Jeune (B)		
		Deputy E.J. Noel (L)		
		Deputy A.K.F. Green (H)		
		Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)		

2.10 North St. Helier Masterplan (P.73/2011): third amendment (P.72/3011 Amd.(3)) - paragraph 3

The Bailiff:

Then we come next to paragraph 3 of the 3rd amendment lodged by the Deputy of St. Mary, and I will ask the Deputy to read the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Page 2 - After the words “an agreed development framework” insert the words – “subject to the condition that in relation to the former Jersey College for Girls’ site, the draft Masterplan shall be amended to include a formal evaluation of this site as a site for States offices”.

The Bailiff:

Minister, will you be accepting this amendment?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

No, Sir, I most certainly will not. Thank you.

The Bailiff:

I invite the Deputy of St. Mary to propose the amendment.

2.10.1 The Deputy of St. Mary:

I shall not be following Deputy Le Fondré’s precedent of simply withdrawing something because he thinks that one or 2 Deputies did not like it. I accept that this is highly controversial. I just want to take people through why I am bringing it and then there will be no doubt a short debate. There are huge advantages ... there are 2 starting points. One is that there are huge advantages of concentrating the States office stock. I went to see the head of Property Holdings about the States office strategy and he showed me a draft document about that strategy. In our conversation he stressed the huge advantages of concentrating the States office portfolio. In Deputy Le Fondré’s amendment, which he did not bring, about possibly using Ann Court or the Gas site partly for States offices, he spelt out the advantages of grouping our office space. “An enabler of cultural and operational change”, I think that means that people would work better together. That they would work more collaboratively because they are in the same building. They would meet over coffee and over lunch. “It would deliver far greater financial benefits by encouraging flexible working practices and greater collaborative working between departments. The additional benefits would be to free up key sites presently occupied by States offices to release capital for reinvestment and to provide vital opportunities for new housing to be constructed.” So there is a strong case for concentrating States offices. There are advantages. My second starting point was the concept drawing which he showed me. I had intended to circulate this but could not find it in the mass of papers at home, however I will just spell out what it had. You would go through that green area at

the front of J.C.G. (Jersey College for Girls). The frontage would be preserved, as I think it is going to be preserved anyway, which is going to be quite difficult in a housing scenario. God knows what they are going to do with that façade in a housing scenario, but anyway. For offices you can see that would simply be a certain range of offices. Then you go through what used to be the J.C.G. building, up the slope, and there behind the same width as J.C.G. was a brand new hyper-modern all glass office accommodation. Obviously with quite a big floor area and you could probably put the entire States office stock in there with huge advantages. You can meet anybody straight away, face to face, without having to get on your bike, or not, and go out to God knows where, all over town to try and have...

The Bailiff:

Deputy, I think I have ruled before that to use the Lord's name in that context is not really appropriate.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

Sorry, "God knows where" is a fixed expression but I will have to... Heaven knows where, whatever. Rather than just meeting them in the same building. The concept drawing absolutely was a moment for me, that is the right place to put it. It is big enough, it brings everyone together. It is the right use of that building and that façade which has to be kept. You have the green space in front, which says: "This is important. This is the States offices." But you do not have to run around to 25 different places, it is all there. The arguments against it, frankly, are fairly light. My prototype, my precedent for this is Norwich, where the Norfolk County Council offices are 3 miles outside the town centre on the ring road, on one of the main arteries going out of town. You get to a roundabout and there is the office. It is perfectly accessible by a regular bus service, both arterially and round the ring round, and/or by car or by bike. There is no problem with getting to it. In the new world where we have a hoppla bus service in 2013 obviously the States offices would be one of the stops. Also it would be incorporated into any new bus type service, buses would come into Liberation Square and there would be an absolutely regular service out to the States offices. The comments of the Minister for Treasury talk about the effect on the centre of St. Helier. Frankly, I did not know that States employees spend their time shopping. They obviously would go out at lunchtimes and do that, but then they will do that locally. They will do that out there in the small shops and cafés and give them a boost. So it is the same spend in a different area. But I think the main advantage is the meeting opportunities and the advantage of being all together, and I think access for the public is just as easy, if not easier, than trotting round to Cyril Le Marquand, La Motte Street, Housing, La Collette, South Hill, I mean, and goodness knows what.

