

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

MONDAY, 12th DECEMBER 2022

COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER	6
1.1 Welcome to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor.....	6
1.2 Tragic events	6
STATEMENTS ON A MATTER OF OFFICIAL RESPONSIBILITY.....	7
2. The Chief Minister will make a statement regarding the tragic incidents of Thursday 8th December and Saturday 10th December and the Island's response.....	7
2.1 Deputy K.L. Moore (The Chief Minister):	7
2.1.1 Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier:	8
2.1.2 Deputy L.J. Farnham:.....	9
2.1.3 Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South:	9
2.1.4 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:	10
2.1.5 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:	10
2.1.6 Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central:	11
2.1.7 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:	11
QUESTIONS	11
3. Written Questions.....	12
3.1 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Chief Minister regarding Consultants in relation to the new Hospital Project (WQ.305/2022)	12
3.2 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Treasury and resources regarding the total subsidy to Blue Islands (WQ.306/2022).....	12
3.3 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for the Environment regarding greenhouse sites (WQ.307/2022)	13
3.4 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Social Security regarding GP consultations under the Health Access Scheme (HAS) (WQ.302/2022)	13
3.5 Deputy B.B. de S.D.V.M. Porée of St. Helier South regarding the extension of discrimination legislation to include religious belief (WQ.309/2022)	15
3.6 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Chief Minister regarding the gender pay gap for each Government Department (WQ.310/2022).....	15
3.7 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Chair of the States Employment Board regarding bullying complaints (WQ.311/2022)	16
3.8 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding cancelled medical appointments (WQ.312/2022)	16

3.9 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade of the Minister for Social Security regarding Government strategies to communicate with the public who have no internet access (WQ.313/2022)	18
3.10 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade of the Minister for Home Affairs regarding anti-social behaviour and vandalism (WQ.314/2022)	19
3.11 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding areas for growth funding (WQ.315/2022)	20
3.12 Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South of the Minister for Communities and Housing regarding the Rent Control Tribunal (WQ.316/2022)	21
3.13 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade of the Minister for the Environment regarding public consultations on draft Supplementary Planning Guidance (WQ.317/2022)	22
3.14 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Social Security regarding G.P. services (WQ.318/2022)	24
3.15 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Social Security regarding overpayment of benefits (WQ.319/2022)	25
3.16 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Home Affairs regarding religious content of weddings and funerals (WQ.320/2022)	26
3.17 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central of the Chair of the States Employment Board regarding the Chair of the Independent Oversight Board (WQ.321/2022) ..	26
3.18 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Children and Education regarding staffing within the Island's schools (WQ.322/2022)	27
3.19 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding Springfield Stadium gym (WQ.323/2022)	28
3.20 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier Central of the Minister for External relations and Financial Services regarding Eu ruling on money laundering (WQ.324/2022)	29
3.21 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding tenants of Jersey Property Holdings (WQ.325/2022)	29
3.22 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North of the Minister for Home Affairs regarding the Emergency Services training (WQ.326/2022)	30
3.23 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North of the Minister for Home Affairs regarding Police Officers (WQ.327/2022)	32
3.24 Deputy M. Tadier of H.M. Attorney General regarding search warrants and compensation (WQ.328/2022)	32
3.25 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central of the Chief Minister regarding categories of Registration cards (WQ.329/2022)	33
3.26 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central of the Chief Minister regarding employment of individuals with Licensed status (WQ.330/2022)	34
4. Oral Questions.....	34
4.1 Deputy R.J. Ward of the Minister for Children and Education regarding Air Quality monitoring in schools (OQ.130/2022)	34
Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North (The Minister for Children and Education):.....	34
4.1.1 Deputy R.J. Ward:.....	34
4.2 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Chief Minister regarding the costs of overseas travel for the public sector (OQ.125/2022)	34
Deputy K.L. Moore (The Chief Minister):	35

4.3 Deputy S.Y. Mézec of the Chief Minister regarding Government action on growing inequality (OQ.136/2022)	35
Deputy K.L. Moore (The Chief Minister):	35
4.3.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	35
4.4 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding health and care services for an ageing population (OQ.132/2022)	36
Deputy K. Wilson of St. Clement (The Minister for Health and Social Services):.....	36
4.4.1 Deputy G.P. Southern:	36
4.4.2 Deputy R.J. Ward:	36
4.4.3 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	37
4.4.4 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	37
4.4.5 Deputy G.P. Southern:	37
4.5 Deputy L.J. Farnham of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding the Our Hospital Project (OQ.128/2022).....	37
Deputy T. Binet of St. Saviour (The Minister for Infrastructure):	37
4.5.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:.....	38
4.5.2 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	38
4.6 Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding the progress re the adoption of P.79/2020 (OQ.127/2022)	38
Deputy T. Binet (The Minister for Infrastructure):	38
4.6.1 Deputy R.S. Kovacs:	38
4.6.2 Deputy R.J. Ward:.....	38
4.6.3 Deputy R.J. Ward:.....	39
4.7 Deputy R.J. Ward of the Chair of the Comité des Connétables regarding the progress of P.79/2020 as amended by the Assembly (OQ.131/2022).....	39
The Connétable of St. Brelade (Chair, Comité des Connétables):	39
4.7.1 Deputy R.J. Ward:.....	39
4.8 Deputy L.J. Farnham of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding Northern Irish hospitals (OQ.129/2022)	40
Deputy T. Binet (The Minister for Infrastructure):	40
4.8.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:.....	40
4.8.2 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	41
4.8.3 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	41
4.8.4 Deputy L.J. Farnham:.....	41
4.9 Deputy G.P. Southern of the Minister for Social Security regarding funding for Primary Care (OQ.133/2022).....	41
Deputy E. Millar of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (The Minister for Social Security):	42
4.9.1 Deputy G.P. Southern:	42
4.9.2 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	42
4.9.3 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	43
4.9.4 Deputy G.P. Southern:	43

4.10 Deputy M.B. Andrews of the Chair of the States Employment Board regarding ... 43

Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John (Vice-Chair, States Employment Board -
rapporteur):..... 44
4.10.1 Deputy M.B. Andrews:..... 44
4.10.2 Deputy G.P. Southern:..... 44

5. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Minister for the Environment..... 44

5.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:..... 44
Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade (The Minister for the Environment): 44
5.1.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:..... 44
5.2 Deputy A. Curtis of St. Clement: 45
5.2.1 Deputy A. Curtis: 45
5.3 Deputy M.R. Scott: 45
5.3.1 Deputy M.R. Scott: 46
5.4 Deputy R.J. Ward:..... 46
5.4.1 Deputy R.J. Ward:..... 47
5.5 The Connétable of St. Brelade: 47
5.6 Deputy M.B. Andrews: 48

6. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Chief Minister..... 48

6.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec: 48
Deputy K.L. Moore (The Chief Minister): 48
6.2 Connétable D. Johnson of St. Mary: 49
6.3 Deputy M.R. Scott: 49
6.4 Deputy M.B. Andrews: 49
6.5 Deputy S.Y. Mézec: 49
6.5.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec: 50
6.6 Deputy M.R. Scott: 50
6.6.1 Deputy M.R. Scott: 50
6.7 Deputy S.Y. Mézec: 50
6.8 The Connétable of St. Brelade: 50
6.9 Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin: 51
6.10 Deputy S.Y. Mézec: 51
6.10.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec: 51
6.11 Deputy S.Y. Mézec: 52
6.11.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec: 52
6.12 Deputy S.Y. Mézec: 52
6.12.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec: 53
6.13 Deputy M.B. Andrews: 53
6.14 Deputy L.J. Farnham:..... 54
6.15 Deputy R.J. Ward:..... 54
6.15.1 Deputy R.J. Ward: 54

PUBLIC BUSINESS 57

7. Our Hospital Project: Reporting (P.109/2022) - as amended (P.109/2022

Amd.(2))..... 57

7.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:..... 59
7.1.1 Deputy T. Binet:..... 61

7.1.2 Deputy A. Howell:	63
7.1.3 Deputy B. Ward of St. Clement:	64
7.1.4 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	65
7.1.5 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:	67
7.1.6 Deputy I. Gardiner:	68
7.1.7 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:	69
7.1.8 Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf of St. Saviour:.....	71
7.1.9 Connétable R. Honeycombe of St. Ouen:	72
7.1.10 The Connétable of St. John:	72
7.1.11 Deputy K. Wilson:.....	74
7.1.12 Deputy M.R. Scott:.....	75
7.1.13 The Connétable of St. Helier:	75
ADJOURNMENT	76

[13.33]

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

COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER

The Bailiff:

1.1 Welcome to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor

I am sure Members will join me in welcoming His Excellency to the Chamber this afternoon.
[Approbation]

1.2 Tragic events

In the last week, our community has suffered 2 major shocks, which have left us, as I say, deeply shocked, moved and saddened. The Chief Minister will make a statement about these things shortly but I wanted to say that I know how deeply these events have been felt throughout the Island and how we all feel a desire to show our solidarity and support and, indeed, our sadness with those and for those who have lost their lives, their loved ones and their homes. There will, this week, on Wednesday evening, be the opportunity to do this. Usually, the Assembly stands in silence to honour current Members and past Members who have died but in these exceptional circumstances I would like to invite Members to join me in a minute's silence to show our respect to those who have lost their lives. **[Silence]** May they rest in peace.

[13:45]

Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

I wonder if I may, at this time, seek the leave of the Assembly to debate P.109 as the first item on the agenda? I ask that now so if the Assembly do agree to do it Members will have time to get speaking notes in order. I wonder if it is appropriate to do this at this stage?

Deputy K.L. Moore of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

If I may, the Government has responded to the request of the Deputy and informed all States Members that we are in agreement with his request.

The Bailiff:

It seems that if it is not likely to give rise to a significant debate it is appropriate to deal with that as a matter of practicality now. You propose that P.109 is dealt with as the first item of business after questions, et cetera?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I do, Sir, thank you.

The Bailiff:

Is that seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak? All those in favour kindly show. Those against? Very well, Deputy Farnham, we will deal with P.109 as the first item of public business.

Deputy K.L. Moore:

Before we move to oral questions, I would like to ask the Assembly to consider allowing me to make a statement about the tragic events of the past days. I thought it would be useful for Members if I was able to do that and enable them to ask questions so that they could then focus on oral questions and after that questions without notice as, I think you might understand, might be appropriate. But obviously that is a matter for the Assembly.

The Bailiff:

Obviously, you have had leave to put a statement and there will be questions that will follow. You would like it to be dealt with when precisely, Chief Minister?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

As the next item please; right now.

The Bailiff:

Right now, before we move on to oral questions? It is a matter entirely for the Assembly. Do you have the statement ready for circulation to Members?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

Yes, Sir, it was circulated this morning and we have recently checked with the Greffe.

The Bailiff:

It seems entirely reasonable. You perhaps are aware, Chief Minister, you will have a fair amount of time available for questions to be asked at various points of the morning because of the way circumstances have turned out. But there is no reason why the Assembly could not agree to take your statement now. That is proposed. Is that seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak? Those in favour kindly show. Those against? Very well, Chief Minister, please do allow your statement to be taken now.

STATEMENTS ON A MATTER OF OFFICIAL RESPONSIBILITY

2. The Chief Minister will make a statement regarding the tragic incidents of Thursday 8th December and Saturday 10th December and the Island's response

2.1 Deputy K.L. Moore (The Chief Minister):

Sir, as you said just a few moments ago, the past days have been some of the most difficult for our Island community in recent memory. We have witnessed 2 tragedies in the space of just 3 days; one at sea and one on land. I am sure that I speak on behalf of all Members in sending my heartfelt condolences to the families and friends of Michael Michieli, Larry Simyunn and Jervis Baligat who were on board the L'Ecume II fishing vessel that was involved in a collision and sank off the north-west coast of the Island early last Thursday morning. We also offer those same heartfelt sympathies to the families and friends of the 5 people who have been confirmed as having died in the explosion at Haut du Mont early on Saturday morning. Four people are still missing following that incident, and with the search now having moved from one of rescue to recovery, we must regrettably be prepared for more bad news in the coming hours and days. We also have a number of families who have been displaced and who are currently coming to terms with the shock of what has happened, having had to leave their homes in an emergency with only the clothes they were wearing. The immediate response of the Parish of St. Helier and Andium Homes to support those families was overwhelming and so greatly appreciated. The thoughts and prayers of every single person in the Island are with those affected by these horrific incidents. We will stand with them in support and solidarity, not just now, but in the coming days and months ahead. As Members will know, Jersey is a community of seafarers with so much of our history, culture and identity intrinsically linked to the fishing industry. We know that the sea can be dangerous, but nonetheless incidents such as the one we witnessed last Thursday are shocking, unforeseen and desperately sad. The fishing industry is itself close-knit, as was clearly demonstrated by the speed, nature and the extent of the rescue effort at sea. The authorities are working to survey and search the collision site, and importantly to recover the bodies of the 3 fishermen on board the vessel. As

independent investigation will piece together exactly what happened, and that picture will eventually become clear. While we wait for these processes to take their course, I know that our community will continue to support the families and friends of the captain and his 2 crew members in whichever ways are necessary. One tragic incident is enough to shake a small community. To have a second within a matter of days is not something we have ever experienced. The devastating explosion at Haut du Mont has shocked everyone in the Island and around the world. I am sure that Members will have seen the footage, which makes for painful viewing, and is unprecedented for Jersey in modern times. Put simply, most of us will never have seen anything like it. Alongside the ongoing recovery operation, a police investigation into the events that led to the explosion is underway. Again, that investigation will be independent at every stage, and will provide the facts of what happened for the families and their loved ones of everyone involved. In times of adversity and, in these cases, disaster, people are often shown at their very best. We would of course rather not have to deal with these events, but how we respond when they happen says a lot about our Island community. In Jersey's case, and in respect of both incidents, the Island's care, compassion and community spirit has shone through. It is a light in these dark times. I would like to place on record my thanks and appreciation to everyone who has been involved in, and supported, the response efforts following Thursday's and Saturday's events. We have been so fortunate to benefit from the skill, expertise and generosity of so many professionals, volunteers and individuals from across the public, private and charitable sectors both within and outside the Island. I want to particularly thank our neighbours in Brittany, Normandy, the other Channel Islands and the United Kingdom who have provided essential equipment and personnel. I have similarly received so many kind messages and offers of assistance and support, from within Jersey and further afield, which again shows the great will of everybody to do what they can to help. We now have the Bailiff's Island Appeal to provide a central focus for those who wish to make donations and help to support those involved in both tragic events. Our emergency services train and prepare for these unthinkable incidents, and Islanders can be proud of the professionalism that they have shown in responding, as they can be of all of our public servants. That response is, of course, ongoing and will very likely continue for the coming weeks. Events remembering the victims will also continue to take place this week, where we can come together as a community to reflect and show our respect, and I am particularly grateful to you, Sir, and the Dean for organising the vigil on Wednesday night. I know that the people of Jersey will continue to respond in the compassionate, respectful and close-knit way that we have seen in the past few days. We will stand together, we will get the answers to what happened, and we will honour the memory of those who have been so sadly lost in tragic circumstances. I am happy to answer Members' questions, being mindful, of course, of the ongoing investigations. I thank you, Sir, for allowing me to offer these words. **[Approbation]**

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much indeed, Chief Minister. There is now a period of 15 minutes within which Members can ask questions of the Chief Minister on any matters arising out of her statement.

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

I am very grateful to the Chief Minister for her statement and fully endorse her sympathy and concern, as well as her thanks to the professionals involved. I just wanted to ask her specifically if she agrees with me that one of the most important sources of voluntary response for these events, particularly the explosion on Saturday morning, has been the Island's Honorary Police services. **[Approbation]** know that not just officers from St. Helier but from other Parishes that are assisting in manning the cordon zone. **[Interruption]**

The Bailiff:

Could we find out who is gracing us with their voice? It has been done?

The Connétable of St. Helier:

I know that officers of St. Helier's Honorary Police, assisted by officers from other Parishes, have been doing point duty right through the last 2 nights in freezing conditions, and I hope that the Chief Minister will join with me in thanking them, in particular the chef de police of St. Helier, who has been co-ordinating all of this work for their work. Also, the members of the public who have been plying the Honorary Police with hot drinks and food throughout this period. [Approbation]

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I thank the Connétable for raising the prolific contributions of our Honorary Police force and I would join with him in thanking them for their efforts. The weather has been particularly inclement, particularly over the last night, and those Honorary Police personnel who welcomed me at the cordon this morning were cheerful and they are doing their bit in difficult conditions. We are all grateful to them. I was particularly pleased that the Constable spoke of the voluntary contributions of refreshments to the Honorary Police. We were quite keen to ensure last night that they were receiving food and refreshment over this period of watch because it is a long one. It was particularly impressive the speed with which all of our emergency services, including the Honorary Police, stepped up to sweep into action as soon as the tragic incident occurred on Saturday morning.

2.1.2 Deputy L.J. Farnham:

May I join the Chief Minister and Members in expressing utter shock and sadness at recent events and, indeed, take this opportunity to add my thanks to all of the emergency services and those involved in helping at this terrible and tragic time? As Islanders begin to come to terms with what has happened over the last week, Islanders are going to want to understand exactly how these tragedies have occurred. I wonder if the Chief Minister is in a position to update the Assembly as to when enquiries might begin so we can understand how these terrible incidents happened and what we can do to ensure they never happen again.

[14:00]

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I thank the Deputy for his question and his warm wishes, which of course I am sure are extended by all Members of the Assembly. As I mentioned in the statement, investigations have begun in relation to both matters. I believe yesterday, once another remote-operated vehicle was assessing the site at sea, and of course the findings of that assessment will be passed on to the relevant authorities who are investigating the circumstances of that incident, and on Saturday the chief of police made it very clear that an investigation had begun into the circumstances of the tragic incident at Haut du Mont. Of course, that matter is ongoing and it will take some time for evidence to be pieced together and for whatever may happen after that.

2.1.3 Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South:

Can I thank the Chief Minister for her words this afternoon and also for her time yesterday evening, as St. Helier South representatives joined her with the Chief of Police and others, to discuss what had happened there and what response there would be? The Chief Minister has mentioned both the victims and those who responded to these incidents - both the professionals and volunteers - could the Chief Minister give us her assurance that those who did respond and will have witnessed some pretty harrowing scenes upon attending these places will continue to

be supported and receive whatever support, be that mental health support or trauma support, in the weeks to come? Would she endeavour to update States Members on that, as it happens?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I thank the Deputy for his question and of course we will ensure that the well-being of all of those, both the families, the wider community, and particularly those who have responded to these tragic incidents, will be well-supported. As the Deputy will be aware, the Listening Lounge service has been extended in terms of the time so that it is available for members of the community. But there is specific and trained response to support those members of the emergency services who are at the scene.

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

Like others, I thank the Chief Minister for her statement and attending onsite to give support to the first responders down there. I would also endorse the comments made by the previous speaker in terms of the post-trauma support; not only to those first attenders but those down the line who are having to provide housing for those displaced, families of those who have lost their lives who will be deeply traumatised by all these matters. I, like I am sure a lot of us, feel completely impotent in these situations and I think we all wish we could do more and myself, and I am sure others, remain, as the Member for St. Helier emphasised earlier on, ready to give support as and when needed and requested.

The Bailiff:

Was there a question there?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

No, there was no question. I suppose the question could be: will the Chief Minister pass on her request to any States Member, should she so wish, requiring any further support from us?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I can reassure every Member that their thoughts and desire to support the members of our community are really felt by everyone. It is clear that all States Members and members of the public service are keen to do their bit and pull together. We certainly feel that and those wishes have been passed on to everybody that is involved in the operations. The Constable also mentioned those who have found homes for people who were displaced in St. Helier on Saturday morning. It must be said that Andium Homes, as our government-owned social housing provider, has been incredible. **[Approbation]** The team there have been incredible. They were there at the Town Hall ably supported by the Parish of St. Helier, immediately stepping up and providing compassionate support to their tenants and helping to find them not only a roof over their heads but, as I was told immediately as I arrived at the Town Hall, that every person had been promised a roof over their heads and a television with which to watch the football. That, I think, showed the sense of compassion and care with which those support services were being demonstrated. Of course there were other much more practical things that had to be done but I can really reassure every Member of this Assembly that their work is being well-represented throughout all of our organisations.

2.1.5 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:

Thank you, Chief Minister, for expressing the feelings that I believe are shared so much within this community regarding these 2 tragic incidents. It is good to know that support is being given and that investigations are being carried out. I just wonder, with respect to the tragic collision regarding L'Ecume II, whether she would be able to inform us at this stage who will be carrying out the independent investigation into that matter.

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I believe that there is a marine investigation team that is the professional service that provides that level of investigation.

2.1.6 Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central:

I would like to add my thanks to those of everyone else for the Chief Minister's statement and also to those that have been involved in helping and supporting with these tragic events over the past week. I have just had some communication from a constituent who is asking whether the Chief Minister can give us some more details around when the fund will be up and running. They have had a look and they cannot find anything at the moment.

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I thank the Deputy and her constituent for the question. The Bailiff has kindly agreed to set up the appeal fund. I believe that the usual requirements will be put in place but perhaps that takes a small matter of time. I know that members of our community really want to support in every way that they can, and that information will be shared with them as soon as it possibly can be.

The Bailiff:

It is not for me to interject, Chief Minister, but I am sure Members will understand if I say that it is intended that it is accessible on the Bailiff's Chamber government website from tomorrow. That is my belief. I am sorry for interrupting.

2.1.7 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:

It came from what the Chief Minister just said. I was stopped in the market just before and somebody who wanted to offer help, so many people have stopped to offer help. One of the things I want to offer is just the opportunity of a Christmas tree. The question is simply: will things like that be accepted for those who perhaps have not got that at the moment or may be facing a difficult time and, if so, I can certainly put you in touch with somebody who wanted to do that who offered so nicely earlier today.

Deputy K.L. Moore:

That is so kind. I know that it is hard for many people to know how to help. We have provided the COVID helpline, which has been slightly repurposed, so that people who particularly either want to find out about members of their family and friends that they are concerned about but also to express their support so we can centrally log that. That is a provision that is available, and I can never remember the telephone number but it is a matter of public record, the COVID helpline will assist members of the public with those enquiries. On the subject of Christmas trees, I am afraid that kind member of the community has already ... other people have been thinking along similar lines and last night I was with my Deputy, the Minister for Housing and Communities, delivering some Christmas trees to some of those people who have been displaced, which were kindly donated. I am sure though that there are plenty of people who will benefit from a little Christmas cheer because it is certainly a particularly difficult time of year for anybody to experience such circumstances. So, we are really grateful for the kind thought and I am sure I will find a good home for it.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member have any questions for the Chief Minister arising out of the statement? That brings questions to the Chief Minister on her statement to an end.

QUESTIONS

3. Written Questions

3.1 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Chief Minister regarding Consultants in relation to the new Hospital Project (WQ.305/2022)

Question

Will the Minister provide the aggregate amount spent on remuneration of Consultants in relation to the new Hospital project since 2012?

Answer

The Government of Jersey does not retain the depth of skills and capacity to deliver a large-scale project such as Our Hospital on a permanent basis. Indeed, would not be practical given the very small number of projects we deliver on such a scale. This means that under normal circumstances, professional services support would be required to deliver large-scale projects.

Previous Hospital schemes (2011 – 2018), spent approximately £25m on outside agencies.

The Our Hospital project, from inception in 2019, to current day, has spent approximately £43.5m related to design, professional fees and consultants.

This includes the following services:

- Health Planner and Clinical Design Team
- Project Management Office
- Cost Management Consultants
- Design Quality Assurance and NEC Supervisor
- Property and Planning Fees Consultants
- Design and Construction team fees
- Pre-Construction Services Agreement costs

3.2 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Treasury and resources regarding the total subsidy to Blue Islands (WQ.306/2022)

Question

Will the Minister provide an annual breakdown of the total subsidy, including loans, between the Government of Jersey and the airline Blue Islands from January 2018 to date?

Answer

As part of its response to Covid-19, the Government of Jersey provided a loan of £10 million to Blue Islands in 2020.

Alongside 4,100 other businesses Blue Islands received support under the Co-Funded Payroll Scheme while public health restrictions were impacting the economy. The Government provided subsidy payments to the airline during the life of that Scheme as follows:

- 2020 – £636,952
- 2021 – £519,019
- 2022 – £31,617

There was additional support provided to Blue Islands in 2020 and 2021 to enable essential air connectivity to and from the Island due to the impact of the pandemic. These arrangements are however governed by formal contracts, are commercially sensitive and do not amount to subsidies.

3.3 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for the Environment regarding greenhouse sites (WQ.307/2022)

Will the Minister –

- (a) advise how many existing greenhouse sites that are derelict or dilapidated had planning conditions attached at the time of application as to what should be done in the event that they fell into disuse and disrepair;
- (b) provide details of the conditions attached in each case; and
- (c) advise whether any of these conditions (or the general provisions in law for dilapidated buildings) have ever been enforced in relation to greenhouse sites; and if not, why not and if they have, when such enforcement occurred?”

Answer

- (a) I am unable to advise on how many greenhouse sites are either derelict or dilapidated, or how many applications for glasshouse sites have derelict or dilapidated planning conditions attached, as I do not hold that data, due to the way data is stored in the current planning database. The Regulation Directorate has a current IT system project in implementation and delivery phase which will change the way data is held to enable the extraction of information relevant to categorisation of the details of planning applications and subsequent conditions. The system change is targeted for completion by the end of 2023.

I can advise, however, that some existing glasshouses sites have a planning condition which requires their removal where they fall into disuse and disrepair. This does not, however, apply to all glasshouse structures, and any individual conditional planning permission will vary according to the individual circumstances of the development undertaken.

- (b) Although I am unable to extract from the planning database each case for greenhouse sites and their conditions, I can advise that a common standard wording for such cases used in the 1980s and 1990s is:

“Should the glasshouses fall into disuse or disrepair they shall be removed from the site and the land restored to agricultural use.”

- (c) All enforcement notices served since 2015 are provided on a [public register on gov.je](https://www.gov.je/public-register). I can advise that since 2015 there have been no enforcement notices served for a condition related to a planning permission for derelict or dilapidated glasshouses, or served under any land condition notice for dilapidated buildings.

3.4 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Social Security regarding GP consultations under the Health Access Scheme (HAS) (WQ.302/2022)

Question

Will the Minister advise how many GP consultations have been conducted under the Health Access Scheme (HAS), broken down by month, since its launch in January 2021?

Answer

The Health Access Scheme was launched on 11 December 2020. Under the scheme members of Income Support households and people in receipt of Pension Plus benefit receive General Practice services at reduced cost. A surgery consultation with a GP will cost scheme members £12 and £9 to see a nurse. Children of these households have surgery consultations free of charge.

The £12 GP consultation fee includes other common services such as

- blood test
- urine test
- pregnancy test
- referral letter
- ECG
- swabs
- spirometry (lung test)

Therefore, if a patient is asked to make a second appointment for any of these tests, they will not be charged a second fee.

The table below shows the number of consultations recorded with a general practitioner. It excludes consultations with a nurse or any other allied health care professional and excludes visits where a service (as listed above) was provided as part of the cost of the initial consultation.

Years	Consultation Date	Home	Remote	Surgery	Grand Total
2020	Dec	156	638	945	1739
2021	Jan	342	985	1922	3249
	Feb	271	716	2175	3162
	Mar	339	970	3227	4536
	Apr	260	702	2727	3689
	May	266	608	2805	3679
	Jun	278	670	3220	4168
	Jul	295	962	2813	4070
	Aug	286	999	2696	3981
	Sep	270	624	2895	3789
	Oct	307	684	3184	4175
	Nov	274	882	3227	4383
Dec	255	861	2571	3687	
2022	Jan	270	963	2597	3830
	Feb	259	800	2538	3597
	Mar	298	999	3187	4484

	Apr	236	679	2485	3400
	May	231	648	2810	3689
	Jun	177	660	2616	3453
	Jul	174	860	2181	3215
	Aug	173	652	2447	3272
	Sep	190	802	2470	3462
	Oct	182	809	2712	3703

3.5 Deputy B.B. de S.D.V.M. Porée of St. Helier South regarding the extension of discrimination legislation to include religious belief (WQ.309/2022)

Question

Will the Minister advise –

- (a) which members of the public she will seek views from regarding the extension of discrimination legislation to include religious belief, and whether she intend to engage with minority groups;
- (b) whether she has consulted with any minority groups, or disability and inclusion led organisations, to best identify how to produce accessible communications and guidance notes; and
- (c) what methods she, or the Department, will be using to ensure communications and guidance is accessible to all Islanders, for example, will the Minister be providing information in multiple languages or in braille?

Answer

My Ministerial Plan includes the following section:

Promoting the Disability Strategy and Social Inclusion and Diversity policies by:

- *continuing to implement the disability strategy on an ongoing basis.*
- *considering the accessibility of communications and guidance notes to ensure that government documents are fully accessible to people with a range of disabilities and are easy to understand in 2023.*
- *seeking the views of the public on extending discrimination legislation to include religious belief in 2023.*

The details of the project to seek “*the views of the public on extending discrimination legislation to include religious belief in 2023.*” have not yet been finalised. All of the considerations set out in the Deputy’s question will be taken into account during that project.

3.6 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Chief Minister regarding the gender pay gap for each Government Department (WQ.310/2022)

Question

Will the Chief Minister advise whether she is considering publishing gender pay gap reporting for each Government Department; and, if not, why not?

Answer

The States Employment Board will publish the gender pay gap for each department as part of the Annual Report of the States Employment Board.

3.7 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Chair of the States Employment Board regarding bullying complaints (WQ.311/2022)

Question

Will the Chair outline how many complaints in relation to bullying within the Government of Jersey have been received since 2017?"

Answer

There have been 126 complaints of bullying within the Government of Jersey since 2017:

2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022 (up to 29.11.22)
15	11	23	38	20	19

For completeness, there have also been 108 grievances within the Government of Jersey since 2017:

2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022 (up to 5.12.22)
8	20	11	7	36	26

The figures above relate to what has been formally recorded within the Government of Jersey's case management system.

3.8 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding cancelled medical appointments (WQ.312/2022)

Question

Will the Minister advise how many medical appointments for services offered by her Department have been cancelled in 2022?

Answer

The table below shows the Outpatient Clinic appointments cancelled or rescheduled each month between 1 January 2022 and 31 October 2022. The data are shown by the care group of the appointment and the reason the appointment was cancelled.

‘Other’ Care Group comprises Pre-assessment Clinic appointments (where a patient is contacted by a nurse prior to an inpatient or day case admission) and Phlebotomy appointments.

Notes:

1. “Medical appointments” has been interpreted as all General & Acute outpatient medical appointments. As such, the data presented includes Jersey General Hospital and Overdale Hospital activity as well as clinics in other locations, such as Le Bas or Springfield.
2. An appointment is counted as cancelled
 - a. when the Appointment Status in TrakCare (the electronic system that captures appointment slots) has been set to 'Cancelled' or
 - b. if the status has been set to 'Not Attended', this can be further categorised by reason, which can be
 - i. ‘Appointment cancelled by service’. Reasons include instances where clinics are cancelled and rebooked in an alternative location or time, which may be on the same day. It is currently not possible to report on these separately.
 - ii. ‘Appointment cancelled by patient’. Reasons include:
 - a. Appointment cancelled by or on behalf of the patient
 - b. Appointment no longer required
 - c. Appointment no longer required (Pat)
 - d. Appt cancellation informed by 3rd party
 - e. Appt cancelled by patient - awaiting patient contact
 - f. Away from Island/Education/Military/Travel
 - g. Earlier appointment requested
 - h. GP instructions
 - i. Later appointment requested
 - j. Leaving island
 - k. Patient transferred to private care
3. Transferred appointments, are **not** counted. A transferred appointment occurs when the patient will see a different clinician (to whom the appointment has been ‘transferred’), but the appointment date and time remains exactly the same.
4. When HCS or the patient cancel the appointment, a new appointment will be given at the next available slot in relation to the urgency of the patient’s referral.
5. HCS encourages all patients to inform the specialty service with as much notice as possible to ensure the slot can be re-allocated to someone else on the waiting list. If a patient requires a different date or time, they can find information on how to inform HCS in their appointment letter. Work is ongoing to ensure patients are given a new appointment slot with a letter being sent to the patient with the new detail.

3.9 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade of the Minister for Social Security regarding Government strategies to communicate with the public who have no internet access (WQ.313/2022)

Question

Given the existence of members of the public on a lower income who may not have access to the internet (and who may not be able to afford to purchase local newspapers), will the Minister provide information regarding any Government strategies that exist either to collect and access data on, or to make direct contact with, such members of the public in order that they are notified of, and assisted in applying for, any Government benefits such as the Community Cost Bonus to which they are entitled?

Answer

Government undertakes several initiatives that aim to make contact with the group of Islanders that the Deputy refers to in her question.

In terms of the Community Costs Bonus itself; Government has run an extensive media campaign to make sure we are maximising reach to those Islanders who could qualify for the annual payment. The proactive campaign has been running since September and has included: notices in parish magazines, radio adverts (over two separate periods), social media, JEP print adverts as well as digital adverts online and in the St. Helier bus station. We have also circulated leaflets through our Community Partners, as well as Churches and Schools.

More generally, initiatives such as Connect Me and Closer to Home are targeted more widely than online or local media. Events have been held across the Island and are promoted via weekly community newsletters (which includes all Parishes) and a wide range of local Charities. This network includes organisations such as the Salvation Army, Caritas, the Grace Trust and Age Concern.

Closer to Home brings together Charities and Government Departments to provide information and advice on a wide range of subjects, with the next event planned for the 8th December focussing on the cost of living and winter pressures. It is our intention to hold a number of Closer to Home events across Parishes during 2023.

Connect Me was established during the covid-19 pandemic and provides support and signposting for Islanders on a diverse range of matters. Since its inception, it has supported over 700 Islanders. Furthermore, Connect Me is a key part of the Covid Social Recovery work which has recently supported over 40 projects across the Island to enable Islanders to access sports, heritage, art and culture.

In addition to these initiatives, Jersey Library offers free internet access to all members, both via desk top computers and via a public Wi-Fi system. Free introductory computer skills lessons are also available, as is access (at-cost) to International Computer Driving Licence training. It is free to join the Library, and there are currently over 30,000 members.

The Library also provides access to copies of the Jersey Evening Post, together with other UK publications. Library members can also access the online Press Reader service, which gives free access to thousands of newspapers from across the world, including a translation option.

The Library Service works closely with colleagues across the Government of Jersey to ensure members of the public can access information about Government public information campaigns and initiatives, recent examples are the Assisted Dying consultation and the upcoming Cervical Screening Awareness campaign.

It is also useful to note that the Jersey Evening Post is available, free of charge, from the Salvation Army, Age Concern and Stuart Court Residential Home.

Finally, Customer and Local Services also send out regular mailings to pensioners explaining what benefits they can access, via a flyer that goes with the annual pension statement, this covers all of the benefits that can be accessed from Community Cost Bonus and Cold Weather Bonus, Income Support through to the Pension Plus scheme. CLS also send out targeted mailings to customers who may be entitled to additional benefits to those currently accessed, and in addition provide information at 'in person' events across the Island, either directly with customer groups or via support groups and Charities. CLS also have officers with the tools to process claim applications at these events, should customers wish.

3.10 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade of the Minister for Home Affairs regarding anti-social behaviour and vandalism (WQ.314/2022)

Question

Will the Minister explain what steps, if any, are being taken to address anti-social behaviour and vandalism in locations known in the Island for such behaviour (including Coronation Park, St. Brelade's Bay and Havre des Pas) and to ensure that any perpetrators below adult age are either adequately supported or appropriately disciplined with consideration for their age and social circumstances?

Answer

Individual incidents that are reported to the States of Jersey Police (SOJP) are triaged based on a threat/harm/risk assessment but typically responded to initially by SOJP response officers or Honorary colleagues.

The Community Policing Team (CPT) are responsible for identifying any patterns where repeat problems have arisen, or where we predict patterns may emerge based on previous trends or prevailing circumstances.

In these cases, the highest priority areas are managed using a Problem-Solving Plan where dedicated officers assess the problem, the people involved and the presiding circumstances and then work with a range of partners to reduce and remove the harm caused in that location. This includes close working with the relevant Honorary Police force for the area, who are key partners in addressing these issues.

There has been some success in all the locations referred to by the Deputy. In fact, when comparing 2022 to the same period last year (Jan – Sept incl) we have seen a 36% reduction in youth crime across the island, much of this reduction through problem solving initiatives.

Whilst not an exhaustive list, the Community Policing Team and their colleagues across the SOJP response teams have and continue to use the following tools / tactics:

- Dedicated foot patrols at key times (coordinated with Honorary Police patrols)
- Jersey Youth Service outreach and Jersey Sport interventions
- Local business leads being proactive to reduce alcohol accessibility
- Services such as Liberty bus, lifeguards and business owners flagging to Community Officers when groups first start to gather, to pre-empt antisocial behaviours
- Installation of Police CCTV, and upgrades of privately owned CCTV and lighting
- Target hardening advice provided to repeat victims of antisocial behaviour
- Social media campaigns promoting greater accountability by parents
- Proactive use of powers of alcohol confiscation under the Liquor (Restrictions on Consumption) (Jersey) Law

- Early liaison with the Law Officers Department to facilitate prosecution where appropriate ensuring it is at the right level (Parish Hall or Youth Court or Magistrates Court) -completed in partnership with other Government departments.
- Appropriate focus by School and Youth Focus (SaYF) Officers who work in all our Schools and attend Youth Clubs to discuss ASB - main aim being that of education and prevention

3.11 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding areas for growth funding (WQ.315/2022)

Question

In light of statements on pages 8 and 9 of the proposed Government Plan 2023-2026 that many of the areas identified for growth funding will require further investment in future years of the Plan, but that Ministers had “constrained this growth until it is clear how such additional investment would be affordable”, will the Minister –

- state what areas of Government were identified as requiring such additional funding and how much additional funding would be required in each area;
- explain the rationale for not prioritising each area; and
- detail the methodology used to prioritise the successful growth bids?

Answer

In the process to develop Government Plan 2023, as for any Government Plan process in the past, “bids” for growth by departments exceeded the funds available by a large quantum. The Council of Ministers were required to undergo a process of rigorous prioritisation to ensure that the final plan was both affordable, and deliverable. This included considering the recommendation of the Fiscal Policy Panel to avoid significant additional spending, and the impact of growth on the long-term financial sustainability of public finances.

Due to the timing of the election, the Council of Ministers were required to compile the Government Plan to a compressed timeline. Ministers reviewed Business Cases in their areas, and then presented to COM for a political discussion and prioritisation within the available financial envelope. To assist the process, COM had a structured discussion to:

- Eliminate bids not supported
- Select bids supported
- Prioritise remaining bids
- Adjust amounts where necessary to ensure affordability.

Through this process Council of Ministers prioritised key areas of government in the plan – with growth of £18 million for CYPES and £16 million for Health (over 55% of total growth). However, as referred to in the plan, we were required to take difficult decisions to balance our ambition for public services with what is affordable for the Island, and that the plans proposed were deliverable to avoid tying up resources that could not realistically be spent. We avoided committing to future spend without an identified funding source, highlighting our strategy in the plan:

“Whilst there may be a need for further investment in future years, these costs should be met through the simplification and rationalisation of existing government activities and any improvements in income forecasts. Departments will not be able to commit to additional expenditure until this is realised.”

Some of the original bids that were included also identified the potential need for further investment in future years, most notably CYPES in relation to inclusion and sufficiency. Work in 2023 in these areas will provide

further clarity regarding the demand in these areas (a further £15 million by 2026 having been estimated in the GP23 process).

As the Government Plan sets out, any further investment would be subject to the availability of funds through either improved income forecasts or increased delivery of savings.

3.12 Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South of the Minister for Communities and Housing regarding the Rent Control Tribunal (WQ.316/2022)

Question

In relation to the proposed Rent Control Tribunal, will the Minister –

- (a) explain what advice, if any, he has received, either from his officers or from H.M. Attorney General as to the kinds of tenancies that will fall under the remit of the proposed Tribunal which he is seeking to establish under P.106/2022; and, if he did not seek any such advice, will he explain why not;
- (b) state whether tenancies established since the Residential Tenancy (Jersey) Law 2011 came into force will fall under the remit of the Tribunal under the powers it has pursuant to the Dwelling Houses (Rent Control) (Jersey) Law 1946;
- (c) explain whether tenancies with Andium Homes will be subject to the jurisdiction of the Tribunal; and
- (d) explain how many tenancies he estimates will have recourse to be considered by the Tribunal pursuant to the terms of both the 2011 Law and the 1946 Law?

Answer

(a) I was appointed as Minister for Housing and Communities on 11 July 2022, and picked up several workstreams that were already underway, including re-establishing the Rent Control Tribunal (“the RCT”). The decision to re-establish the RCT was taken by predecessor last year (as published in the [Fair Rents Plan](#), 31 December 2021). Work to identify nominees to serve on the RCT started before the election and has continued since then.