[16:30]

I just put that in front of the Assembly and await people's comments. I fear some brickbats are coming my way, but nevertheless I thought this should be aired. I have had conversations with people who have also felt this is the right place. This solves the issue. I would just throw in one alternative possibility. We do not hear much about the site next to Tourism, the Esplanade car park, but of course that would be bang next to the bus station and extremely convenient, and also big enough, which Ann Court and the Gas site are not. I move the amendment.

The Bailiff:

Is the amendment seconded? **[Seconded]** Minister, do you wish to speak?

2.10.2 Senator F.E. Cohen:

I have no objection to the principle of the consolidation of States offices. Indeed, it is an exceptionally good idea, but please, please not on the Ladies College site. This is a building by the celebrated architect Adolphus Curry. It is a really good piece of modest classicism, of stripped down classicism. It is the classic regeneration site. The Deputy of St. Mary has said that it will be

difficult to convert it into residences. He clearly has not looked at the Binney/Martin plan, which I approved. It is a simple, light touch conversion. It delivers wonderful apartments with high ceilings, for the Connétable of St. Helier. It delivers magnificent large apartments and behind it they have designed a very simple modern apartment building. I think we could now do with a variation of that because the site has now been extended and it would be better to develop a more classical façade for the building behind, and to flank the existing building with 2 classical terraces retaining the green area to the south. But please do not consider this as a suitable site for States offices. This is the key regeneration site, the key residential regeneration site, for the north of town. Just imagine the effect of a regenerated Ladies College site with wonderful classically designed houses that are affordable for Islanders living in that area, going to work from that area, and we are proposing here to consider the concept of trying to get thousands of people in, all at the same time, in the morning, and out in the evening, to a consolidated States office. It simply does not work from a practical perspective and it would undoubtedly wreck a magnificent opportunity and wreck a wonderful building designed by Adolphus Curry. I urge Members on this more than any other amendment, to please reject it.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Can I ask for a point of clarification please, Sir? The Minister said it is a wonderful site and the scheme has been designed for housing and obviously this is more opportunity. Because it is such a wonderful States-owned site for housing what element, if at all any, of this site could be used for affordable category A housing?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

That is a decision for a later day, but it is an ideal site for affordable housing, certainly in parts. An ideal site. I am not saying all of it should go for affordable housing. Some of the apartments are really exceptionally large but this site is perfect for a significant element of affordable housing.

2.10.3 Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

Members will have this afternoon, you have not announced it, Sir, yet, but Members will have received an important R of a major part of the office rationalisation strategy. Such is the importance of this I am going to seek leave of you to make a statement tomorrow morning about that, so that Members may question me on that important report on States rationalisation. This is made in the... I hope with the delight of the Minister for Home Affairs because we are making progress on office strategy. I am not going to make any comment about that because I will explore that further tomorrow morning. The office strategy for the States, of which that report and this amendment, has taken too long. I accept that and I have been trying with the good offices of my Assistant Minister, the Constable of St. Peter, to make significant progress on the rationalisation of States offices. I agree with the Deputy of St. Mary that we can do an awful lot to rationalise the multi-site nature of States offices. So we are absolutely at one in achieving that objective. But, there is a lot of talk among Members, and we have been together for quite some days, about the issue of offices and where offices are going to be built and the supply of offices that are coming on to the market. I apologise to Deputy Le Claire, because I have not responded to an email, that he asked about the progress about the phased development of Esplanade Square. Yes, S.o.J.D.C. (States of Jersey Development Company) is going to progress the first phase, if there is demand, for office space, and that is obviously subject to further discussion, and I will respond to him later. But the point that is relevant there is that offices need to be in the core of the town centre, in the right place, and there is space in order to achieve both the demands of the commercial sector, which needs to consolidate and there are numerous financial institutions to consolidate, just as the States of Jersey, and there is space within the core of the town to deliver States offices. Offices need to be in the centre of town. That is where the whole footfall for lunchtime shopping, the maintenance of King and Queen Street and all of the daytime economy depends upon. Are we really serious and, yes, I stand up and I admit that I instructed Property Holdings to rule out J.C.G. as a site for offices