I was advised by officers that the Dwelling-Houses (Rent Control) (Jersey) Law 1946, as currently constituted, prevents the Rent Control Tribunal from considering rents that are set in a written contract prescribed by Regulations made under Article 7 of the 1946 Law (“a Standard Tenancy Agreement”). The form of Standard Tenancy Agreement is set out at the Schedule to the Dwelling-Houses (Rent Control) (Standard Tenancy Agreement) (Jersey) Regulations 1993. There are some additional restrictions which are set out below.

In summary, the RCT can consider a lease:

- made verbally or in writing for any duration (ie including both less than and more than nine years in duration)
- that grants the right to occupy as a residence a house or part of a house in consideration of a rent (a “house” includes any property used for residential occupation, for example, flats);
- whether or not rent includes payment for use of furniture or for services and/or any common parts.

Article 2 of the 1946 Law sets out the following exceptions to the jurisdiction of the Rent Control Tribunal:

- Leases for dwelling accommodation let in conjunction with land exceeding two vergées in area

- Leases for dwelling accommodation forming part of premises used for commercial or industrial purposes and let in conjunction therewith
- Leases for dwelling accommodation let at a rent which includes payment in respect of board unless the value of the board to the lessee does not form a substantial proportion of the whole rent
- Written leases for less than nine years which use the Standard Tenancy Agreement
- Property that is leased by or to the States.

(b) Yes, as long as they sit within the criteria set out above.

(c) Andium is a separate legal entity to the States and so there is no additional restriction on the consideration by the Rent Control Tribunal of Andium leases subject to the criteria set out above.

(d) The 2011 law is not relevant to the powers of the RCT. There is no evidence available on the proportion of all residential leases that conform to the Standard Tenancy Agreement. 13,800 private sector tenants are identified in the 2021 Census.

3.13 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade of the Minister for the Environment regarding public consultations on draft Supplementary Planning Guidance (WQ.317/2022)

Question

Will the Minister explain –

- why the public consultations on the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance for [‘Housing Outside the built-up area’](#) and for [‘Density’](#) (both dated October 2022) were set for a 6-week period and how this relates to the requirements of Article 3 of the [Planning and Building \(Jersey\) Law 2002](#) for the period in which representations can be made by the public;
- how the proposed limits of 279 square metres (sq.m.) or 3,000 square feet (sq.ft.) gross internal floorspace within the first policy were decided upon;
- why implementation of Recommendation 3.6 of the [St. Brelade Character Appraisal](#) with respect to footprint and height of replacement homes in areas outlined within the [Baseline Report](#) was not proposed in those draft policies;
- what outcomes these policies are intended to achieve and how success is to be measured; and
- whether the public responses to the consultations will be published and whether the States Assembly’s approval of these policies will be sought?

Answer

- The Government of Jersey consultation code of practice states that significant public consultations should normally last for at least eight weeks. The adoption of supplementary planning guidance is not, however, considered to be a significant public consultation on the basis that it is supplementary to an established policy framework (the bridging Island Plan) which has already been through extensive public consultation and scrutiny. The six-week consultation period is thus considered to be proportionate to the matter under consideration, whilst also responding to the new government’s priority, as expressed in the 100 Day Plan, to introduce controls over the development of large homes.

Article 3 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 has no relevance to consultation on draft supplementary planning guidance. Article 3 specifies publicity requirements for a draft Island Plan.

Supplementary planning guidance is prepared and adopted under the auspices of Article 6 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002, where there is no specific legal requirement to undertake public consultation, nor any prescribed periods of time for any consultation to be undertaken.

(b) Both supplementary planning guidance notes seek to introduce a parameter to control the size of new homes developed in Jersey, both within and outside the built-up area.

A threshold of 3,000 sqft gross internal floorspace was identified in the Chief Minister's 100-Day Plan and, as set out in the draft guidance, is considered to be justifiable on the basis that:

- much of the island's current need is for smaller homes: Jersey's Future Housing Needs 2019-2021 report identified a potential shortfall of 2,750 one, two and three-bed dwellings (both flats and houses), together with a potential surplus of around 70 four- or more bed dwellings, over the report period;
- a dwelling of 279 sqm (or 3,000 sqft), is a substantial structure; over double the floor area of a standard four-bed dwelling¹. Such dwellings are likely to be marketed in the 'luxury homes' bracket with a substantial market value;
- housing in Jersey is expensive. The median price of four-bedroom houses sold in the first quarter of 2022 was £1,110,000. This compares with a median price of a 1-bed flat of £332,000 during the same quarter and £600,000 for a 2-bed house. The median weekly household income in 2019/2020 was £790 per week before housing costs which equates to an annual household income of just over £41,000. A four-bed home at the 2022 Q1 median would, therefore, represent 27 times the median annual 2019/2020 household income, well beyond the reach of most islanders;
- the 2021 census indicates that 44.1% of owner-occupied homes in the island were under-occupied where households had two or more bedrooms above the standard required relative to the number of people living in the house. This suggests that larger homes in the island are not being put to optimal or best use, and that better use might be made of the existing stock;
- larger dwellings within the countryside can also have a more significant adverse impact upon the distinctive character, quality, and sensitivity of the landscape, seascape or coastal unit in which they are sited. This impact can be experienced from wider afield as larger development is more likely to appear in longer vistas, especially when any new dwelling has been sited and orientated to maximise views; and
- to make the best use of valuable urban land there is a need to better manage the size of new homes, particularly large homes.

(c) The St. Brelade Character Appraisal formed part of the evidence base for the island plan review. Recommendation 3.6 of the appraisal was one of a number of recommendations focused on discrete areas of St Brelade and which related specifically to the control scale and design of replacement homes.

This recommendation, along with others, has already been considered and given expression, as appropriate, in the planning policy regime applicable to different parts of St Brelade's Bay including Policy NE3 –

¹ SPG Policy Note 6 'A minimum specification for new housing developments' (1996, updated 2009) set out minimum space standards for new dwellings. The minimum net floor area quoted for four-bed dwellings ranges from 88 - 109 sqm depending upon the number of storeys. This figure is similar to the minimum gross floor areas of four-bed dwellings of between 90 to 130 sqm specified in the UK Government's statutory guidance paper – Technical housing standards; nationally described space standard 2015. In these figures, the difference between net and gross floor areas is not considered to be significant.

Landscape and seascape character; Policy GD7 – Tall buildings; Policy GD8 – Green backdrop zone; and Policy GD9 – Skyline, views and vistas.

Further design guidance for the bay may be prepared as part of the development of the St Brelade's Bay improvement plan, which could include specific design parameters for different parts of the bay, and is a more appropriate planning tool by which to further consider these issues, if required.

- (d) The objectives of the proposed draft supplementary planning guidance are set out in each of the notes.

In summary, the interim policy H2A – Density of residential development in the built-up area, seeks to deliver a positive design-led approach for the provision of new homes in the island's built-up area to ensure optimum efficiency in the use of land, having regard to minimum standards of density for different parts of the built-up area; and to ensure that new homes are not delivered at a density which exceeds 350 dwellings per hectare. It also seeks to ensure the provision of information to ensure the sustainable management of residential development where it is in excess of 150 dwellings per hectare.

Interim Policy H9A – Large homes outside the built-up area, together with interim policy H2A – Density of residential development in the built-up area, seek to ensure that new homes do not exceed 279 sqm (3,000sqft) gross internal floor area.

The performance of these policies will be assessed relative to the proposed Island Plan performance framework. The draft guidance also sets out requirements to provide information that will be used to monitor various aspects of new residential development relative to these objectives.

- (e) Public responses to consultations are routinely published, together with the Minister's considered response to them, as a matter of course.

As stated above, supplementary planning guidance is prepared and adopted under the auspices of Article 6 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002, which empowers the Minister to publish guidelines and policies. States Members have been engaged and encouraged to offer comment about the draft guidance to which the Minister will have regard before adoption. Similarly, the Minister has directly consulted the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture, and the Minister for Housing and Communities, given the relevance of the guidance to their respective portfolios.

3.14 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Social Security regarding G.P. services (WQ.318/2022)

Question

Will the Minister advise what measures, if any, she has under consideration to ensure the maintenance, or improvement, of high-quality G.P services (such as same day appointments) given the financial difficulties faced by G.P practices in the Island; and will she further advise of any face-to-face meetings she has had with G.P representatives to address their concerns about delivering high standards in primary care?

Answer

The Minister has met with the Primary Care Board on one occasion since taking office, with a further meeting scheduled to take place this week.

General Practices in Jersey take part in the Jersey Quality Improvement Framework where, in 2022 over £2 million will be awarded to Practices for the achievement of standards. The measures in the Quality Improvement Framework were adopted following recommendations from a working group which comprised GPs and Officers. The working group has met to discuss quality improvement measures on 6 occasions during 2022.

The G.P. package of measures announced earlier in this year committed to expanding the Jersey Quality Improvement Framework, setting performance targets and increasing the funding package within this contract to £2.8 million by 2025 (see Ministerial Decision: General Practice Initiatives May 2022). This programme of work is also seeking to introduce 'Patient Voice' and discussions are taking place with the PCB and the JQIF working group on the best way to introduce patient voice into JQIF to improve focus on aspects of service which are important to islanders and patients.

3.15 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Social Security regarding overpayment of benefits (WQ.319/2022)

Question

Further to the recent publicity stating that "severe mental stress" was caused to a benefit recipient resulting from the pursuit of an overpayment of benefit made in error by her Department, will the Minister detail what measures she has taken, or intends to take, to eliminate such errors in future; and will she specifically advise to what extent overpayments are caused by staffing pressures in the delivery of Income Support awards?

Answer

All customers in receipt of Income Support are legally required to inform the department of any changes within their household which may affect their Income Support entitlement, at the earliest opportunity, to ensure their claim is paid at the correct rate.

Customers are informed of this when their Income Support claim is opened and receive ongoing notifications of this in letters sent from the department.

Anyone suffering from mental stress can be supported by a nominated person through an authority to disclose, this can be a person known to the claimant or an agent or advocate providing additional help.

The Income Support team can accept changes through a household member writing to, phoning or visiting the department, but we have also made it easy for customers to inform the department of changes in circumstances through simple online forms. Internal reports are also used to identify changes in earnings which have not been notified by the claimant, but these reports are retrospective and will only provide limited information on overall household income.

Income Support was supporting a high number of claims with an increase in unemployment caused by the pandemic, however, most changes to claims were actioned within 5 days during that time. The level of staffing in the department does not lead in itself to overpayments.

A claim is overpaid benefit when the information relating to a change in circumstances is not communicated to the department, which means a claimant then receives more money than they are entitled to. In these situations the department will seek to recover any overpayment caused by customers failing to inform the department of a change in circumstances.

3.16 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Home Affairs regarding religious content of weddings and funerals (WQ.320/2022)

Question

Will the Minister –

- (a) explain the reasons for any difference in approach to legislation regarding what is permitted in terms of religious content of weddings that take place at the Registry Office and funerals that take place at the Crematorium, given that both are ostensibly secular settings; and
- (b) explain why the Registry Office is not allowed to have religious icons, whereas the Crematorium has a permanent cross on the wall which can be covered up at the request of the organisers; whether she is considering regularising this current position and, if so, how?”

Answer

- a) Permitted religious content within a civil ceremony held at any location (including the Register Office) is prescribed by Article 17(8) and 17(9) of the Marriage & Civil Status (Jersey) Law 2001 and is limited in nature. Funeral services (including those held at the Crematorium) are not subject to legislation, including in terms of content.
- b) The Register Office is a ceremony space for the solemnisation of civil marriage ceremonies. As such, religious symbols have never been featured in the Register Office. The ceremony space at Jersey Crematorium is offered as a location for hire for the use of a funeral, memorial or committal service. It can be used as a secular space or as a faith space and a variety of faith symbols are available for use by request of next of kin.

3.17 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central of the Chair of the States Employment Board regarding the Chair of the Independent Oversight Board (WQ.321/2022)

Question

Following the appointment of a new Chair to the Independent Oversight Board, will the Minister advise –

- (a) what information the Chair was provided in respect of the remuneration of this position;
- (b) which Ministers participated in the final decision to appoint the new Chair; and
- (c) what input the States Employment Board provided into the process of appointing the Chair?

Answer

- a) The States Employment Board (“SEB”) was not provided with information in respect of the remuneration of this fixed term engagement. SEB were subsequently advised that the search and outreach to potential candidates was undertaken by a specialist executive search agency. The executive search agency provided all candidates the same information regarding the proposed terms of engagement and remuneration. The day rate for this fixed term engagement was market mapped as part of the recruitment and selection process against all candidates considered to have the skills and experience required for the position. SEB were also advised, following the appointment, that remuneration for this post would be provided by Treasury and Exchequer. SEB have noted that

Professor Mascie-Taylor will ordinarily work 2 days per week, which may be extended to 3 days a week by mutual agreement, and for a maximum of 48 weeks per year.

- b) The decision to engage the Chair was taken by Minister for Health and Social Services. Prior to making her decision, the Minister and the Deputy Chief Minister met the two potential candidates recommended by the appointment selection panel.
- c) The States Employment Board was not involved in the appointment of the Chair, as is often the case for appointments made by Ministers and sourced via pre-approved agencies. The process to engage Professor Mascie-Taylor was overseen by the Jersey Appointments Commission with the Chair of the Commission chairing the selection panel and overseeing the process. The SEB were duly informed after the appointment had been confirmed.

3.18 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Children and Education regarding staffing within the Island’s schools (WQ.322/2022)

Question

In relation to staffing within the Island’s schools, will the Minister state –

- (a) how many supply staff are currently employed who are based in the U.K. but living in Jersey to fulfil short-term contracts of employment as supply staff (i.e. who fly to Jersey each week, month or term specifically to provide supply cover); and
- (b) the monthly cost of this arrangement, including travel and accommodation expenses if applicable, with a breakdown of the different costs incurred?

Answer

(a) Out of roughly 900 teaching staff, there are currently fewer than five teachers employed via an agency.

These teachers have been recruited to begin work for two terms from January 2023, until July 2023. They will also provide 2-3 weeks’ teaching during December, during which time they will be accommodated in hotels.

We are currently organising residential accommodation for these staff from January 2023.

(b) Monthly figures below are estimated. Due to the low number of UK agency staff currently employed, we cannot provide individual details.

Contract	Salary up to *	Other employment or agency costs	Accommodation costs	UK relocation / other travel costs *
GoJ	£4,813	£1,250	£0.00	£700
Agency	£4,813	£500 to £1,000	£1,200 to £2,500	£200

- *This is based on the highest point on the teacher's salary scale*
- *Where teachers are staying in hotels, accommodation costs may reduce but flights costs may increase*

3.19 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding Springfield Stadium gym (WQ.323/2022)

Question

In relation to the work being carried out on the Springfield Stadium gym area, and further to reports of a delay, will the Minister advise –

- (a) the current estimated date for completion of the work;
- (b) the reason for any delay; and
- (c) whether there are any additional costs to be incurred as a result of delays and, if so, what they are and from which budget they will be met?

Answer

- A) Current estimated date for completion is unknown (currently estimated as end of Q1 2023). There is approval needed from Jersey Property Holdings (JPH) in respect of fire stopping proposals to the original building fabric (proposal received 28th November 2022). The approval from JPH is expected to be received week commencing 5th December 2022. Once these have been approved, a formal schedule of works will be issued with timescales set in place for the fire stopping works and completion of the refurbishment.
- B) The project has been delayed for several reasons
- At Pre-contract stage
 - i. Client changes (mitigated within update works programmes and tender)
 - ii. Delay to planning process (mitigated within update works programmes and tender)
 - Contract works
 - i. Client changes in specification (mitigated within latest programme)
 - ii. Fire Stopping works to existing structure (ongoing)
 - iii. Delay of materials to Jersey (mitigated within the latest programme)

It is worth noting that whilst it is not unusual for projects to experience client change or delays in materials the main project delay specifically to the Springfield development, is due to the lack of fire stopping and fire compartmentation between building areas, which is needed to be brought up to date in line with the latest fire safety legislation.

The fire stopping issue was first noted in May 2022 at which time the project team engaged with local fire stopping specialists (a specialist type in limited supply on Jersey) to survey the building, to establish areas of fault and subsequent resolution. Please note this survey does not cover all areas of the building but those parts immediately affected by the refurbishment works project and thus the remaining building is likely to incorporate the same risks (currently untreated).

Please note as these are original building defects the current design team will except no liability for the works undertaken and thus seek approval from the States of Jersey for the works proposed. Without completion of these works, further delay will be inevitable as without these works the refurbishment project cannot be completed.

- C) The existing project budget will incorporate the delay to the original refurbishment works as well as the fire stopping works that are necessary prior to the resumption of the refurbishment.

3.20 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier Central of the Minister for External relations and Financial Services regarding Eu ruling on money laundering (WQ.324/2022)

Question

Following the latest E.U. ruling on money laundering, is it the Minister's assessment that access should be guaranteed to the 6th E.U. Anti-Money Laundering Directive, including provisions that reconcile public access with privacy and security concerns?

Answer

On 22nd November 2022, the European Union Court of Justice (ECJ) ruled that the legal provision whereby information on the beneficial ownership of legal entities is accessible in all cases to any member of the general public is invalid.

The question of whether the Sixth E.U. Anti-Money Laundering (AML) Directive should seek to reconcile public access with concerns regarding privacy in the wake of the recent ECJ ruling is one for the European Union. It would not be appropriate to comment on matters regarding the creation of laws which do not have application in Jersey.

This judgement, which relates to the Fifth AML Directive (2018/843), is not directly applicable to Jersey, however this is a seminal judgement in the international development of public access to registers. As a result, Jersey carefully considering the detail of the EU Court of Justice's ruling as part of the ongoing development of the Island's policy on beneficial ownership. The Government of Jersey intends to publish a policy statement and action plan on this issue in the near future.

3.21 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding tenants of Jersey Property Holdings (WQ.325/2022)

Question

Will the Minister state the number of tenants of Jersey Property Holdings who have –

- (a) expired lease agreements, including the number of these who have been offered new leases of more than one year;
- (b) rolling 1-year lease agreements; and
- (c) lease agreements with less than 5 years remaining?

Answer

- A) C There are currently two expired lease agreements whereby the tenants are "Holding Over" and still in occupancy pending negotiation of new leases.

- B) None. A lease is generally for a fixed term, either a “paper lease” for 9 years or less, or a “contract lease” passed in the Royal Court for any term exceeding 9 years. However, there are currently 92 rolling-licence agreements with licence fee payments made to Jersey Property Holdings.
- C) At the current time there are 79 lease agreements, out of a total of 119 lease agreements with rental collected by Jersey Property Holdings, that are due to end within the next five years, ie before 29/11/2027.

3.22 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North of the Minister for Home Affairs regarding the Emergency Services training (WQ.326/2022)

Question

In relation to the Emergency Services, will the Minister advise –

- (a) how many officers are trained in Gold, Silver and Bronze Major Incident Command;
- (b) how many officers are trained in Gold, Silver and Bronze Command in relation to C.B.R.N. (Chemical Biological Radiological and Nuclear); and
- (c) the last occasion on which the Emergency Services trained together in relation to C.B.R.N.?

Answer

a) States of Jersey Fire and Rescue Service:

- 3 officers are trained in Strategic (Gold) Command;
- 7 officers are trained in Tactical (Silver) Command and;
- 24 officers are trained in Operational (Bronze Command).

Note: Fire and Rescue Service professional doctrine does not differentiate between incidents and 'major incidents'. Operating in a major incident context is a core part of training.

States of Jersey Ambulance Service:

- Strategic Commanders – 3
- Tactical Commanders – 5
- Operational Commanders – 5
- NILO/Tactical Advisor – 3

States of Jersey Police:

Aside from the Chief of Police who has a wide range of training and experience of Gold incident command in both the UK and Jersey, the SOJP has five other senior officers on their Gold standby rota. All five have experience of senior command in a variety of emergency and crime environments and one of the five has that experience from almost 30 years of policing in the UK.

Two of the remaining four have completed the MAGIC (Multi-Agency Gold Incident Commander) course in the UK and the other two are scheduled to complete the course in 2023.

The Silver rota in the SOJP is held / managed by the Five Duty Officers responsible for the five uniformed shifts. All have received a variety of JESIP (Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles) inputs and training and are familiar with the principles of such joint working, namely – Co-locate, Communicate, Co-ordinate, Joint Understanding of Risk and Shared Situational Awareness.

The five uniformed Inspectors are supported by the Community Policing Inspector and five Detective Inspectors all of whom have similar training and experience in the management of serious / major incidents and crime. All of the training delivered to these officers has been completed either through joint (other emergency services & partners) on-island inputs and exercising or indeed via on-line nationally accredited training packages. A full week of JESIP training was recently provided by local staff to a wide range of emergency service personnel / commanders in November.