in the town centre. What would States officers, of which there would likely be perhaps hundreds of States workers, what would they be doing in their lunchtimes in an office in J.C.G.? Ten minutes walk from the town centre, not visiting the sandwich bars and the retail environment that we have created, it is absolute nonsense to suggest, if I may say, that offices should be on the periphery of the ring road in St. Helier. It just does not make sense from a practical point of view, from an egress, or whatever the correct word is, from a transportation point of view. Where are the people from the south of the Island, whether or not they are in a car or on a bike, how are they going to get to J.C.G. in the morning? We would never allow a commercial operator to build offices in the north of the ring road in the north part of town. We would require them, and that is at the heart of the planning policies, to be in the centre of town, of which we have numerous spaces to deliver. That is what we should be doing. There is a role for, and I agree with the Deputy of St. Mary, about, as I say, consolidation of States offices and I would just alert and maybe excite Members to draw their attention to the sites that the States has in our ownership or in related ownership in terms of where we could deliver offices. I am not talking about the Esplanade but let Members just think about the vast areas of land that the States of Jersey own in the town centre. Whether that is an extension of Cyril Le Marquand House, whether that is looking at working with the Post Office at Post Office Headquarters, which is going to have to be developed, which there are other sites around there that need to be done and other centres. Ladies College, as the Minister for Planning so elegantly calls it, of which I was an Old Girl a while ago, so I care about the Ladies College - I did my A level French there - is a delightful housing site. Deputy Le Claire is absolutely correct to say that he should also be pressing for it to be a mixed tenure housing site, and there is a role for there to be some affordable homes on that States site. That is how we are going to be delivering the dream of home ownership. Some social rented, some lifetime homes, maybe some shared equity, and some premium category B in order to finance it. That is the dream. That is what we need to be concentrating on and as a conversation, finally very briefly, I had with another Member in the coffee room, sometimes this Assembly sends messages that we are going to continue to evaluate all options. Sometimes this Assembly does not make the right decisions, if I may say so, but 80 per cent of decisions... but making a decision is probably better than constantly reviewing matters and keeping all options open and never making a decision. Make a decision today, highlight and decide that J.C.G. Ladies College should be a housing site and let us get on and deliver homes that we have been debating now for 6 days the importance of.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

Can I ask a point of clarification of the speaker? He said that the States owned vast areas in the centre of town and then he struggled a bit with saying what they were. Could he please just give a more complete list because I have not read that report, and I suspect most people have not either?

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

Think around the town. I can think of the harbour area, I can think of the Tourism building, I can think of the Housing Department on the Esplanade, and that is just for starters. I can think of buildings around this area of the Royal Square, which the Home Affairs Department is. There are numerous, I think there is something like 50 different sites around the town centre that the States of Jersey... inefficient office accommodation, and I am sure with a little imagination the Deputy can think; he does not need me to give a list.

2.10.4 The Connétable of St. Helier:

I think that Senator Ozouf made some very telling points about the best place for the new consolidated States offices and the regeneration possibilities of having them in the town centre, and again it is a shame that Deputy Le Fondré's amendment was withdrawn because that is what Ann Court provided. It is decision time on J.C.G. It is one of the things that upsets Islanders most, that that property has been empty for so long. I think it was moved out of when I became a Deputy, which is about 15 years ago and it has more or less been under-utilised ever since. It is an example

that people keep singling out of our inability to make decisions. It is decision time, even if one can think of other uses for the site. It was decision time recently on the Millennium Town Park. It took us a dozen years to make a decision on that because we could not somehow resolve the parking issues. I do not think there is any way back on this building. It has got to be put to a proper use and I think the improvements that the Minister for Planning has described are eminently appropriate. I question possibly his remarks about affordable housing and where those bits should go because he seemed to be suggesting that affordable housing occupants perhaps did not deserve the bigger apartments and the raised ceilings. I am sure he did not mean to suggest that.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

If the Connétable would give way, that was not what I was suggesting. But I think some of those apartments on the historic building would be quite enormous and would be unnecessary for the purposes of affordable housing. I think some of them would be well in excess of 2,500 square feet. That was the only point I was making.

The Connétable of St. Helier:

So we cannot have affordable penthouses then? The only other point I would make about J.C.G., and I make it every time it is discussed, and it has been debated in the Assembly probably a dozen times, J.C.G. used to provide a very important safe route for children going down the ring road. They would cut across the front of the building and, indeed, the lawns in the front were an important aspect of public open space. I have had assurances in the past from Ministers that that through route will be retained, and I simply flag that up because sending people down the ring road, where it sinks down below the Adolphus Curry designed building, it is not a nice place to walk during the rush hour, and I think it is important we keep that walking route open so that people can get to Drury Lane up and over the top, to where they are going. I would ask the Minister to bear that in mind.

2.10.5 Senator T.J. Le Main:

I would like to particularly follow Senator Ozouf. I know the building quite well but not like Senator Ozouf, who is an Old Girl. Some years ago we at the then Housing Committee, which I was the President at that time, did an exercise and a very expensive exercise on the conversion and the provision of homes on this site and in this building. Senator Ozouf has absolutely said everything that I intended to say about the building, and the Minister also. The main building, the protected building, will provide some most magnificent apartments, completely for the reason that the inside of the building is totally protected in a lot of areas.

[16:45]

There are some magnificent stairways, high ceilings. Really, it is a perfect site for developing and maintaining what we try to do now in maintaining old buildings, listed buildings, by providing homes on one side up Drury Lane and there is no question about it, as the Minister has just said, because of the quality of the inside and the need to protect the interior of the building that some of the apartments will be 2,000 to 2,500 square feet, and it is just not practical to even consider the interior building converted to be for social housing. I am very, very keen that this building, like many others, now is developed and I could see a very good sale and demand for this building for apartments in this building, that it really will be quality with the kind of fixtures that are still permanent fixtures in the building. As I say, I totally concur with what has been said. It is the wrong place for an office development for all the reasons well highlighted by Senator Ozouf, and we now must move on, we must get on. We are becoming a bit of a joke really with some of our properties, and I can see St. Saviour's Hospital going the same way; that is sitting there doing nothing at the moment. We have got millions of pounds worth of assets, Haut de la Garenne was another one, and we really need to make some decisions. Quite honestly, if anybody in this Assembly owned those properties personally, they would have been sold, developed and gone a

long time ago. We need to move on and I support wholly what the Minister and Senator Ozouf were saying on this, and I will not be supporting this amendment.

2.10.6 Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

This amendment from the Deputy of St. Mary seems to be encouraging us to move back to the good old bad old days where all 53 Members, and in this day and age there is probably substantially less, would act as ad hoc Ministers for Planning to determine whatever their favourite scheme was going to be and try and get it through this House. We do have States officers whose job it is, at the present time, to try and come up with a worked out policy to determine the relocation and consolidation of States offices. I find it surprising that we do not just allow that particular process to go ahead. I feel quite sure from the comments from the Minister for Treasury and Resources, whose department oversees part of this work, that consideration probably has taken place to determine whether or not Jersey College for Girls' site would be a sensible site to be considered for States offices. So the processes are there, the work is being undertaken and there is absolutely no place for this amendment in the North of Town Masterplan.

2.10.7 Deputy A.K.F. Green:

I have not got much more to add to the debate, but I have to say I am absolutely amazed that... you could not even say the ink is not even dry on the Island Plan, we have not even printed the Island Plan as amended, and all the promises there and everybody accepted that we were going to use States-owned sites to provide social housing. Already there has been 2 attempts to remove sites available to States social housing: Ann Court, possibly Gas Place could count as a second, and now the Girls or Ladies College. We have not even printed the new Island Plan as amended. For years and years, I do not know how many years, Girls College, Ladies College, has stood empty, while various schemes are being worked up, and we are very good at working up schemes, but we are not very good at delivering them. It is time to get on with the job. The main building will make excellent departments and the Minister for Planning was not saying that these are too good for ordinary folk of Jersey. What he was saying is that these would be very grand apartments that could help to finance affordable homes for ordinary people in Jersey; that is what he was saying. That is what we need and we need to get on and do the job. Stop talking about it, let us get on with it.