All Sergeants in the SOJP (most likely to perform bronze roles in a major incident) are required to complete the annual nationally accredited on-line JESIP packages and many have attended the local JESIP training both recently and in the past. It is the intention of the Jersey Resilience Forum Training Sub-Group to maintain the annual training programme and a series of table-top and on the ground exercises.

Within the last month over fifty emergency services commanders and staff attended a two-day training and exercising event in respect to a marauding terrorist attack. The event used specialist input, training and exercising based on the JESIP principles and using the experience and recommendations from a wide variety of related incidents in other jurisdictions.

b) States of Jersey Fire and Rescue Service:

No officers have attended a specific CBRN command course at any level.

Note: HAZMAT (Hazardous Materials) response, including chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive, whatever the cause, is part of the core role for the Fire and Rescue Service and so all command training is applicable to some degree.

States of Jersey Ambulance Service:

Tactical CBRN Commanders – 3
Radiation Protection Supervisor - 1

States of Jersey Police:

No SOJP staff are currently accredited in the CBRN command roles.

That said, the organisation uses nationally agreed plans and actions cards and has over time developed mutual aid contact and support in a wide variety of related areas. Local expertise is also available through the Jersey Fire and Rescue Service and the Jersey Ambulance Service.

Of particular note, is the work currently being undertaken in conjunction with the Emergency Planning Department in respect to the National CBRN centre, the Technical Response Force and the capabilities and support that they would be able to offer in the event of such an incident.

- c) The last formal multiagency CBRN exercise was held in late October 2014, however, whilst the recent multi-agency training and exercise event was not specifically focussed on CBRN, various elements of the scenario and the multi-agency response to it were identical, focussing of course on joint working and the JESIP principles.

These elements of the exercise enabled a review of existing plans and reinforced relationships with a number of agencies in the UK that would be called to assist in the event of such an incident.

Ambulance National Incident Liaison Officer's (NILO's) regularly train with FRS HazMat Officers.

3.23 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North of the Minister for Home Affairs regarding Police Officers (WQ.327/2022)

Question

Will the Minister outline –

- (a) what the current number of States of Jersey Police Officers is, broken down by rank;
- (b) how many Police Officers have left in the last 6 months who were not of retirement age;
- (c) how many of those Police Officers were given an exit interview; and
- (d) when the States of Jersey Police will be recruiting and whether this will be in the Island?

Answer

- a) States of Jersey Police Officers broken down by rank;
 - Chief Officer x 1
 - Deputy Chief Officer x 1
 - Superintendent x 1
 - Chief Inspectors x 3
 - Inspectors x 12
 - Sergeants x 37
 - Constables x 145
- b) 10 Police Officers have left in the last 6 months who were not of retirement age.
- c) All officers have exit interviews with line managers. 8 of these officers also had a secondary exit interview with a member of the senior leadership team.
- d) The States of Jersey Police have recently run a recruitment process locally. 10 new officers have been selected to begin their training in January 2023.
The States of Jersey Police have also recently recruited 4 experienced Police Officers who are transferring from the UK in January.

3.24 Deputy M. Tadier of H.M. Attorney General regarding search warrants and compensation (WQ.328/2022)

Question

Will H.M. Attorney General state –

- (a) whether it is standard policy or usual practice for compensation to be issued in cases where a search warrant has been found to have been issued illegally;
- (b) whether any consideration has been given to a precedent being set from compensation being issued in this way for any future warrants that are found to have been issued illegally;
- (c) why, and at whose request, the amount of damages awarded in the recently reported ‘Abramovich’ case was kept secret; and
- (d) whether this case was brought as a civil claim or a Public Law case?

Answer

- a) It is understood that the Deputy’s questions relate to an agreed settlement (subject to a question concerning legal costs, which was not settled and remains outstanding) of judicial review proceedings concerning two search warrants that was reported in the media on 10 November 2022. The agreement to pay damages in that case was not a matter of standard policy or usual practice but was an agreed settlement between the parties on the particular facts of that case. It was agreed between the parties that the warrants obtained were unlawful and that the matter should be resolved without the need for a final court hearing on that issue. Whilst I am not aware of previous judicial review proceedings of this type in Jersey, they are more common in larger jurisdictions, such as England and Wales.
- b) The answer to a) is repeated. Agreements to settle of this sort do not set legal precedent and are not of general application outside the scope of the case being settled. There is published material and judgments concerning damages awarded in cases in England and Wales.
- c) Mr Abramovich was not a party to the judicial review proceedings, but a spokeswoman issued a statement on his behalf concerning the settlement. Whether and why any aspect of the settlement was agreed by the parties to be confidential was a matter for the parties, and it is often the case that details of a settlement are contained in a confidential schedule.
- d) The case was an application for judicial review and was therefore an aspect of public law.

3.25 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central of the Chief Minister regarding categories of Registration cards (WQ.329/2022)

Question

Will the Chief Minister advise how many individuals currently hold each category of registration card (Registered / Licensed / Entitled / Entitled for work)?

Answer

The most recent statistics on residential/employment status are found in the [results of the 2021 Census](#).

For information, these are reproduced below:

	Persons aged 16 or over on Census Day
Entitled	74,681
Licensed	2,106
Entitled for work	5,454
Registered	4,550

3.26 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central of the Chief Minister regarding employment of individuals with Licensed status (WQ.330/2022)

Question

Will the Chief Minister confirm how many current permissions have been granted to employ someone with Licensed status, broken down by public and private sector?

Answer

The most recent statistics on current permissions for licensed individuals are found in the [June 2022 Labour Market Report](#)

For information, these are reproduced below:

Sector	Number of jobs by residential status of current post holder, June 2022 - Licensed
Private	1,920
Public	780

4. Oral Questions

4.1 Deputy R.J. Ward of the Minister for Children and Education regarding Air Quality monitoring in schools (OQ.130/2022)

Again, this question comes from a constituent; just as a general question. Will the Minister advise what actions are currently undertaken to monitor air quality inside schools, including CO₂ monitoring?

Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North (The Minister for Children and Education):

Since the pandemic started 300 CO₂ monitors have been distributed to school to monitor air quality. This has allowed school leaders to assess whether further action is required to improve air quality across different areas of the school building. Detailed guidance has been provided to school leaders to explain how to effectively use these portable CO₂ monitors and what remedial actions can be taken should the devices record a high level of CO₂. This includes improving quality through improved ventilation or use of air filtration devices.

4.1.1 Deputy R.J. Ward:

How are we checking that they are being placed in the right place? The query came from a concern that one of the CO₂ monitors was not being put centrally within a school but perhaps into an office, for example. So just to check there is a double check going on that they are being used appropriately.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

I am happy to go to officers and double check a framework for checks but, from my understanding, from my conversation with the officers because during September, October heading towards the winter, possible cold and COVID, we did have extensive discussions about air filtration and air ventilation. I have been told the teachers in classes where it was put and also school leaders were trained and how to follow it up. Also I have asked officers - it has been done - all headteachers received an email on 12th October 2022 re-emphasising the guidance and also being asked to submit any request for extra air filtration units if they are required. We have 50 units on order now.

4.2 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Chief Minister regarding the costs of overseas travel for the public sector (OQ.125/2022)

Will the Chief Minister advise the aggregate cost to the Government of Jersey in 2021 across all Ministerial departments from civil servants or other public sector workers travelling overseas while fulfilling their duties?

Deputy K.L. Moore (The Chief Minister):

The total spend in 2021 was £414,506. This of course was a year that was much affected by COVID and so that total figure, which includes all flights and hotel accommodation that was paid for by the Government of Jersey in that year, was probably a smaller amount than one would see in a normal year.

4.3 Deputy S.Y. Mézec of the Chief Minister regarding Government action on growing inequality (OQ.136/2022)

Following the results of the latest Opinions and Lifestyle Survey from Statistics Jersey, which showed a growing number of Islanders reporting that they are “struggling to cope financially”, will the Chief Minister outline what action the Government will take to tackle the root causes of growing inequality?

Deputy K.L. Moore (The Chief Minister):

Thank you, Deputy, for the question. The survey results published last week indicate that 24 per cent of households identified themselves as finding it either very difficult or quite difficult to cope financially. Over the past 12 years responses to that question have varied from a slightly higher figure of 26 per cent in 2014 and a lower figure of 18 per cent in 2017. Although there is no specific trend over this period we can see that between a fifth to a quarter of those surveyed describe their situation in those categories. Last week also saw the publication of an analysis of indicators of material deprivation, which showed encouraging progress in the past decade.

[14:15]

Indicators associated with material deprivation decreased in important areas such as overcrowding, unemployment, lack of educational qualifications and unskilled work. That being said, my Government wants Jersey to be a place where everyone can thrive. We will continue to address these key areas to help to achieve a good quality of life for all Islanders. As Members will be aware, the first 2 of our common strategic priorities relate to housing and economy and skills in particular, and we have already put more money into people’s pockets by agreeing the package of measures that was agreed in our mini-Budget back in September. We have also increased the minimum wage. We are increasing the supply of affordable homes and the quality of private sector accommodation. We are developing a well-skilled workforce within a sustainable economic framework, supporting family friend policies and support for families in particular through early intervention. We are also investing in education and skills. These actions will help to further reduce material deprivation and tackle the root causes of inequality and help all Members of our community to thrive.

4.3.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

I slightly disagree with where the Chief Minister went towards the end of that. Raising the minimum wage clearly does address part of the root causes of growing inequality but not all the other ones she raised did do that, including increasing benefits, which is addressing the symptom rather than the cause of poverty. Could I provide the Chief Minister with a further opportunity to outline some other tangible actions which she will seek to take, which truly do address the root causes of growing inequality and not simply address the symptoms, which can well be a good thing to do in difficult times but in terms of the long-term desire to see reduction in inequality do not quite do it.

Deputy K.L. Moore:

Perhaps I was not clear enough in my response but I did talk about our commitment to improving education and skills, which are exactly areas that address those root causes by increasing the skillset

of members of our community and enhancing their opportunities to work and to thrive. Also, we are most certainly committed to investing in the early years in family friendly policies, and policies that help to break the cycles of deprivation by working with families, providing them with sustained support that enables them to enhance their way of life and to improve their own circumstances.

4.4 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding health and care services for an ageing population (OQ.132/2022)

Will the Minister undertake to provide Members with the questions to be asked as part of the consultation process about how the public would propose to pay for health and care services for an ageing, but healthy, population; and will she outline what measures she proposes to use to ensure that any solutions proposed by the public are based on an informed understanding and not random suggestions with unforeseen consequences?

Deputy K. Wilson of St. Clement (The Minister for Health and Social Services):

As Members will be aware, a survey that seeks to understand more of our Islanders' attitudes to healthcare funding will be distributed to 3,500 randomly selected households. The survey was to be distributed in October/November but I made the decision to delay until early next year on the basis of feedback provided by members of the public who participated in 2 independently-facilitated focus group sessions. They and the chief statistician suggested that we should avoid the pre-Christmas period. I am happy to provide the questions to Members of course and will do so before the survey is distributed. The survey is not proposing solutions to the public. It is asking questions about their attitudes to healthcare funding. The answers provided by the public will help us, as Government, to develop potential funding solutions for more in-depth consultation later in 2023.

4.4.1 Deputy G.P. Southern:

The question remains: how is she going to assure herself and us that the questions to be asked are relevant and go to the issues about health and care treatment on the Island?

Deputy K. Wilson:

The questions, many of which are included, are based on standard questions that are used by U.K. (United Kingdom) institutions to understand attitudes to healthcare funding. They have been reviewed by the chief statistician to ensure that they are open, understandable and non-biased. We have also welcomed the involvement of G.P.s (general practitioners) in that consultation on how the questions should be phrased. I think we also want to assure the Assembly that we have also contracted specialist health economists to support our work to develop these healthcare funding solutions. In addition to providing detailed financial models to help us better understand future expenditure and revenue requirements they are also undertaking extensive research of the funding model used in other jurisdictions to support us to make these informed decisions about how we go forward.

4.4.2 Deputy R.J. Ward:

May I ask the Minister in regards the random process of allocation and what process of random will be used? May I suggest whether the Minister would use the process of sortition, as it was stratified sampling, because when it takes a survey like this, it is really important we get a good view. I wonder if the Minister has considered taking that approach rather than just genuinely random, which may not be on a small population.

Deputy K. Wilson:

What I would like to do is, because I do not have the details of the sampling methodology today, I would be happy to share those with him.

4.4.3 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

The Minister referred to survey questions seeking to find out the attitude of people towards how to pay for health and care services. Does the Minister understand that somebody's attitude for how much they are prepared to pay will be largely dependent on how much disposable income they have to enable them to be able to pay? Would she ensure that however these responses are collated at the end, that they are presented in such a context that understands that people's levels of disposable income will have a direct impact on their attitude towards how much they pay and may not be considerate of how we, as a society, pay, bearing in mind lots of people cannot afford to pay more?

Deputy K. Wilson:

Yes, clearly those issues will be taken into account. The questions have also been informed by the feedback that we have received from the participants in the focus groups. I think when we have more clarity about the way in which the consultation process will unfold I will be able to address some of those issues for him.

4.4.4 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

I am aware of a previous survey that I believe was conducted by someone else, not her department, which reached a headline conclusion that the public were happy to pay for primary care because that is what the majority of responses they got said. But when you scratch beneath the surface you saw a direct link between those with more disposable income being happy and those without disposable income not be able ... whether they are happy or not, not be able to pay for those services. Will she confirm that in conducting this exercise they have learnt lessons from previous ones and will not repeat the mistake that has been done previously?

Deputy K. Wilson:

If I could just assure the Deputy that in circulating the questions before they are actually distributed it may well provide an opportunity to address those particular concerns that he has.

4.4.5 Deputy G.P. Southern:

Does the Minister agree with me that we must not lose sight in this process of services being free at the point of delivery, as they are in many places on the Island currently?

Deputy K. Wilson:

I think all of the issues that participants of people who have been involved in this conversation previously, as well as now, will be taken into account as part of the way in which we will develop our consultation going forward in 2023. It is clear that there are different opportunities, there are different options, there are different perspectives about the future healthcare funding model that we should develop going forward. As Members will know, there is already work underway to address the sustainable health funding model for the future. The issues which the Deputy has raised will be considered as part of that.

4.5 Deputy L.J. Farnham of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding the Our Hospital Project (OQ.128/2022)

Will the Minister advise how many States Members and officials participated in the visit to hospitals in Northern Ireland and the total length of their stay, as referenced in appendix 2 of *A Review of the Our Hospital Project*?

Deputy T. Binet of St. Saviour (The Minister for Infrastructure):

I was accompanied by 3 officials on the visit to Northern Ireland, which covered 3 nights and 3 working days. The delegation consisted of the acting project director, the associate managing director

for Health and Community Services, the medical director for Health and Community Services and me.

4.5.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Can I thank the Minister and say that is a very appropriate team to do this visit? Does the Minister agree that delivering good healthcare is not just about the fabric of a building? It is not just about how a hospital is built? Appendix 2 of the report, which relates to the visit to Northern Ireland, lists 18 good objectives for the visit. Some about the build and the hospital and layout but many objectives relate to how a delivery of a health service correlates with the design and build of a hospital. Would the Minister agree that that is important and essential in designing and developing any future healthcare model for Jersey?

Deputy T. Binet:

I am very happy to agree to both of those statements.

4.5.2 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Does the Minister consider the N.H.S. (National Health Service) in Northern Ireland to be in a state which Jersey should seek to emulate, and did the Minister give any consideration to visits to other jurisdictions which have more successful health services?

Deputy T. Binet:

I think it is fair to say that the review does not seek to emulate anybody's particular health service, and that certainly was not the purpose of going to Northern Ireland. The purpose of going to Northern Ireland was to see some relatively new facilities - 4 in total - all of which had been built in the last 10 years and all of which ... perhaps I am just a layman but they were certainly superb, as far as I could see. I think they quite impressed the remainder of our delegation who are people far more qualified to make comments on such matters.

4.6 Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding the progress re the adoption of P.79/2020 (OQ.127/2022)

Will the Minister outline what progress, if any, he has made in fulfilling green lanes and quiet lanes: priority to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders (P.79/2020), adopted (as amended) by the Assembly on 15th July 2020?

Deputy T. Binet (The Minister for Infrastructure):

Officers have brought forward legislative proposals to support the Comité des Connétables in their endeavours to progress P.79/2020. Officers from the operations and transport directive have met with a subcommittee of the comité to present and discuss the details. I am awaiting the conclusion of the comité's deliberations before acting further.

4.6.1 Deputy R.S. Kovacs:

Just from the infrastructure point of view, what progress is in plan for the next 6 months once the response is received?

Deputy T. Binet:

As I say, it is very difficult for me to make any further plans until I have heard back from the comité because I am sure the Deputy realises that minor roads and the lanes referred to are under the control of the Parishes and not the Infrastructure Department.

4.6.2 Deputy R.J. Ward:

Is the Minister aware that the proposition itself was to designate any lane, be it Parish or government or whatever department runs it, if he is aware of that situation?

Deputy T. Binet:

Apologies, but if I could ask the Deputy to clarify. I did not quite understand what the question related to.

[14:30]

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Basically, the designated lane can be any lane on the Island, as suggested in the proposition, so it does not have to just be a Parish lane. It can be under the Minister's remit - I believe that is the right word - and I just wondered whether the Minister was aware of that given his answer to the last question?

Deputy T. Binet:

Not specifically, I have to confess. But I would have thought that given the intention for quiet lanes to be quiet lanes that it would be very unlikely to refer to very many roads under the control of the Infrastructure Department.

4.6.3 Deputy R.J. Ward:

The proposition was about designated lanes. Could I ask the Minister to perhaps have a look at the proposition again because it was a very specific thing that it mentioned?

Deputy T. Binet:

Certainly, happy to do that.

4.7 Deputy R.J. Ward of the Chair of the Comité des Connétables regarding the progress of P.79/2020 as amended by the Assembly (OQ.131/2022)

Will the Chair advise what progress the comité has made in implementing Green Lanes and Quiet Lanes: Priority to Pedestrians, Cyclists and Horse Riders (P.79/2020) following the unanimous adoption of the amended proposition in 2020 by this Assembly?"

The Connétable of St. Brelade (Chair, Comité des Connétables):

I thank the Deputy for his question and the patience in not having pushed this further. I think he must feel he has been referred to the department of circumlocution, listening to the previous speaker, because we seem to have gotten nowhere. Notwithstanding that, I can say from the comité point of view, we are keen to progress this but it has to be in a practical manner that is policeable. One of the problems we have had in discussion with others is establishing what a watertight definition of essential travel might be. It is not straightforward. A lot of these lanes we mention may have few properties on and they are very simple to deal with, others might have hundreds on them, and that is a different story. I can assure the Deputy that the comité are pleased to progress this. I have got a timeline which I am happy to let him have but it is probably not appropriate to take the States time up with this at this point.

4.7.1 Deputy R.J. Ward:

Thank you for that wonderful word in the first answer, it does feel a little bit like that. Can I ask the chair of the comité whether perhaps they will have discussions with organisations like the Dutch Cycling Academy who really could give excellent advice on simple ways to designate even a beginning point of a few lanes to really make some difference so that we do not have to invest millions of pounds in infrastructure that quite frankly we already have. I would ask the chair whether he would take on board that and perhaps take that as one of the things that might be a driver behind these changes.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Yes, indeed we would.

4.8 Deputy L.J. Farnham of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding Northern Irish hospitals (OQ.129/2022)

Following *A Review of the Our Hospital Project* stating that a visit to Northern Ireland was “exceptionally valuable”, is the Minister aware that the Northern Ireland Healthcare Service is in crisis following years of underfunding and policy disfunction, including the suspension of unplanned surgery in some hospitals and, is it his assessment that Northern Ireland should continue to be used as an exemplar for Jersey’s future hospital and healthcare facilities?

Deputy T. Binet (The Minister for Infrastructure):

The objective of the visit to Northern Ireland was to view various modern hospital facilities constructed over the past 10 years. It was also to gather information about the relative merits and challenges of delivering different types of healthcare facilities and further insight into options for modern methods of construction. The delivery of the facilities visited have been recently overseen by the principal expert adviser to the Our Hospital review who was able to advise on the benefits and challenges. Neither the visit nor the review places any emphasis on the system of care in Northern Ireland. This was about facilities and learning what we can to deliver an appropriate project for Jersey.

4.8.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I thank the Minister for a very well-read technical answer provided by an officer. However, can I refer the Minister to his previous answer where he agreed with me that the delivery of healthcare in the region is intrinsically linked and associated to the design and delivery of a hospital. I am trying to match it up with his answer so they would just bear to see the fabrics of buildings which is not in accordance with the objectives in his review. In a recent review ... I am coming to the question very quickly ...

The Bailiff:

Well, no, if you could come to it pretty well straight away, Deputy, because it has been a while ...

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Enniskillen Hospital was recently ranked 120 out of 121 hospitals in the U.K. Can I ask the Minister why did he choose Northern Ireland over some of the best performing hospitals and healthcare systems in the U.K. for this review?

Deputy T. Binet:

Well firstly I am very happy to give the Deputy an unscripted answer, I do not have any problem with that at all. In terms of linking the 2, as I said, I agree entirely that a new hospital has to marry up with the healthcare services provided. I can state the position again. We went to Northern Ireland to look specifically at buildings, and I do not really see that that particularly relates to the healthcare services running within them because the quality of the buildings were excellent. We could have gone elsewhere but it seemed to make sense to go where the expert adviser had been responsible for delivering projects over a 10-year period.

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Will I be allowed a final supplementary?

The Bailiff:

It is not normal. Normally if there are no other questions intervening between the ... you have had one supplementary. The question has a final supplementary but only if there are other questions intervening. Do you have a question intervening?

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Yes, I do.

The Bailiff:

Well in which case just under the wire. 74

4.8.2 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Not intentionally coming to Deputy Farnham's rescue here but if it has that effect. The previous hospital project members I understand undertook a visit to hospitals, I believe, in parts of England and in France as well. Has he taken account of the work that was done in those previous iterations about different forms of hospital projects as delivered in those jurisdictions and included the evidence that was gathered from those visits to provide a more holistic approach in this report?

Deputy T. Binet:

Yes, I think it is fairly safe to say we have got a very skilled team that have been working on various iterations of the hospital for a long period of time and they have access to all of that information and draw on all of that when they do any work, to be honest with you, not just the review. So, all of that will be carried forward in any event.

4.8.3 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Would the Minister like to give his assessment of the differences and the specifics that were uncovered in the most recent exercise in Northern Ireland as compared to those previously done?

Deputy T. Binet:

No, that is not something that I could do because it is not something I have done. I have not personally overseen a comparison of those 2 elements, no.

4.8.4 Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I have here a dossier of approximately 100 pages of media clippings and other reports dating from December 2022 back as far as 2016 about the crisis in the healthcare service in Northern Ireland, and I will leave this in the Members' room should Members feel a desire to look at it at some time during the sitting. Will the Minister agree to look into the shortcomings of the Northern Irish health service and correlate that to any findings in his trip and the review has come up with to ensure that he is not taken off the right course by just looking at the fabric of a building and not how it can deliver services?

Deputy T. Binet:

I am still struggling to see the connection. We were not in Northern Ireland to look at the delivery of their actual health services. I am certainly happy to look at any evidence that the Deputy feels is relevant but, as I say for my part, I really cannot make the connection as strongly as Deputy Farnham can.

4.9 Deputy G.P. Southern of the Minister for Social Security regarding funding for Primary Care (OQ.133/2022)

Will the Minister inform Members what progress, if any, she has made in negotiations with primary care providers to establish sustainable funding for primary care and, if no progress has been made, when does she expect to have done so?

Deputy E. Millar of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (The Minister for Social Security):

I thank the Deputy for his question. Regrettably, it is not one I can really answer. The review of sustainable primary care funding is being conducted by the Minister for Health and Social Services over the course of the next year. While I am committed to working with the Minister in terms of developing the primary care strategy and a sustainable funding model, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on that review just at present.

4.9.1 Deputy G.P. Southern:

I am rather disappointed to hear the answer as given. Surely there must be the most together approach to this particular issue, one that relies on both departments to establish sustainable funding for primary care.

Deputy E. Millar:

I disagree. I think the review funding sits clearly with the Minister for Health and Social Services; she will be conducting that review. The Minister and I met with the primary care body last week. We hope to continue working with them closely, collaboratively and in partnership to develop our primary care services. There is a huge amount to talk about and that work is underway but I cannot comment on the review because I am not directly involved in it at this stage, but as soon as the review is ready and the Minister has some aspects to talk about, I will be very happy to discuss them with her.

4.9.2 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

If it is not appropriate to provide a clear answer to Deputy Southern at this point because of the ongoing review, why is it appropriate to continue to take a substantial amount of money out of the Health Insurance Fund for another purpose when that review has not concluded?

Deputy E. Millar:

I think that is something that is going to be debated over the course of the coming week.

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Without having to waste a supplementary, would the Minister aim to answer my question which was for her position?

The Bailiff:

Yes, the fact that it may be debated subsequently is not an answer to the question. Minister, if you could hazard your answer.

Deputy E. Millar:

I believe that, as amended by the Council of Ministers, all the monies that we propose to remove from the H.I.F. (Health Insurance Fund) for 2023 are going directly towards primary care services and services that are directly for the benefit of patients. Withdrawing that funding will mean that some of those services will also have to be withdrawn. We have this year, just to add on to what is happening from the Social Security Department, my predecessor and the primary care body announced this year investment of £9 million into primary care. This investment provides direct financial support for the employment of nurses, paramedics, pharmacists and healthcare assistants. This is aimed to allow practices to develop their provision of services and ensure that patients receive the right care at the right time in the right place and from the right person. For example, Islanders can go and see a nurse for routine monitoring rather than a G.P., which both preserves G.P.s' time and also be a cost-efficient service for the patient. The £9 million includes a wage support scheme, which will help practices with the cost of employing healthcare professionals such as nurses, paramedics and healthcare assistants. A budget of £1 million is available in 2022 and a further £2

million will be available in 2023. This funding will be phased out in 2024 and 2025 as new ways of delivering care in funding are rolled out in conjunction between the Health Department and the primary care body.

The Bailiff:

Are you able to bring your answer to a close? Normally one minute 30 seconds is what is roughly ... if you have one last sentence, that is fine.

Deputy E. Millar:

I had a little more but that is the flavour of the £9 million investment.

4.9.3 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Interesting but not an answer to my question. I also do not agree that it is true that services would not be able to be provided if money did not come from the H.I.F. for it. That can be provided by another means if we choose to; we can choose to budget these things how we like. Would the Minister indicate whether she believes the negotiations, which Deputy Southern refers to in his question, will be easier or more difficult to conduct if money has been taken out of the H.I.F. for another purpose?

[14:45]

Deputy E. Millar:

I believe that what matters to G.P.s is that they are paid for the provision of their services. I do not think the G.P.s themselves will be particularly concerned whether the money comes from the H.I.F. or the general reserve, but we must accept that there are a number of other pressures that we need funding from the general reserve to meet. Having discussed with the Minister for Health and Social Services, I do believe that if the money does not come from the H.I.F. then services will have to be withdrawn.

4.9.4 Deputy G.P. Southern:

I find it rather shocking to find that a Minister for Social Security denies having total responsibility for the funding of primary care because she does surely. Does she not agree?

Deputy E. Millar:

I am surprised by the Deputy's shock because I do not believe I denied any responsibility for funding. The responsibility clearly sits with me at the moment. What I do find odd is that the Minister for Social Security has any responsibility for provision of primary care, which very clearly in my opinion sits with the Minister for Health and Social Services. That is an entirely sensible way forward, that is what I will be working with the Minister for Health and Social Services over next year and the year after to ensure we have both an adequate primary care strategy which meets the needs of patients, the practices and there is funding available. We will be working very closely with the Minister for Health and Social Services to achieve that.

4.10 Deputy M.B. Andrews of the Chair of the States Employment Board regarding ...

Will the Chair explain what premiums, if any, are paid to staff in Health and Community Services who are filling vacancies on a short-term basis during 2022?

Deputy K.L. Moore (Chair, States Employment Board):

If the Deputy is content, the Vice-Chair, the Constable of St. John would like to answer the question.

The Bailiff:

Yes, if the Deputy does not mind?

Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John (Vice-Chair, States Employment Board - rapporteur):

H.C.S. (Health and Community Services) has 2 approaches to filling vacancies on a short-term basis, both of these being used during 2022. They either use external, interim or locum workers or offers acting-up opportunities to existing staff within the organisation. For interim roles, no specific premiums are paid to individuals other than the agreed day rate, which is higher than that of the permanent rate to offset lack of paid annual leave. The acting-up roles offer the difference between their substantive role and the role that they are filling at the time.

4.10.1 Deputy M.B. Andrews:

Would there be any quantitative data that could be made available to me in private about this?

The Connétable of St. John:

We can try and find that. I can tell the Deputy, for example, that H.C.S. have spent £8 million on zero hours bank staff up until the end of October, but I am happy to share details with him if he asks a specific question.

4.10.2 Deputy G.P. Southern:

I think I may have heard the answer in his previous answer but what information is shared with Health and Community Services of the use of the bank nurses?

The Connétable of St. John:

I am not quite sure, Deputy. The information that we get at S.E.B. (States Employment Board) comes from H.C.S. in terms of what they have used, so it is H.C.S. that tell us how many hours they have used.

5. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Minister for the Environment

The Bailiff:

Very well, that brings questions with notice to an end. We now move to questions without notice. Unfortunately, the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture is unwell and therefore the 45 minutes for questions will be allocated 15 minutes as to the Minister for the Environment and I am afraid the remaining 30 minutes - and I say "I am afraid" from the Chief Minister's point of view - to the Chief Minister. So, the first question period is for the Minister for the Environment. Does any Member have a question for the Minister for the Environment?

5.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Recently the Minister shared his intentions with Members to limit the size of private dwellings. Does he intend - albeit though I believe he has the power to do this by order perhaps - to come to the Assembly with a proposition on this?

Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade (The Minister for the Environment):

I presume the Deputy is referring to the recent consultation we held on several items of supplementary planning guidance. It is under the terms of the Planning Law that I will bring further supplementary planning guidance on this matter. The aim of that consultation was to discuss how we might restrict the development of very large buildings where there may be the potential to develop a number of smaller units which would be of use to families to the Island. It will be my intention, following assessment of the consultation exercise, to bring that supplementary planning guidance into action.

5.1.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Just to be clear, does he intend ... because I think this is quite an important issue when we start encroaching on to what citizens can and cannot do with their own properties and limit the sizes of houses. I am not saying that I agree or disagree but I think it is probably an area important enough

to be worthy of debate by this Assembly. Could he just clarify whether he is going to bring it to the Assembly or not?

Deputy J. Renouf:

No, I do not intend to bring it to the Assembly. I think it is worth pointing out that this was an item mentioned in the 100-day action plan of the Government. There has been plenty of opportunity for Members, and indeed the public, to respond to that intent and indeed there has been response to that. It is also the case that there is within that guidance, even in the published guidance on which we consulted, there was considerable care in the phrasing of it to allow for exceptional circumstances. It is not a blanket ban and is not intended to be a blanket ban. It is intended to set a direction of travel and to place further policy guidance in front of planning officers and the Planning Committee when they come to make decisions. So I do not believe it is necessary to bring it to the Assembly as a separate proposition.

5.2 Deputy A. Curtis of St. Clement:

Does the Minister believe that planning permission for applications should only be granted if they contain sufficient information required by the relevant policies of the bridging Island Plan to allow an informed, fair, transparent and consistent determination?

Deputy J. Renouf:

I think it would be very hard for a Minister for the Environment to argue against that outline or, put another way, let us not have full and frank disclosure of information. I think that would be a totally untenable proposition, so in principle of course I support what the Deputy has to say. I am suspecting there may be a supplemental coming which will try and extract some more information from me; I do not know.

5.2.1 Deputy A. Curtis:

Given this then, will the Minister ask the department to ensure that applications seeking to convert commercial sites to residential for which a redundancy test applies includes sufficient evidence of marketing in line with existing policies and the supplementary planning guidance?

Deputy J. Renouf:

I think the Deputy has made a good point in that we need to ensure that where this is policy guidance on information that needs to be provided in order for officers to make a determination and in order for the public to see that fairness has been clearly evidenced, that that sort of information should be forthcoming for decision-makers and indeed in the public forum. I am happy to commit to remind officers of that need as soon as this sitting is over.

5.3 Deputy M.R. Scott:

Following up on Deputy Farnham's question, does the Minister accept that most of the proposals in the 100-day plan were indeed debated by the Assembly and that the government website suggests that if there is going to be a consultation that should generally be ... a significant conversation should be 8 weeks whereas the one that was brought into place for the expensive houses and density was limited to 6 weeks. That contrasts with the 12 weeks that is provided generally for consultation along with the opportunity for the States Assembly to debate changes of planning policy that is currently provided under law, so that this decision to bring in policies without the States Assembly's approval may be regarded as undemocratic.

Deputy J. Renouf:

I would take issue with some of the Deputy's comments. The 8-week requirement sits around the Island Plan itself; the 8-week consultation period. This is supplementary planning guidance and supplementary planning guidance can only work in the same direction of travel as existing policies.

In other words, it cannot invent new policy directions, it has to be supplementary to existing policy directions, so in that sense a 6-week period feels appropriate. It may interest the Deputy to know that we received several - I think 2 but there may have been more - comments from people who said they could not meet the deadline and we told them that we would accept comments when they were able to within the next 2 weeks, I think. So I believe that anybody who is wanting to have a consultation on this issue has had a very good chance to do so.

5.3.1 Deputy M.R. Scott:

Does the Minister accept that this is not normal supplementary planning guidance which generally is guidance rather than policies with numbers which amend the Island Plan, which bring in further content into the Island Plan and therefore should be distinguished from supplementary planning guidance and that it is appropriate for the States Assembly, given their import, to approve their content?

Deputy J. Renouf:

No, as I have said already and explained in my earlier answer for the reasons I gave earlier, I do not accept that. I think this works clearly in the direction of the existing Island Plan and I am content with the answer I gave earlier on that.

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

May I ask for some guidance from the Chair on a matter of a process, and that is if a Member does not agree with the Minister and wishes to call for a debate, rather than just lodging a proposition, what are the options? I am not sure if that question could be answered quickly but I thought I would raise it.

The Bailiff:

Well I am not sure I fully understand the question, Deputy. The question is: what are the circumstances in which a Member can procure a debate on a particular issue before the Assembly?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Well, as I understand it, the Minister is going to use his powers under the relevant law to make a decision that I think is quite far-reaching and could affect many Islanders. I think that is a decision which is perhaps worthy of debate and ultimate approval by this Assembly. I am wondering what, other than lodge a proposition, I am trying to work out the timing from when the Minister's desire might become embedded in law as a decision. Is there a way a Member can either call that in or intervene with the process to force a debate other than lodging a proposition?

The Bailiff:

Well thank you for the question, Deputy Farnham. Obviously, I do not want to interrupt question time as we go along at the moment but I will give that some thought.

5.4 Deputy R.J. Ward:

It was last week or the week before that the U.S. (United States) House of Representatives Committee found that some of the world's largest oil and gas companies have internally dismissed the need to swiftly move to renewable energy and cut planet heating emissions despite publicly portraying themselves as concerned about the climate crisis. May I ask the Minister, does he feel that continued investment in these companies supports this contradictory approach by these large companies?

Deputy J. Renouf:

This seems a good debating point. I am not sure it has a huge amount of relevance since I do not control any funds that would be invested in any of these companies. I would say this, that, as I tried to explain in the previous debate that we had on this matter, the question of how a transition is going

to be funded away from fossil fuels is a complicated one in practice. We know that the fossil fuel companies have extraordinary financial resources and extraordinary technical abilities. We would, I am sure, all like those resources to be deployed in the services of a clean energy transition. I find it hard to know what policies we could pursue in Jersey that would enable the encouragement of investment into a particular part of the investment portfolio of a fossil fuel company when they are investing in green technologies as opposed to the bits when they are not.

[15:00]

5.4.1 Deputy R.J. Ward:

Further, the chair of the House Oversight Committee said that documents obtained from companies, including Exxon, Shell, BP and Chevron, showed that the fossil fuel industry has no real plans to clean up its act and is barrelling ahead with plans to pump more dirty fuels for decades to come. Indeed, the committee accused the oil firms of a long-running greenwashing campaign. May I ask the Minister, is it not the fact that by not showing the willingness to say that, we should not be investing and showing the approach that we can invest in one area to get another? We are being shown again and again from studies that that is not the case and should we not be thinking again about that attitude?

Deputy J. Renouf:

I presume I am being asked for a personal opinion here. I would prefer not to see any further investment in major fossil fuel infrastructure. As I pointed out in the debate, it is very difficult to draw those lines. We may need to invest in fossil fuel infrastructure in Jersey in order to smooth the transition. We still are dependent on aspects of fossil fuel infrastructure; does that count as a fossil fuel investment? It is very hard to draw those lines. I agree with those who say that investment in major scale exploration of new fossil fuel resources is incompatible with our intention to get a swift transition but the matter of how you deliver that, and in particular how I would play a role in delivering that, I find much harder to discern.

5.5 The Connétable of St. Brelade:

The Minister has a considerable, I would say, mileage of country footpaths to administer. Would he tell Members whether he has sufficient resource within his department to be able to manage those footpaths given we are trying to get people to use them more, not only with their legs, but also with their bicycles?

Deputy J. Renouf:

I thank the Connétable for the question. It is particularly opportune that we are answering that and answering that question at the same time as we are going to be talking about the Government Plan because I am very pleased that during the discussions around the Government Plan, I was able to secure some additional funding for the Natural Environment team. That should enable us to continue funding people who had previously been funded under the Climate Emergency Fund to continue working in the Natural Environment team on precisely those kind of activities. They will also be able to be employed in other countryside management activities. So from the top of my head, I cannot remember the figures that this involves but I am pleased that we were able to secure those additional resources. They are not huge in the great scheme of things by Government Plan standards but they nevertheless make a big difference; a little money goes a long way in terms of countryside management. It is also worth saying that a lot of that work involves working with volunteer groups in the Parishes and other social and environmental groups who want guidance in order to see how they can help with that kind of countryside management and path management and I think that work will be able to continue.

Deputy M.R. Scott:

It is a question to you. It is clear that Deputy Farnham and I would like to bring a proposition to have a ...

The Bailiff:

I am sorry, Deputy, if this is ...

Deputy M.R. Scott:

Sorry, this question is under Article 18 of the Standing Orders 26(6), I am asking whether it is possible for Deputy Farnham and I to bring a proposition that the States Assembly should have a proposition ...

The Bailiff:

Well, Deputy Scott, as I have already indicated, I will answer that question but I do not propose to do it during the course of question time because at the end of the day this question time has a time limit required on it. Thank you very much. Yes, Deputy Andrews, probably time for one more question.

5.6 Deputy M.B. Andrews:

Does the Minister believe that companies in Jersey should be reporting on green finance investments as an overall percentage of investments for their companies?

Deputy J. Renouf:

I would be interested in further clarification on what he means by companies in Jersey. Does he mean a full range of companies including finance companies, for example, operating in Jersey? Okay, I take that nod to mean yes. So I think this is work that is ongoing which involves consultations between Deputy Jeune and the Minister for External Relations and Financial Services in terms of the way in which it applies to finance, which I think is where the biggest impact that we could have in this area would occur. I think those are discussions which are ongoing. I have delegated responsibilities for those areas to Deputy Jeune and I am willing to get back to him and give him a more full answer either as a written or oral question answered in the future but I do not have any more information than that at the moment.

6. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Chief Minister

The Bailiff:

That brings the time available for questions to this Minister to an end. The remaining time within this period is for questions that can be directed to the Chief Minister. Does any Member have a question for the Chief Minister?

6.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

The Chief Minister's Minister for the Environment has stated his intention to bring back regulations to implement a licensing scheme similar to iterations that have been before this Assembly previously. Could the Chief Minister confirm whether she has the unanimous support of the Council of Ministers in the Council of Ministers bringing that proposition?

Deputy K.L. Moore (The Chief Minister):

Certainly, the Minister for the Environment has my support and has the support of the majority of the Council of Ministers. I am afraid that at this point I cannot recall exactly what the makeup was but certainly there was overwhelming support across the Council of Ministers for the Deputy and the Minister in bringing forward this proposition.

6.2 Connétable D. Johnson of St. Mary:

In the absence of my being able to ask the question of the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture, can the Chief Minister elaborate or clarify why or the circumstances whereby this morning's incoming flight from Heathrow was unable to discharge its passengers for a full half hour on account of the fact that the steps were not available due apparently to some breakdown in communication between B.A. (British Airways) and the company providing that service?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I thank the Constable for his question. While I have no knowledge of the specific circumstances that the Deputy has outlined, I am aware that there were some significant delays last night in flights leaving the Island. My understanding is that this may be due to some changes, operational changes at the airport that have taken place very recently. That of course is a matter for Ports and I am sure that the Minister will be cited on these. If not, I will request him to take up this matter of maintaining the high standards of service levels Islanders rightly expect as the airport progresses into the future.