2.10.8 Deputy J.B. Fox:

Over the years this particular building has been looked at to be a new police headquarters, it has been looked at to be the new offices for Planning and Environment and Public Services, all of which have failed miserably because it is a listed building and there is a huge amount of wasted space that would be involved in it, and the cost factor as well. On the other side of the coin, Deputy Green has just highlighted that people keep talking about public property such as this being used for category A housing, et cetera. Its value is in using it for category B, into selling them off to the appropriate people and for using that money, ring-fencing it, into social housing category A at a much more productive site than is possible on that site. Therefore I will not be voting for this amendment.

The Bailiff:

I have seen next Deputy Le Claire, Deputy Southern and then Deputy of St. John. I have received a note from the Deputy of St. John saying that he cannot be here tomorrow and was wondering whether he could move up the list. Do either Deputy Le Claire or Deputy Southern object?

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I am happy to give way.

The Bailiff:

That is very kind. Very well, the Deputy of St. John.

2.10.9 The Deputy of St. John:

Sorry, about this, Sir, but I have a funeral tomorrow morning after the Governor's retirement and therefore apologise in advance. All I want to say is when Planning are looking at the Ladies College, the old belfry, in fact, carries a large number of students' names that have been through the college over many generations, and I believe that should be retained within the building, some way or another, under the historical monuments side of things, and I hope that the Planning Department can take that on board. That is all I want to say on that.

2.10.10 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

It is an interesting turn of events. If one looks back on the Hansard about 3 or 4 hours ago, or even 3 or 4 days ago, I was saying to Members that the States of Jersey Development Company was having their first meeting on Monday... sorry, they were being formed on Monday and they were going to be meeting on Friday. In my view the Minister for Treasury had an overriding ability to direct the States of Jersey Development Company and what they are going to do. I just heard the Minister for Treasury stand up and say that he has directed them not to build offices on the Jersey College for Girls site. We already have that situation where the Minister for Treasury is able to direct the States of Jersey Development Company. That may or may not be a good thing. It may or may not be a bad thing, but one thing is for certain I have got to agree with Senator Ozouf and also Senator Cohen in the use of these sites where there is architectural merit in a mixed scheme to be developed. Senator Le Main says we have become... his words were: "We are becoming a bit of a joke with what we are doing with our property." It is no laughing matter. If you look at some of the state of disrepair that these buildings have been left to go into, absolute dereliction, that is why the people of Jersey have not got any faith in it, and that is why a lot of us have got trouble about delivering on States-owned sites. It might be a spark of hope that something has happened for once, because no business in their right mind would operate at the speed that the States of Jersey does. If we were in the hotel business we probably would just be digging the first spade at the Radisson Hotel and we would not have had a brick on top of another brick by now. We have got to get on with maximising the benefit of these assets for the public and house the population. To continue to sit back... we have got away from committee systems when they were wrestling among themselves about what they wanted to do with things. We are now in a position, good or bad, I did not say it was good or bad, I said it could be good, it could be bad, we have now got a situation where the Minister for Treasury can direct the States of Jersey Development Company to do whatever he thinks is right. We need to be aware of that because what we are hearing is, although we voted recently not to have phased development on the waterfront by the Deputy of St. John, we are going to have phased development on the waterfront because that is what we need. I agree with Senator Ozouf 100 per cent, we need to get office space in town. I also agree that we need to try and rationalise our office space because it is ridiculous. Some of these people in these offices are occupying places that could be used for housing. Old houses, poor places for working, we are bad employers really. So it is absolutely right what Senator Ozouf is saying, and he has been saying it for years. While it may be a good thing, while it may not be a good thing, I have got to completely agree with Senator Ozouf, it is time to get on. It is time to get on, and you know what, even if we mess up a little bit, maybe we make 10 per cent of what we do a mistake, at least we will be doing something instead of sitting there watching these sites getting used as target practice for kids with bow and arrows and rocks and catapults and things. I am sorry, the Deputy of St. Mary does not have my support for office use in this. I would like to also say when you look at what is available in town, and thinking outside of the box, we have got La Motte Street, which is used for the Youth Service, for the musical thing there. A huge car park at the back, which could be redeveloped with Social Security and they are going to replace into St. James and the back of the old school there. Springfield School: what are we doing with Springfield School long term? Are we going to look outside the box, maybe put down where the police are so that they are closer to Rouge Bouillon. We have a double catchment area of young facilities. Or possibly we can put it up at d'Hautrée. Are we thinking outside the box? We have got the police site, we have got the fire department site,