6.3 Deputy M.R. Scott:

I would just like to ask the Chief Minister if she is supportive of the Minister for the Environment bringing in interim policies H2A and H9A without the consent or prior approval of the States Assembly?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I do believe that the writing of supplementary planning guidance is simply that. The Minister for the Environment has my full confidence in his approach to despatching his duties.

6.4 Deputy M.B. Andrews:

Is the Chief Minister of the belief that there needs to be structural reorganisation of the civil service and public sector workforce?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

The civil service has for the past 5 years experienced a period of considerable uncertainty due to structural changes that have been driven. Our Government is very aware of that and does not wish to cause any further stress to our workforce. However, we do wish to ensure that we deliver value for money and that is where our focus will be moving forward. We want to ensure that we have a skilled workforce. We particularly have a relentless focus upon recruitment and retention and that is particularly within our critical key workers, meaning health workers and education where we have what seems to be a recruitment crisis. We are much focused on solving the issues causing those recruitment issues and also delivering value for money for Islanders.

6.5 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Does the Chief Minister regard the Cabinet Office which she has created to be aligned with that that was outlined in the vision proposed by the P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee) subcommittee in the last term when they concluded that their functioning of Government would benefit from having a Cabinet Office?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

In all honesty, I can understand why the Deputy might be asking this question. I can only say partially, and the Deputy and I have discussed this both in public and in private also, the world is not perfect and I think that what we are delivering is a major step forward. But there may be some aspects that might consider some further work in the future but at the moment with what we have, I think we are making a positive step and progress.

6.5.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

I thank the Chief Minister for what was a very fair and accurate answer, I think. Could she therefore explain to us when she referenced the future at the end of her answer how soon that future may be that we can expect improvements in the design of the Cabinet Office so that it can function as it is intended to to deliver on Government political priorities?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

We are still working on that delivery and I cannot commit exactly to a timeframe at this moment but I am mindful of the Deputy's comments. I look forward to discussing that with him in the future and benefiting from his wisdom and the work of the former subcommittee.

6.6 Deputy M.R. Scott:

Coming back to the Lifestyle and Opinions Survey, which included a report on the trust in Jersey institutions, there were 2 institutions in which trust had reduced that I noticed which is Statistics Jersey and the police. I wondered whether the Chief Minister had any thoughts on what might be the reason for that and whether that will be looked into.

Deputy K.L. Moore:

In the main, that particular section of the Jersey Opinion and Lifestyle Survey was quite positive and it was good to see. The Deputy is quite right in highlighting of course there are always areas where we need to work further and it is a particular sadness that the States of Jersey Police and Statistics Jersey may have been viewed in that respect back in June and July of last year. I am sure that all people working for those areas of government, which are important areas, and areas where their independence is particularly important, will continue to build the confidence and work with the public of the Island so that that measure can be seen in a different light next year.

6.6.1 Deputy M.R. Scott:

In the case of Statistics Jersey, does the Chief Minister consider that the reduction in trust, given that Statistics Jersey scored pretty highly in the past, may have anything to do with a perceived compromise of the independence of the chief statistician after the merger of his role with director of analytics for S.P.P.P. (Strategic Policy, Performance and Population), our government department?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

The Deputy has of course much greater knowledge in this specific area than I do, but my only understanding of Statistics Jersey is it has the utmost independence and it is allowed to operate with that independence, and all Members of the Government and indeed the public service respect that.

6.7 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

With regards to the tragic incidents which occurred on Thursday morning out at sea, is the Chief Minister able to confirm at this point which body she believes will be responsible for carrying out any sort of investigation into it?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

An investigation has begun with the relevant marine authorities.

[15:15]

6.8 The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Would the Chief Minister agree that the Marine Accident Investigation Board is the correct body to undergo that investigation?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I thank the Constable for his assistance.

The Bailiff:

Yes? Was the answer yes?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I would agree with him.

6.9 Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin:

Can I ask the Chief Minister if she thinks Islanders are paying too much money to visit the doctor?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

We have recently identified, in the Government Plan in fact, that there is work to be done, particularly for certain sections of the community to ensure that there is greater ease and financial support for members of our community, particularly for children, so that they can receive primary care.

Deputy S.G. Luce:

Can I take that as yes then?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

Yes.

6.10 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Could the Chief Minister outline what form of consultation takes place with the representatives within the municipal government in the Parish of St. Helier when the Government decides to announce policies which will clearly have a big impact on St. Helier such as changes in plans to a hospital proposal or where a school may or may not be built?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

Well, we have recently set up the Future Places Ministerial group of which the Constable of St. Helier is a member. This group is mostly focused on taking a strategic approach in terms of land use, and I think that is the appropriate forum with which we should discuss such matters internally. Therefore, the Constable of St. Helier as the leader of that Parish is a part of the group.

6.10.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Therefore, can we take it as a given then that before the Council of Ministers goes ahead and lodges proposals like that, which is an amendment to the Government Plan on a school site in St. Helier or other amendments and propositions that get brought to the Assembly on, for example, places where the hospital may be located, that the Constable of St. Helier as the representative of the municipal government in the Parish of St. Helier is directly consulted?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

If we could focus particularly on the siting of the school, I do recall that that was a decision of the previous Assembly who supported an amendment brought by Deputy Rob Ward to locate that school on Gas Place. The Constable has been consulted with regards the views of the Future Places panel and their desire to deliver a school to meet the urgent needs that our education facilities have. We certainly want to deliver a better environment within which our young can learn and enjoy their formative years and also deliver community facilities at the heart of our town-dwelling public and population. The Constable was fully cited on this decision and, as part of those discussions, he is also aware of our desire to increase green spaces and to compensate for that by proposing to turn the current site of the Springfield School into a park in the future and also to look at other sites, such as

the current Le Bas Centre to create additional green space in and around town and also to link all of those with green pathways around town and through to St. Saviour.

6.11 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

I can do this all day. To correct the Chief Minister whose understanding of the States decision in the bridging Island Plan was inaccurate. The States determined that the gas works site could be available for use for a new school if no other appropriate sites were made available. It did not decide in principle that this would be definitely to go ahead. Can we therefore gather from the fact that the Constable of St. Helier has lodged an amendment to that amendment to the Government Plan stating that nothing should happen until a masterplan for that area is in place, as a sign that whatever consultation process she does use to engage with the Constable of St. Helier that it evidently is not good enough?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

Thank you for reminding me of the finer elements of that debate. If that was the case, then I stand by the Deputy's memory. However, it is our view that the Gas Place site is the most appropriate site. If I could draw the Deputy's attention to the Northern Quarter, which I believe he or some of his party members have suggested might be preferable in their view as a site for education, it is simply not the case because part of that site, the Northern Quarter, has already been purchased by Andium and plans are underway to begin its development. The other part of the site is in private hands. We want to focus on delivery. It is critical that we do deliver better education premises for our young and particularly within the town setting, and so that is why we are committed to this progress alongside the creation of additional green space around town.

6.11.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

The argument the Chief Minister has used about the Northern Quarter site could surely just as easily be used about the old hotel sites on Kensington Place; the argument is exactly the same there. But the Chief Minister did not really answer my previous question which was that given that there is an amendment that has been proposed by the Constable of St. Helier to the Government Plan saying that this should not go ahead until a masterplan for the area is in place, does the Chief Minister regard that as a sign that her consultation process with the Constable of the capital of this Island, and the most densely populated part of this Island is not adequate?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

Clearly there is a difference of opinion but it is our view, the Future Place panel, that this is the way forward. We have spent as an Assembly, not so much this one because we are so new, but the previous one has spent a lot of time looking at various iterations of ideas and not delivering. This Assembly wishes to deliver, and certainly this Government wishes to deliver and to improve the lives particularly of town dwellers. We feel it is particularly important to deliver green spaces within and around town rather than on the outskirts of the Parish that are a considerable walk away, probably a drive to the border with Trinity.

6.12 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Could the Chief Minister confirm for us the membership of that Future Places body, how many of the members who sit on it are directly electorally accountable to people who live in St. Helier? Would she further comment on if that body is reaching conclusions which are at odds with the democratically elected representatives of St. Helier, whether residents of St. Helier can have faith in it as a representative body to make decisions that are line with what we want?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

So, I think there are at least 3 representatives of St. Helier: the Minister for Children and Education, the Minister for Housing and Communities, as well as the Constable of St. Helier. So I do feel that

the residents of St. Helier are well catered for and they are most certainly at the forefront of our thoughts when taking such decisions that relate to the built environment within which they live. We could particularly point to former Jersey Opinion and Lifestyle Surveys that have indicated issues about residents of St. Helier and their feelings towards the environment within which they live. That is where our desire comes from to deliver, not only better education facilities for their children, but also a nicer environment within which they can live.

6.12.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

The Chief Minister did not indicate who else sits on that panel and whether those representatives of St. Helier make up a majority on it but what is clear from the members she did list is that two-thirds of them were elected on the basis of wanting to see an extension of the Millennium Park on to the Gas Works site. So how can the Chief Minister expect residents in St. Helier who live in that area to have confidence that when they go out to vote that their voices will be heard because it sounds like at this point they are not.

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I am not going to start listing the membership of every panel; I think it might stretch my memory at this point of the day, I am afraid to admit. But what we have focused on is that this will be a community facility that will offer green space outside of school hours to local residents. It will also offer an active travel route around the site. We are very focused on doing that because with the greatest intentions, even if the Millennium Park were extended, and we understand the desire to do that, it will still not be a size and scale equivalent to large parks that we may see in great cities around the world. So, we have approached this in a sort of best endeavours way and also focused it on being able to offer access and active travel routes that people might run and walk and cycle in and around that green space to other green spaces and on to St. Saviour where there is a particularly large population and beyond into the wider countryside of the Island. I think that that will be a good thing for the residents of St. Helier to enjoy.

6.13 Deputy M.B. Andrews:

Does the Chief Minister believe that government redistribution needs to be alleviated in relation to transfer payments that are made to Islanders?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I am sorry, but I am not quite sure what transfer payments the Deputy is referring to.

Deputy M.B. Andrews:

Welfare payments.

The Bailiff:

Could you say that again, please?

Deputy M.B. Andrews:

Essentially what I am asking for is for the Chief Minister to provide her opinion on government redistribution. So, in essence, we are speaking about welfare payments that are made to Islanders, so households; does she believe there needs to be a mechanism in place to try and alleviate the extent of government redistribution?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I am not entirely sure what the Deputy is driving at, and forgive me if I am being obtuse. But what I would like to say is that of course this Assembly supported our approach in the mini-Budget and that approach did distribute money to Islanders in different household groups in order to put more money in their pockets at this difficult time. We did that through the income support system, we did that

through the community bonus, which is extended to those who do not have a sufficient income to pay income tax and also, thank you to an amendment from Deputy Feltham, to extend that group which pays a small amount of income tax. We have also recently agreed to increase the value of benefits and housing components to meet the rising cost of living. So, I think we are approaching all of those pieces of work, along with increasing the minimum wage to show our commitment to ensuring that everybody has the best opportunities and to improve their quality of life.

6.14 Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Will the Minister explain that since the formation of the new Government how the morale is in the civil service and whether she is satisfied and working well with the new chief executive and her team?

Deputy K.L. Moore:

Well, we I think have a very strong civil service who are totally motivated by doing the right thing and serving their community, and I have been really impressed by their approach. We know that there still exists pockets, particularly in healthcare, where culture and morale is an issue, and it is one that we wish to address and we are doing so by delivering, ensuring that we improve recruitment and retention and also housing opportunities for people who work in those critical services. I am very grateful to the chief executive for her unstinting hard work through every single week that we have worked together.

6.15 Deputy R.J. Ward:

Last week on Friday, I was pleased to attend with a few Members from across this Assembly, training offered called cultural humility training, and I found it both challenging, interesting, informative and it certainly made me look at the way I addressed the world. Unfortunately, only 15 Members of the Assembly attended this opportunity. Can I ask the Chief Minister whether she would commit to making this training available again into the future and to really encourage Members to attend, particularly Ministers and Assistant Ministers from across Government who did not attend and Members from across this Assembly, as it is a great way of opening our minds to the diversity that we have on this Island.

[15:30]

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I thank the Deputy for the question because I had heard about this training programme and I was quite disappointed I had not been able to find space in my diary to attend. I would really encourage Members to attend future sessions. One Deputy to my left has just informed me that unfortunately one session was cancelled but I believe another date is being provided by P.P.C. because this was an initiative that was brought forward by that committee.

6.15.1 Deputy R.J. Ward:

I believe that 2 sessions were cancelled because there were no Members. But would the Chief Minister agree that these types of things really have to be encouraged and time needs to be made for Members so that they can address issues which perhaps they are not aware of? I certainly was not aware of some of the things that I encountered.

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I would entirely agree with the Deputy. It is always good to open our minds and to think about what other people think about the world and to try and put ourselves in their shoes, which I think is the description that the Deputy was giving.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member have a question for the Chief Minister? If no other Member has a question, then question time is over for the Chief Minister and question time in general is now concluded. I have been asked to give a ruling about the ability of Members, other than bringing a separate proposition, to call matters in or something of that nature. It seems to me that this is not something that I need to rule upon for the purposes of the business of the Assembly during the course of this sitting. I propose therefore that that kind of confirmation should be provided directly through the Greffe in the normal way that Members consult in terms of what their procedural options are. If it is necessary for me to make a ruling at that point then I will.

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

Could I ask for a ruling on another matter, please? Given that this was not a previously scheduled Assembly date, I personally have had some issues with childcare, partly because my child's other parent is part of the efforts at the Pier Road incident. I am wondering if the hybrid sitting, that of course is available to those who have COVID, could that be available to those who have issues with childcare this afternoon, please? It would enable me to still use my vote and I would not be disenfranchised because of caring responsibilities.

The Bailiff:

I have confirmed with the Deputy Greffier that my memory is correct. I think the way that the Standing Orders have been changed, whether that is desirable or not, permits individuals, for whatever compelling reason, to deal with the matter remotely if they are within the Island. There is no reason why that cannot, I think, be done in your case, Deputy. The answer is, I think, yes, that is a possibility.

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

Thank you, Sir.

The Bailiff:

We have now reached the end of questions and the Assembly had previously decided that at the end of questions we would adjourn and start again on public business tomorrow morning. Whether that is still the will of the Assembly I will test in a moment. But it may be sensible as there is one preliminary matter to deal with, which is the decision as to whether to reduce the minimum lodging period for the Minister for Social Security ...

Deputy E. Millar:

Sir, I think that request should have been withdrawn.

The Bailiff:

It has been withdrawn, has it?

Deputy E. Millar:

I believe so, Sir. Is that for the Social Security Regulations? I think the Social Security (Amendment of Law No. 17) and the Draft Health Insurance Fund, those were both pushed into January, so I am not proposing ...

The Bailiff:

Well in which case you do not need the Assembly's agreement to take them.

Deputy E. Millar:

No, Sir.

The Bailiff:

In which case it is a matter for the Assembly whether we adjourn now or whether we begin to deal with Deputy Farnham's proposition.

Deputy K.L. Moore:

Sir, may I propose that we continue with the sitting, please?

The Bailiff:

That is the proposition, is that seconded? **[Seconded]** I am going to assume because no one is standing, does anyone wish to speak on that?

Deputy R.J. Ward:

No, Sir, it was a separate thing I wanted to get in before that. It was when the deadline was for comments on the Government Plan, just to be sure when that deadline was because I am unsure about a couple of things.

The Bailiff:

I will have to ask, I am afraid, with the Greffier. I have not been monitoring the deadlines.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Sir, I can help, I think it was 12.00 p.m. on Thursday, midday on Thursday but I am getting a nod, so I assume it is the case. Thank you, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Unless the Greffier is going to shake his head at me and not you. Yes, it was 12.00 p.m. on Thursday. Thank you, Greffier. Do Members agree that we should stay until the usual conclusion time at 5.30 p.m.? I am going to assume that we have taken that on a standing vote and that is what we are going to do.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

May I raise an issue then? I want to raise a huge concern that I have had that there are, therefore, 8 comments papers that were submitted late for this debate on the Government Plan. Every single thing I have submitted recently it seems it has had a late comment paper or a late amendment to it. If we are going to continue I think we need to start to look at rearranging Standing Orders. I have a real concern for the processes in this Assembly if so many times we are going to miss deadlines. If it was this week I would totally understand with what was going on but it was before those incidents happened. I am not conflating with those things but I just want to make that point. It is very difficult if we are reaching deadlines and Government is simply not doing it on so many comments papers and amendments to amendments and so on.

The Bailiff:

Are you asking me to make some form of ruling about that?

Deputy R.J. Ward:

I just wonder whether those comments papers should be accepted because the good reason seems to have been "but we were busy".

The Bailiff:

At the end of the day it must be a matter for the Assembly whether that is a possibility or not. If the Assembly wish to reject a document on the grounds that it has not fallen within a deadline, then so be it. Yes, the Greffier has reminded me, and I am sorry I did not recall, Standing Orders require of

something filed late merely an explanation, if it is a comment that as to why it has been filed late. If the explanation exists then it is in accordance with Standing Orders.

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I would like to offer my apologies if there were comments submitted late on behalf of the Government. We did have a significant number of amendments and comments to publish and I absolutely accept the Deputy's comment of all busy. But, of course, we were also somewhat concerned on Thursday morning with the sad events in relation to the tragedy at sea and the sinking of the L'Ecume II.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

7. Our Hospital Project: Reporting (P.109/2022) - as amended (P.109/2022 Amd.(2))

The Bailiff:

We now move on then to Public Business. The first item, as the Assembly has resolved, is the Our Hospital Project: Reporting, P.109, lodged by Deputy Farnham. For the purposes of this debate the main respondent will be the Chief Minister. Deputy, you indicated that you would like to accept the amendment of the Connétable of St. Helier, is that correct?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Therefore, you would like, if the Assembly agrees, for your proposition to be read as amended by his amendment.

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Indeed I would, Sir, thank you.

The Bailiff:

Do you have any objection to that, Connétable?

The Connétable of St. Helier:

No, Sir, that is great, thank you.

The Bailiff:

Do Members agree that the proposition should be read as amended by the amendment of the Connétable of St. Helier? Very well. In which case I ask the Greffier to read the proposition as amended.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

The States are asked to decide whether they are of opinion - in order to achieve the best possible clinical and financial outcomes from the delivery of a new hospital, to request the Council of Ministers to present a report to the States no later than 20th March 2023, in which a comparison is made between the multi-site option indicated in the report *A Review of Our Hospital Project* (R.154/2022) and the Overdale project, as previously approved with the adoption of the following propositions: Our Hospital Site Selection - Overdale (P.123/2020); Our Hospital - Acquisition of land for the new hospital at Overdale (P.129/2020); Our Hospital - Preferred Access Route (P.167/2020); and Our Hospital - Budget, Financing and Land Assembly (P.80/2021), both with and without the costs involved in the previously agreed remodelling of Westmount Road, St. Aubin's Road, Peirson Road, Victoria Park and the Inn on the Park car park and the associated land purchases and the demolition of the Jersey Bowling Club and its reprovisioning, with the report specifically to

include (a) a direct like-for-like financial analysis of the multi-site option and the approved Overdale project to include both capital and running costs; (b) a direct like-for-like clinical and medical analysis of the multi-site option and the approved Overdale project; and (c) additional options for funding the approved Overdale project; and that no decision should be sought of the States Assembly that would deviate from the decisions previously taken on the hospital project until the report has been presented.

Deputy I.J. Gorst of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

Sir, prior to the reading of the proposition I think you indicated that it was your view that the Chief Minister would be the direct respondent.

The Bailiff:

Yes.

Deputy I.J. Gorst:

I think it was my understanding that the responsibility for delivering the hospital rests with the Minister for Infrastructure and, therefore, I would have expected you to suggest that he was the direct respondent.

The Bailiff:

If the Chief Minister believes that the Minister for Infrastructure is the correct responder I do not think there is any difficulty with that because it is not that it obviously rests with one particular Minister but I do observe that the Minister for Infrastructure is not present in the Assembly and will not be dealing with any response over the ...

Deputy K.L. Moore:

I can confirm that the Minister for Treasury and Resources is correct, the Minister for Infrastructure is the main responder and stands ready to do so, Sir.

The Bailiff:

In which case I am happy to note that the ... sorry, did you have something to add to that, Connétable?

The Connétable of St. Helier:

A separate matter, Sir.

The Bailiff:

A separate matter. I am very content, therefore, that the Minister for Infrastructure will be the main responder in the matter. Do you have a point to raise before the proposition is ...

The Connétable of St. Helier:

Yes, please, Sir. Just to declare that I am the president of the Jersey Bowls Club, which is affected by the proposition.

Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson of St. Mary, St Ouen and St. Peter:

Could I also take this opportunity to put a declaration of interest on record that I have a sibling who lives in the area around Overdale?

The Bailiff:

Very well. Thank you very much indeed. Neither of those are direct financial interests and do not require withdrawal. The Greffier has read the proposition.

7.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Can I start by thanking the Assembly for giving permission to debate this important proposition as the first item? Could I also thank the Constable of St. Helier for his amendment, which I am pleased to accept, and also thank the Assembly for allowing that too? The Constable's amendment simply seeks to ensure we understand the difference in costs and logistics of providing the new road against not providing the new road. I can say in this Assembly that nothing would give me greater pleasure if we were to achieve the Overdale solution without having to build a new road. I think the Constable's amendment, if successful, if this proposition is successful, will help us to understand more about that. The sole aim of this proposition is to ensure that the Government does not abandon the approved Overdale project without first seeking the States Assembly's approval and until such time as there is certainty that the multi-site scheme proposed by the Chief Minister and the Minister for Infrastructure is a better option for Jersey, both clinically and financially. I also want to say that this not a wrecking or a delaying proposition, as some commentators have suggested. Indeed, how can it be when the alternative solution itself includes a much later completion date? It is a scheme that will not be completed until 2032, whereas the current plans would produce a fully operational hospital originally by the end of 2026, but now because of these delays by early 2027, if we are of a mind to get on with it. Essentially, this proposition simply asks the Chief Minister and the Council of Ministers for them to be open and transparent, something they have publicly committed to on numerous occasions. A review of the Our Hospital Project was presented to the States Assembly by the Minister for Infrastructure at the beginning of last month. The review concluded that the Overdale project should be abandoned and replaced by a phased multi-site development. This report I contend is disappointing, not least within the context of the large amount of expert clinical advice and detailed financial information compiled for the existing project.

[15:45]

This has been largely ignored, I am sorry to say, or discounted in the latest report. That level of detail was quite rightly demanded by the previous Assembly and provided a number of reports and propositions, which were all dealt with quite properly and in line with the democratic procedures of this, our States Assembly and especially by the Chief Minister in her then role as chair of the Our Hospital Scrutiny Panel, who demanded and were provided with considerable detailed information on all aspects of the Overdale project. She was a hard taskmaster, as was the panel, when it came to detail. Yet neither she nor the Council of Ministers appear to want to provide that same level of information prior to cancelling what probably is the most important project that this Assembly and indeed past Assemblies and future Assemblies will ever have to deal with. It is a new hospital, a long overdue hospital and probably the most important building on the Island. I am asking for more information today because the report is light on detail and does not contain any evidence to underpin its findings. The report is wholly speculative and at its own admission the report is subjective. The final paragraph on page 113 of the report states and I quote: "All of the assumptions laid out in the above are subjective and should be validated by a further detailed analysis prior to the ratification of the selection of the option going forward." That is all that I am asking the Assembly to approve today, with the added requirement that they also properly update the current scheme's financial estimates so a direct comparison of costs and clinical outcomes can be made. I would hope that this new Assembly, this new Assembly that was elected by a new electoral system, albeit without the Senators but that is for another day, this representative Assembly would absolutely insist upon knowing that information and understanding those comparisons before abandoning the Overdale plans. The report claims that the current plans will cost up to £115 million more but does not provide evidence or give precise figures. The report recommends or suggests or should I say asserts that a new scheme will cost an estimated £635 million. However, this figure does not take into account any provision for inflation, contingencies or optimism bias, ongoing Government of Jersey civil service or project team costs, writing off approximately £51 million; that is £76 million expended on the Overdale project, less approximately £25 million of land and asset purchases already expended

by the current project. I know that Ministers will not say that some of that investment can be utilised, and that is exactly the same position that we took in 2018 when we were referring to the spend in the previous projects but in practice that was very difficult. While we always learn lessons from the past I cannot see that too much of that £51 million expenditure could be transferred to the new project. It does not include compensation and costs relating to halting the Kensington Place housing development and I understand that the Government do plan to acquire that site for somewhere in the region of £17 million. I also happen to suspect that that is an awful lot more than the site was sold for not so long ago. In fact I think perhaps it was sold for less than half of that amount. I could be wrong and I look forward to receiving clarification. But if that was the case there is a hefty premium for compensation paid for interfering with that project. The figure of £635 million does not take into account the loss of significant income from land and property disposals and the social benefits, and by that I mean the housing and other community and civic schemes that would be enabled by consolidating our current health facilities into one location. It does not include the cost of maintaining the current hospital facilities during the extended build time past 2026, which is when maintenance and running costs and essential investment in the infrastructure of the current hospital is set to increase at an alarming rate, which are significantly more than the amounts set aside in the Government Plan; £5 million a year. It does not include the additional financial and logistical running costs or duplication costs of operating over multiple site facilities compared to a single-site solution. That is not an entire list but I think it is a good indication of what is missing from that figure. A multi-site hospital spread across a number of locations also disregards the valued clinical advice which strongly advocates that Jersey would be best served by a single-site hospital. That is one of the lessons we did learn from previous iterations and that was not to ignore how doctors and nurses, our patients and visitors and everyone who uses the hospital. It is, therefore, highly likely, in fact I would be prepared to say that it is a certainty, that a proposed multi-site scheme will cost more, will take twice as long to complete and will not produce the best clinical and patient outcomes. One of the main premises behind the report is that the Overdale project has become unaffordable. While I accept that it may well not fall within the criteria of the £804.5 million, as approved by the previous Assembly, and I still have the words of the Constable of St. Lawrence ringing in my ears, daring me not in so many words to come back and ask for more money. But it was very clear at that time that if the budget was to exceed that, the States Assembly would have to give approval, and that is certainly what I would expect to happen. This unaffordability claim raises a number of important issues and should be challenged. Firstly, contrary to assertions in the executive summary and the foreword by the Minister that, in essence, the Our Hospital Project at Overdale is to be abandoned partly because of the changes in financial markets. Pages 91 and 92 of the report make the following statement and I quote again: “Despite changes in the underlying financial markets environment, the broad principles of P.80/2021 ...” That was a proposition in relation to the budget financing and land assembly programme of the Overdale project, which this Assembly approved, still apply today: “The Strategic Reserve pays the financing costs and ultimately repays the debt.” The report says that principle is still relevant. The chart on page 91 of the report, also that chart appears in the report attached to this proposition and using current assumptions for the interest rates and the investment returns, even knowing what we know now about the markets and interest rates demonstrates that borrowing at the level approved in P.80/2021 and even up to £850 million could still be supported through the new proposed funding solution that leads to a better long-term outcome than solely using reserves. Therefore, in summary, the Our Hospital Project could still be funded using a modified but similar proposal to that originally put forward and indeed under the revised proposals the Strategic Reserve is projected to end up higher than originally predicted. Of course the Minister for Treasury and Resources and his Treasury team should be commended, not too much though, for their work to produce a more flexible method of financing the project, which could be applied to either option. The work being done by the Treasury could be applied to either option. This is why I am also asking for 4 new funding options to be considered. We know things have changed since we did the sums last time but it is not beyond the skill of the Treasury and the Minister for Treasury and Resources to

come back with some better solutions for that funding. This is not a short-term project, this is a long-term project and we should be mindful that delaying an essential project because of short-term financial challenges is not always the best thing to do, otherwise we would never have invested anything. We have a financial crisis almost every decade, but it is important for the business of government to continue. Of course, it is also important that we search out the right methods to do it. In terms of timing, if the Treasury team who are working with the project cost consultants, and they are the very same consultants who worked on the Overdale project - so they know it well - can put together, as I understand it, somewhere in the region of 10 or 11 different scenarios in the space of a few short weeks for the Minister for Infrastructure's report, they can certainly meet the very realistic deadlines requested in this proposition. I would expect in this debate Members can expect to hear Ministers and the proponents of the new plan repeating a number of messages that we have heard. They will say that we must live within our means and not burden future generations with unmanageable levels of debt. They would be saying that while ignoring the previously approved funding model, which is still viable in the current market. They would be saying that while taking a short-term funding view on a long-term project. They say that was not, in my opinion, understanding the financial context of such a decision. For example, Jersey will spend in excess of £20 billion in running and delivering our health service over the next 40 years, that being of course a likely time of up to which any loan would be amortised, against any financial backdrop an £800 million or £900 million or even more investment in a good hospital to deliver those essential services from is not only appropriate and affordable but it is essential. They will say that we must do what is right for Jersey while ignoring the expert advice of our medical professionals who have said time and time again that a single-site solution is the best option for us. It is the best option for the doctors and the nurses, for the patients and the visitors. It is the best option for Jersey. They will say a multi-site option is a better use of space, while ignoring the loss of income from land disposal and the much needed housing for Islanders that would be sacrificed; Kensington Plan being just one example. They will say that they can use modern methods of construction when of course they can use modern methods of construction for Overdale. They will say that they are getting it done when it is already done and ready to go. They will say and this is my favourite, that ... the Chief Minister has quoted this and I hope she quotes it again in the debate, she will say that indecision is over. In case they had missed it, indecision has been over for some time. The previous Assembly had made all of the key decisions in 4 different debates and all this Government seems to want to do is to take us back to square one. To summarise, this proposition asks the Chief Minister and the Council of Ministers to report back to the States with the following information: a direct like-for-like financial analysis of the multi-site option and the approved Overdale project to include both capital and running costs; a direct like-for-like clinical and medical analysis of the multi-site option and the approved Overdale project and additional options for funding the approved Overdale project, taking into account of course the different economic circumstances we find ourselves in. Requests for extra information about public projects, especially those of major importance to our community, are an established part of our democracy. They are an expected part of the process, of the checks and balances and all Ministers, Members and civil servants know this. Questions and clarifications in the public interest are factored into Government decision-making and the Government must be properly held to account by this Assembly. To that end I make the proposition.

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much, Deputy. Is the proposition seconded? [**Seconded**] Does any Member wish to speak on the proposition? Yes, I have the Minister for Infrastructure.

[16:00]

7.1.1 Deputy T. Binet:

Whatever Deputy Farnham may have to say this afternoon, I believe the Assembly is obliged to focus carefully on the proposition as worded. Before I get to the prepared part of my speech, I would just

like to point out that the claims made this afternoon about the completion time for the hospital are not correct and the team inform me that it would be unlikely that it could be completed before the end of 2027. I think that is an important point that needs to be made. It is clear from the wording of the proposition the proposer is seeking a great deal of detailed financial information and the agreed amendment has added yet another layer. While that might sound like a statement of the obvious, it is important for the Assembly to have a full understanding of what that means in practical terms and to comprehend the cumulative effect in the event of its adoption. Before elaborating, and without wishing to complicate matters unnecessarily, it should be noted that the proposition contains several ambiguities, namely at point (a) that our running costs is unspecific in terms of that to which it relates. Does it apply to the running costs for staff, the running costs of the facility itself or both? What precisely is meant by the term a direct like-for-like clinical and medical analysis when applied to both the multi-site option and the approved Overdale project? Are we to analyse then and compare the safety elements of the 2 proposals or the comparative efficiency or both? Assuming, as I believe we must, the more comprehensive interpretation of sections (a) and (b) the amended proposition would require the following: from a physical and constructional point of view, completion of all necessary consultations with all relevant health staff, clinicians, nurses, doctors, et cetera, to define the division of services between the 2 main sites; completion of the review to define the type and location of new mental health facilities and a completed set of architectural drawings for the 2 or possibly 3 sites yet to be developed. From an operational point of view it would involve an analysis of all staff requirements for all sites, 3 or 4 in total, given our desire to retain the facilities at Les Quennevais for the longer term and analysis of all staff requirements for the approved Overdale project. This, incidentally, is a piece of work that was never undertaken by the proposer during his term of office. From a financial perspective it would also require a full construction cost for the 2 or 3 sites yet to be developed, a full costing for all the staff requirements for the multi-site option and a full costing for the staff requirements of the approved Overdale project; again, a piece of work that was never undertaken by the proposer during his previous term of office. It is extremely important for Members to understand that very few of these exercises can be undertaken simultaneously. For example, until consultation has been completed we cannot decide on the location of each service and until the location of each service has been decided it is not possible for the architects to produce a set of plans. Until the plans have been completed it is not possible to assess the cost of construction and so on. The self-same principles apply to the task of defining staff numbers, precise roles and associated cost, particularly given the possibility of small areas of duplication in the case of the dual-site option. In addition to all of the foregoing, Constable Crowcroft's accepted amendment now asks the project team to produce a full separate costing of all the various works entailed in the previously agreed remodelling of Westmount, St. Aubin's Road, Peirson Road, Victoria Park and the Inn on the Park car park, the associated land purchases, the demolition of the Jersey Bowling Club and its repositioning; this so that the total cost of these works can be subtracted from an updated costing for the Our Hospital Project. I will return shortly to the issue of timescales for these works but for the moment I would like to focus on what the work on the amendment would achieve. For the sake of arguments, let us say that it shows a saving of £50 million. The net result then is that we will have confirmation of the exact amount of money we can save should we be prepared to submit a new planning application in the hope, forlorn as it may be, that the planning authority will accept the construction of a 64,000 square metre hospital on a compromised site with no infrastructural changes at all. How likely is that? I suspect the only way to achieve anything like this would be to reduce the scale of the development at the Overdale site considerably, and this is precisely what the recent 100-day review has in mind. Returning now to the all-important issues of timing, as you will have heard, a great deal of information is being requested and much of it has to be undertaken sequentially. With this in mind I consulted senior officers and the current Government of Jersey project team, including the acting and I hope soon to be permanent Hospital Project director, a highly competent civil servant with over 6 years' experience in the front line of both the Gloucester Street and Our Hospital Projects and they inform me that the earliest that this information could be produced in full

is the end of September 2023. I will repeat that because I think it is an important date; that is the end of September 2023. Assuming for obvious reasons that we would have limited time to progress matters between now and the new year, we would have a meagre 69 working days from 2nd January to complete the requirements of the amended proposal, an absolute impossibility in my view by any measure; it is as simple as that. If the Assembly votes in favour of the proposal a full 3 months will be wasted, save for the fact that we will know how much money we might save if we lived in a world where planning decisions were instantaneous and no account was taken by the planning authority or the operations and transport directorate of the need for appropriate infrastructure. Having made what I hope is a compelling case to reject the proposal on the grounds that, as worded, it would deliver nothing in the time available, I think it might also be helpful to comment on it in a wider context. There is little doubt that the proposer would like to proceed with the Our Hospital Project as it is without further delay. If this is the case, I believe he should have lodged a proposition to that effect, not one that is impossible to deliver within the time specified. If defeated, and common sense suggests it must, then any further proposition of this kind would need to be set within an appropriate timeframe, in this case about 9 months, under the circumstances that would surely be unthinkable. I think the time has come for us to make a choice one way or the other. Either we accept the many risks associated with the Our Hospital Project, massive cost, new funding requirements, lack of risk management, lack of expansion possibilities and poor flexibility at a time of great instability or we progress with the findings of the 100-day review which seeks to address all of these pressing issues in a balanced and responsible manner. It is a stark but necessary decision. On that basis I urge Members to reject this proposition.

Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

Do you want my camera on as well? Can you see my camera or not? Can you hear me?

The Bailiff:

All we need to do is hear you, Deputy, and the answer is yes, we can.

7.1.2 Deputy A. Howell:

I am speaking against this proposition today and in support of the Council of Ministers. The Our Hospital Project is not all that it was cracked up to be. I believe the previous States Assembly was badly informed and possibly misled. It was not just 3 homes that would have been destroyed but 14. The then Senator Farnham's not a single tree will be destroyed is simply not the case. The all-on-one-site aspect of the design also needs to be questioned. The laundry continued at Five Oaks, insufficient mental health base would have necessitated the continuation of a provision of St. Saviour and there were other defects; insufficient beds, only 175 24/7 beds. When you have a growing elderly population and the current reduction from 250 to 146 beds means that we simply do not have enough. Some of our consultants are operating on Jersey patients in the U.K. at the present time. There were no rehabilitation facilities, no physiotherapy or occupational therapy departments, no hydrotherapy pool, not sufficient space for outpatients and no mention of rheumatology, neurology, a dedicated diabetic centre, pain clinic or dental department. There were insufficient ward work stations for doctors and nurses, not enough barrier nursing beds, no separate entrances for clean and sterile supplies to go in and waste to go out, nowhere for Meals on Wheels, no permanent venue for the much-needed Child Development Centre and no room for expansion. The approved Overdale project cannot be officially approved as there are other omissions. There is still no waste strategy and believe me there would have been a lorry load of waste every minute and yet no capacity for its disposal. It is not a done deal. Unfortunately, there is not a staffing strategy for the Our Hospital Project, nor were there details of any running costs; these are serious oversights. The Deputy is now asking officials in our new Government not only to come up with their own figures but also to perform the work of the very expensive design and build team who ignore these details. One has to ask how a design and build consortium would ever have been able to provide the Island with the best financial

figures when at the time that they were contracted no one knew what was needed in terms of size and shape or facilities. Can you still hear me? There was no site, there was no competitive tendering. Why was this permitted? How could it have provided the best value for money? How can such a blatant waste of taxpayers' money have been allowed to occur? The funding model was never viable and it is not viable now. I wish to do all I can to help the Minister for Infrastructure and the Government to make sure that the new hospital is properly funded, future-proofed and provides all of the services and facilities that the Island and Islanders need. Past declarations of plans provide details of what is needed, together with which clinical adjacencies work best. I for one think we should have the best healthcare service and facilities that the Island can afford and I will do all I can to make this happen. Let us not get bogged down in timewasting to achieve nothing but go forward positively. Please, vote against Deputy Farnham's proposition.

7.1.3 Deputy B. Ward of St. Clement:

I am pleased that we are having this debate, which provides me with the opportunity to share with the Assembly my views and reasons for supporting the present review and proposal for 2 multi-site health facilities. After some 44 years of working across Health and Social Services I feel I have some hands-on, front line and managerial knowledge and experience to make a measured judgment and make comments as to why we need a 2/3 site health facilities. I have for many years been working with a 2-site facility; it is not like it is something brand new. What we need to be looking at is the general and acute hospital on its site; a non-acute step-down rehabilitation, convalescence, outpatient, community health facility at Overdale, which a lot of parishioners remember Overdale with a lot of fondness that when they would have their operations that is where they would be transferred to recuperate and strengthen and then be helped to go home. Les Quennevais, once we have used as a transitional facility, could be considered as a community health hub, incorporating G.P. and nurse-led services to the population out west. But this can only happen and all the consideration of what happens with Les Quennevais because we are linked into contracts at the moment to get this done, but what happens afterwards can only be when we have got our basics right and that is the new General Hospital and a step-down facility at Overdale. I am urging the Assembly not to just consider the cost and the financing of Our Hospital Project at Overdale, as previously approved, but you have got to consider the design and service provision. The question of the design was not included in the Staddon report at the inquiry. The inquiry focused on the site rather than the design and provision, which was beyond the scope. Overdale Hospital site is clearly not big enough to accommodate the floor plate of our hospital design, nor can it be pivoted through a 90 degrees fit. Hence the need to move Westmount Road across the field, otherwise known as Rondel field and to demolish, as my colleague has said, 14 homes at the top of the road, as well as the Waterworks headquarters near the crematorium.

[16:15]

Therein lies the fundamental issue affecting the original Overdale Hospital project, and it does not fit the site or provide the services that we have now. The new hospital that was being proposed by Deputy Farnham, when you look at the plans there is no hydrotherapy pool, no memory clinic, speech and language services physio department, occupational therapy, no dedicated diabetes clinic, no long-term dedicated Child Development and Therapy Centre, which is based at the William Knott, no dedicated rehabilitation ward, as in Samarès, no step-down beds, this includes in the delayed discharge of patients who occupy beds that would otherwise be available for routine planned admissions, no dental department, nowhere for oral surgeons to work, no mention of neurology, rheumatology, stroke care and care of the elderly. Limited outpatient space and no palliative end-of-life dedicated ward. I could go on. This is an acute hospital. The overall project has been trying to put a quart into a pint pot with no space to expand or future-proof. What do we want? We all want the same thing and that is we want a new acute general hospital that has easy access for emergency services and patients, future-proofing and space to extend facilities if needed, modern medical and

surgical inpatient services, more space for patients to be cared for and staff to work in, little or no bed-blockers. If we have the situation at Overdale with the one site we are in a no different situation to what we are in today because there will be no bespoke rehabilitation services for patients to move on to following their acute episode. We need a new pathology department, pharmacy department, high-dependency intensive care, a larger A. and E. (Accident and Emergency) Department; I could go on. But this can be achieved on the existing General Hospital site incorporating the additional space provided where the 2 hotels, the Revere and Stafford, stood. However, to develop the acute services we need to start developing the Overdale non-acute health facility now and, as set out in the bridging Island Plan, it was agreed that that could be reused as some other health facility. Whether we get this Overdale non-acute service, let us get this up and running. Services can be relocated out of the existing General Hospital to the Overdale site, which would then provide the services that would be missing with the one-site hospital. Health would retain the West Mount Rehabilitation service, the William Knott services, there would be no need to alter the access road. The Overdale site can accommodate all these non-acute services that I have related before and more, and there will still be enough room and land and space for future-proofing healthcare facilities and to provide space to build housing, staff housing in that area. I urge you to reject this proposition.