we have got the ambulance site, we have got Sacré Coeur, we have got Springfield, we have got d'Hautrée. We have got all these sites. We have got Broad Street Post Office, which goes right to the back of Commercial Street. We have got Hue Court, Cyril Le Marquand House, and all of these things have to be looked at a little bit creatively. That is why I supported the States of Jersey Development Company and people chastised me for doing it because I think that that kind of creative thinking is going to help us long term. Members have got to be aware of another thing that we need to recognise as well. If we have got a consolidated workforce then we do not need 3 human resources officers for 600 workers in 3 different buildings. We are all paying through our taxes for these people's employment. Where there is duplication or triplication, I am sorry, while I agree that we need to protect workers' jobs we do not need to protect duplication and triplication in this modern day. The ordinary people in Jersey, ordinary people outside of Government, do not want to pay any more taxes, so we need to get on and rationalise our property. Members are now aware of what the Minister for Treasury is able to do and capable to do. I am supporting what he is doing. I am supporting - although I would ask Scrutiny to bear in mind the phased development on the waterfront, I think that is a step-change that we had agreed not to do - but I would completely agree with him that there needs to be a rationalisation and 100 per cent agree with him that the Jersey College for Girls' site is absolutely totally the wrong place for offices and I am 100 per cent behind him on that. I am 100 per cent behind the Minister. They are giving us the reassurances they are going to deliver affordable housing on these States-owned sites. Right. Then let us see an application from the Minister for Planning to himself, or whoever is going to do it, for the States of Jersey Development Company to build housing in the scheme that the Minister has mentioned before the end of the year. If there is a scheme on the table that could be expanded a little bit then let us see it in this Assembly before the Minister leaves. Let us see the first States-owned site given planning permission before he departs.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

If the Deputy would give way; the application already has a consent.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

He moves faster than I gave him credit for. I would like to congratulate him and I propose the adjournment.

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

If the Deputy has finished may I just clarify something which he said in his speech, which is quite important. He suggested that I directed the States of Jersey Development Company not to build offices on the J.C.G. site. That is not correct. It was Property Holdings I said. There is a really important difference between the integrity of a States department and S.o.J.D.C., which is governed by the Regeneration Steering Group. So I do agree that J.C.G. can be developed by S.o.J.D.C. but after it has been transferred and been through the standard arrangements of the Regeneration Steering Group and transferred at value and all the rest of it. Sorry, but I just needed to clarify.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I am comforted and I withdraw that thing. I obviously misheard and apologise. Thank you.

The Bailiff:

It is now 5.00 p.m. and the Assembly had agreed to adjourn at that time. There are 3 further Members who have indicated they wish to speak on this amendment. Can I just mention 2 things before we do adjourn. The first one is would Members be kind enough to clear their desks because Members will remember that it is a ceremonial occasion tomorrow morning for His Excellency and so therefore if Members would be kind enough to clear their desks this evening. Secondly, I inform Members, as already indicated by the Minister for Treasury and Resources, that he has lodged a report entitled Land Transactions under Standing Order 168(3): Lime Grove House acquisition in principle.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Can I just make one comment about tomorrow? We have obviously got the special meeting first and then obviously we are carrying on at whatever time, I think it is about 11.00 a.m.

The Bailiff:

Yes, what I would suggest to Members is that the Assembly will sit again at 11.00 a.m.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

May I just note, Sir, if Members could consider if I could be défaut excusé tomorrow as I will be attending a funeral which starts, I think, 11.45 a.m. or 12.00 noon in Gorey.

The Bailiff:

Just to remind Members then. The Assembly will be sitting at 9.30 a.m. for the farewell to His Excellency. Then following that, Members will go out into the Royal Square to see His Excellency depart, and then it is suggested that the Assembly should reconvene at 11.00 a.m. to continue...

The Deputy of St. Martin:

Could I ask that we finish at lunchtime tomorrow, so we can do some work outside in the afternoon.

The Bailiff:

That is entirely in the hands of Members. Very well, the Assembly is adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

[17:01]