7.1.4 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

If I could start with a flippant comment and hopefully improve the quality as I go along. I have to say I do find there is something rich in hearing some criticisms of the detail of a proposed scheme and then leading to a conclusion of putting your faith into a scheme where there is far less detail. It may well be the case that there is an iteration of the Our Hospital Project based along the lines that is proposed by the Government that could be suitable, could be viable, affordable and provide excellent healthcare services but at this point we do not have anything even close to the level of detail required to reach that conclusion safely. It is for that reason that I and my Reform Jersey colleagues will support this proposition in the hope that it may lead to a position where we can get that detail and feel more secure in making a final decision. I think that there is probably out there in our Island community no majority view in support of any proposal for a hospital. There may well be majorities against particular options but there is no majority in favour of any proposed option when it has been put forward. But the thing that I think there probably is a majority feeling of is the feeling of being totally and utterly fed up of going around this merry-go-round over and over while we can see the condition of the current General Hospital deteriorating over time, costing more money, us wasting even more money on consultants and going and re-reviewing this, tearing up this option, going back to the drawing board again. I for one am fed up with that and do not want to play any role in prolonging that. Where we are today with a series of approved propositions in this Assembly for an Overdale Hospital is not close to what I had in my mind years ago when we started this but we are where we are. That is our starting point and, therefore, any change to that has to be considered on that basis. We have on the one hand propositions that have been passed by this Assembly, this sovereign decision-making body of the Island, a level of detail that is provided without approvals for various parts of that proposition, substantial amount of work that has been done to produce work for a single-site hospital solution at Overdale or we have a political suggestion - I choose my words carefully in that and I will come back to that later on in what I have got to say - to go for an alternative proposal, a multi-site hospital and for the proponents of that alternative to present an argument in their favour, which is that it could be done more affordably than what is currently agreed. But if we are going to make that decision one way or the other I think it ought to be done on the basis of clear-evidenced fact, not conjecture. The phrase that the current hospital proposal is unaffordable is true if and only if you put caveats in that sentence. It is true that it is unaffordable in its precise terms through the precise funding permissions that have been agreed by this Assembly; I doubt that that point is contested. But to say that it is unaffordable full stop is not the case. It is the case that the Government and the Assembly can re-examine funding options to find ways of putting some form of proposal together, whether that is through phased borrowing, whether it is through another

mechanism, to make the approved project affordable. It may well involve taking on more debt than some people are comfortable with, and that is a political judgment at the end of the day but it is possible. It is also possible - and this was the position that Reform Jersey had during the election - which is that with a review of the business case for the approved project then perhaps further savings could be made to identify a way of making it more affordable. In fact that is something which the Government's review paper does say it is possible to some extent anyway. That is the position that I am comfortable taking, which is that if we are going to divert from that, that it has to be on a strong evidence base and to see some form of like-for-like comparison when we are about to undertake one of the biggest capital projects, potentially the biggest capital project that we may ever do, unless one day in the future somebody does decide to go ahead with a bridge to France, and perhaps we will not be able to afford it when it comes to it after whatever amounts of money we waste on this. I am comfortable in taking that position. But looking at the alternative, I think it is right that whoever stands up in this debate to outline their position and tries to invoke some form of mandate for them to do so, that we ought to be clear from the start what those mandates are. Our position was clear, that we do not consider it in the public interest that the site selection process be reopened or that a drastic change from the approved proposals are adopted. It is clear that there are some Members who took a very different view at the election and to those I say fair enough. If your position to your electorate is that you did not like the proposal that the previous Assembly agreed and you want to see a drastic change to it, no problem; you have got a democratic mandate to uphold that position. But for those who took a different position or for those who took no very clear position in the election, something that is, I am sure, very tempting to do when the public are so divided on this question, there is no reason whatsoever to just go along with what other politicians conclude because you did not have a conclusion yourself or because it did not align with the one that you were elected on. For the Government now to say, having conducted this review, that it wants to change basically the entirety of the hospital proposal, some Members of that Government can justifiably claim a democratic mandate for that shift in direction but none of us are obliged to follow it without a strong evidence base that says it is the right thing to do. At this point with what we have been presented in the review, presented as part of this 100-day plan, we cannot say with any certainty that if we go ahead with that we are going to end up with a better quality health service, better quality facilities and deliver it at a more affordable rate. There simply is not the justification on paper to do that. The previous States Assembly had a Future Hospital Review Panel set up to examine the Overdale proposals as they were going through. I found myself regularly agreeing with what that review panel said and voted occasionally in favour of propositions that they brought, which would I am sure have been to the great frustration of Deputy Farnham at the time. He says, no, not at all; okay, I am sure I believe that. With this new Assembly we sought to re-establish that review panel in order to attempt to scrutinise something, until unfortunately not that long ago it was not exactly clear what we would be scrutinising but we managed to find a way in of providing some sort of examination of where we are. We have published our comments paper; I hope Members have had time to read it. It is not that long, certainly nowhere near as long as the review report itself. But our central finding in conducting the work where we questioned Ministers in quite a robust fashion and went through as much of the documentation as we possibly could, but our central finding in conducting our work is that the clarity we sought on the processes, the gathering of evidence and the detail sought in order to inform decisions, is not available at this stage. Our overriding conclusion in relation to that report is that in trying to provide an evidential base for a political decision, the Government has developed a review which raises questions about its scope and objectivity, rather than providing certainty for decision-making. I have to say I think that was a blunder on the Government's behalf. If the Government, claiming some form of democratic mandate, wanted to change the hospital proposal they are within their rights to do that and we, as an Assembly, are within our rights to determine whether the majority of us also agree with that or whether we would say, no, we would prefer to stick with what we have got so far and work with that in one form to enable to move forward. But instead they have provided for a report to be done and the easiest part of it to look at are the last few pages, which goes through

different options and tries to relatively succinctly point out where the savings are there. I am afraid it raises more questions than it answers.

[16:30]

It provides for savings based on the £108 million figure approved for the Overdale project, which is not a like-for-like comparison, which does not include some of the key aspects of the approved funding from the previous proposition, which you can see in the reports to Deputy Farnham's proposition on page 4, which goes through what were the project's capital costs and other budgeted costs, including things like optimism bias, client contingency, which under questioning we have discovered are not part of the figures included for the alternative proposal. Straightaway that comparison is not safe, we do not know what the figure will finally be once those aspects are included into it. Deputy Farnham is asking us to include in a review now done to find that like-for-like basis to include both capital and running costs. Deputy Binet and others may well want to make whatever criticisms of Deputy Farnham for that apparently not being in the original funding proposals. I have to say I find that playing the man and not the ball because it is acknowledged even in the Government's own review on this that the running costs for the multi-site option are at the highest of the options that they looked at. If we are going to be taking on a huge amount of borrowing over decades to fund a new hospital facility, at this point now that we are being asked to throw that in the bin and go back to ... somebody said square one, I think it is kind of square 1.5 possibly because at least the site is determined, although not much else is in there, over those decades the running costs will be substantially higher and that will add up over time. Is it at this point us worth saying that that alternative is affordable when it will cost more in its running costs in the long term? Can we say for the figures we are given for comparison are safe when they do not include - as far as I am aware and I am happy to be corrected if I have got this wrong - the extra costs that will be necessary to maintain the current General Hospital site because of the state of disrepair that is rapidly approaching? Does it take into account the costs of land acquisition that we have spoken of for the Kensington Place sites and of course, as previously mentioned, optimism bias and contingency costs? The figures we have on paper in front of us do not provide answers to that and leave still many questions to be answered. So I think it would have been better probably to have just avoided that exercise because the decision that the Government wishes to take in changing the approach is a political decision. One which they have every right to seek but one which they have no right to expect the Assembly to simply grant because they ask for it. We can and should only grant it on the basis of evidence that the claims they make about its affordability are true and, at this point, we do not have that evidence base. I wish to see Jersey have the best healthcare facilities we can possibly deliver on this Island. I want them to be affordable as well and where we are today is not even close to where I would have wanted us to have been through past iterations for this review process. I do not think I would be serving my constituents well if I did not at least play a part in trying to ensure that those questions of affordability were properly answered before we make crucial decisions in enabling changes to go ahead. Our position as a party has been we would have preferred to have seen a more robust analysis of the business case for the currently approved scheme to try to make that more affordable rather than going back to the drawing board and potentially ending up costing us more. I dread to think where we may be years in the future when that may not become realised and we end up going over this whole process again. I would ask Members to support this proposition from Deputy Farnham.

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

It is important for us to remember that this is not just the fault of the previous Government but the one before that as well. We have had years of inaction and mismanagement both politically and administratively and every time hope emerges that we may go ahead and commence building that we all voted for in the last Assembly, we are faced with push backs or new decisions that send us back to stage one. I am sure that our incumbent Chief Minister and the Minister for Treasury and Resources both remember which positions they held during prior debates on the new hospital. I have

a number of concerns about the plans and to the idea of a dual-site solution and, as we have heard, it is not a dual-site solution. It is probably full site. This idea was the official line back in 2013 but, as we all know, this was later rejected following concerns from the Health, Social Security and Housing Scrutiny Panel in 2014 alongside evidence from senior clinical staff that was collected by the Hospital Policy Development Board in 2018. According to evidence collected as part of the board's review, a dual site would require extensive moving between sites by staff and this would be, in their words, inconvenient and logically undesirable. There was clear evidence to support removing the dual-site option and I should note that this was one of the only findings to be supported by the entire Policy Development Board including the then Minister for Health and Social Services, former Deputy Richard Renouf. What we risk doing here is ignoring these prior reviews for the sake of political capital. Jersey is 9 miles by 5 miles. Any site is destined to be controversial but surely our Island's small size also means that we should not require more than one site on which to build a hospital. It is my intention to support Deputy Farnham's proposition. I apologise to the Deputy for saying this but although I cannot say that I have been convinced by his leadership on this project over the last few years, I believe that it would be an error for this Assembly to make another about face without clear, detailed and costed evidence to support these new plans, especially given the previous reporting available on this option. I must support this amendment because it is currently the only way to guarantee that this Assembly obtains the necessary detail on its delivery, costing and staffing. No Government would ever adopt a proposition from a Back-Bencher with such an omission of detail and neither should this Assembly. However, I must also stress to both the Assembly and the Government that we need to do better in building consensus and support for a new hospital regardless of where it goes. Our conversations and debates about it are rooted in rejection and opposition. Piecemeal steps are made but they arrive from the top down, doing little to build hope or address wider concerns. What these 8 years have revealed are more about what we do not want and cannot have rather than what we do need or what we can sustainably agree upon. We need to show the Island that our decision will be the best option for our future and that we can build the best possible hospital this Island can have because we desperately need it. Now you may recall that there was an attempt at a deliberative approach selecting an anonymous group of Islanders to help reach a decision on where to build the new hospital. The Our Hospital citizens' panel. Unfortunately, they were only entrusted with reaching a consensus on the criteria for site selection and not the selection of the site itself. The idea of using a deliberative body could have been a huge asset, as we have seen with the Assisted Dying citizens' jury, had the last Government or its project staff had the foresight to take that approach. There was clearly not enough faith in Islanders for them to have a clear say in the site itself and what we got was a potentially promising idea being absorbed into a bureaucracy of poor communication and apparent inaction. The facilitator of this body remains anonymous despite the concerns expressed by the previous Public Accounts Committee, of which I was a member. We do need to do better than this. We need to include the public in a way that does not treat them as a mere token in the wider process but as the beating heart of this problem while acknowledging its urgency. Our current hospital needs to be replaced as soon as possible and we need to replace it with something that we can be proud of. Public statements will only go so far. What we need is to show the public that we, as their representatives, have listened, that we understand what they want, what they expect, what they need and that we can provide for them with the clarity and transparency that they deserve. If this amendment is the only way that we can get there, then I am for it. Thank you

7.1.6 Deputy I. Gardiner:

I am finding myself *déjà vu* because we did have so many debates over my previous 3 years at the Assembly, and I looked through all my speeches that I made. Back then, Senator Farnham and today's Deputy Farnham was on the side of the Government and it feels a bit different today. At the same time, I can almost re-read all my speeches that I have done over the whole debate. I cannot agree more, and I said several times that we need a hospital. Now, if Deputy Farnham remembers when it was just presented to the Future Hospital Panel, the first draft before it had been published

of the outline and business case, I asked question because I was a consultant: “Why have you done a comparison between these 3 particular things? Why have you done a comparison which was do nothing?” which, obviously, none of us knew they would do nothing. It is the option so why think about the option and do nothing when it is not the option? Second, a refurbished current hospital. Obviously, all of us knew that a refurbishment of the current hospital would not be the option and the third, a new build at Overdale because the Overdale site was then established. I have asked why we have not included the option to build on 2 sites? Why are we spending all this money paying for consultants exploring it if the option is do nothing or the refurbishment of Gloucester Street is included? We could avoid this debate. I would be happy to avoid this debate on building but if we are going back ... and I know that it is several governments, but at the same time, it is outlining a business case and I do know because I was looking and reading and done a public hearing. It is clearly stating that it is not complying with the Green Book. We do not have staffing costs. We do not have revenue costs. As Deputy Mézec says, it is not about this. If we are asked to compare like for like, I do not have revenue costs to compare. So what do I need to compare? I am happy to present as a member of the Government revenue costs but I do not have things to compare to so, basically, I am being asked for something that is really difficult to produce. The Constable of St. Martin mentioned P.A.C. (Public Accounts Committee), and we have been together at the P.A.C. I am not sure if Members had a chance to look in the report published on 13th September 2021 *Governance Arrangements for Health and Social Care - Follow Up*. It was clearly stated that government arrangements for the Jersey Care Model and Our Hospital Project sits outside of the main health business and a separate government arrangement was made. We cannot have separate governance arrangements between the healthcare system and the hospital that we are building so, again, the case did not address this. We have a problem with the staffing at the current hospital asking for 75 per cent of single rooms. We do not have enough staff to care for current provision. Seventy-five per cent of the single rooms will require a higher provision but because staffing costs were not provided, how can we compare? It is really important that we compare apples to apples now, like for like. I am a bit confused. I understand Deputy Mézec said that we do not need to prolong, we do not need to push, we need to make a decision on what is happening but we need to create something that was not created previously. It is again creating longer terms. One more point that was raised. I was surprised that Deputy Farnham accepted the Constable’s amendment. I read the Constable’s report and I cannot agree more with the Constable because for the last 2 years, together we tried to help and support residents of St. Helier against the disruption and destruction of the area.

[16:45]

For 2 years, the then Senator Farnham and the team made it very, very clear there is no chance we can build the Overdale Hospital without the highway. We had a proposition from the Constable that we reviewed dozens of options for the road and we get back with the same highway because it is impossible. The Scrutiny Panel said that we can create a hospital and we do nothing and it was rejected, and now we are in the debate and Deputy Farnham accepted the amendment from the Constable saying: “We might build a full Overdale scale without the road.” So ,what was impossible 6 months ago and what has become possible now? I am for numbers. We had several debates but what we have been asked to do is basically, from my point of view, impossible.

7.1.7 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:

Before I start, I will declare that I do live on Westmount Road. I did not declare it at the beginning of the debate because my understanding was that is not a conflict of interest for the purposes of this proposition.

The Bailiff:

No, I do not think it is. It is simply calling for a report in effect so it is not a direct conflict, yes.

Deputy L.V. Feltham:

That was my understanding too but, for the purposes of transparency, I felt I should say that before speaking. That does bring me on to a point which is, for me, this debate and this proposition is not a debate about the location of the hospital. This is a decision about an appropriate and proper process to follow to ensure that Members have the necessary information available to them to enable them to make the right decision and also so that the Assembly does not repeat the mistakes of the past. We have heard from various Members about how, potentially, detail was lacking in previous business cases. So for me, the idea that we would press on and go backwards on this project without having business cases that are detailed in front of us is counterintuitive to that argument. I did sit on the review panel and went through the review documents in quite a lot of detail and, for me, there is not enough information within that document for us to base our decisions on. When we questioned Ministers, which you will see in our comments, there were very many areas where more information would need to be supplied at a later time. There is no mention, for example, about the practicality of building on a working hospital site where you have to demolish buildings while people are working in them. We would need to understand how the project will be planned to ensure that the hospital staff can continue working, for example. A lot has been mentioned about the Treasury Green Book. I know that the Chief Minister, when she led the previous review panel, was quite consistent in her criticism of the previous Government around the level of documentation and the type of documentation that had been presented for the previous hospital project. I was listening to Deputy Gardiner earlier who mentioned the business as usual option. I would just like to take the opportunity to read a section of the Treasury Green Book which may explain why I feel that, by adopting the proposition today, it would align us more with the Treasury Green Book processes. I quote: "Proposals for change must start from a thorough objective and quantitative understanding of the current situation. This should be informed by research and consultation with experts and stakeholders. A clear quantitative understanding of business as usual is essential to understanding the current situation and to identifying and planning the changes that may be required." It goes on to say: "Business as usual in Green Book terms is defined as a continuation of current arrangements as if the proposal under consideration were not being implemented. This is true even if such a course of action is completely unacceptable. The purpose of this is to provide a quantitative benchmark as the counterfactual against which all proposals for change will be compared. Business as usual does not mean do nothing because continuing with current arrangements will have consequences and require action resulting in costs. In practical terms, there is therefore no do nothing option." So, for me, what this proposition does, it would enable us to receive that quantitative information as outlined in the Treasury Green Book. Also, Ministers have argued that this proposition would delay work on the hospital project. What is being proposed by Ministers is to go backwards to a feasibility stage so we would enter into a new project and that project would then be in a feasibility stage because the feasibility of the new option is not known. So they will need to be doing the outline business case anyway and part of that outline business case should indeed be comparing it to the business-as-usual option. So what I say to Members today is that rather than us being pushed to make decisions when we do not have the relevant and required information in front of us, what we should be doing is saying to the Government: "Go away. Do your business case. You have taken the political decision to pause the project. That is your decision and then when you have the outline business case and we have sufficient information for the Assembly to take a decision, then we are prepared to take it." So that is where I am standing. I would also like to draw the Assembly's attention to some of the missing information with regard to clinical risk. When I asked a written question of the Minister for Health and Social Services, I was given a very clear answer back which said: "As outlined in the review on page 12, it is essential that a further more detailed analysis is undertaken with respect to clinical risk, cost and planning assumptions before any final decisions are ratified." We are not in a place to be ratifying final decisions to go backwards on this hospital and I urge Members to support this proposition.

7.1.8 Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf of St. Saviour:

I recall in the election that the future of the hospital was one of the major election issues and I faced the difficulty of having to submit a manifesto and 3 days later the report came out from the planning inspector saying that the application could be, in theory, approved. We then found out that the relations with the contractor meant that the One Hospital Project could not be continued with because there were issues with the contractor. We had then established that the costs that this Assembly in a rather ... I was not here at the time and it was interesting to hear the chair of P.P.C. speak about previous decisions. The Assembly at the Government Plan last year I think should have been informed because they knew then what we, the new Council of Ministers, has found out about the costs associated with the hospital which this Assembly had approved. It was not just an Assembly proposition that has been approved in a principle. It was a bill of supply. That means that the borrowing was authorised, the money was allocated and all approvals had been given. What has transpired is that the money was not borrowed. Members know that the money now would be at a vastly additional expense than what it was today so the borrowing was not done. The allocation of money, some of which would have been put in to carry out the project, was not there. The costs before at this time last year, I understand, were higher, according to the information that I have been told, and then the Ukraine crisis with the cost-of-living issues has meant that there is an even greater increase in costs. I understand Members' frustration. As an election candidate, one of the reasons why I stood was because I was absolutely frustrated that we were not told as members of the public and this Assembly was not levelled with in terms of what the facts of the One Hospital Project was. Information has come to light which is very clear that it cannot be built for reasons that were probably known this time last year but, for whatever reason, were not explained, and now have only got worse. The public are absolutely aghast at what has happened. They are aghast at the delays and they are aghast at the decision-making and the issues of transparency. These are serious issues which were uppermost for many reasons in people's elections and many reasons why Members of this Assembly are here today because they stood on transparency, accountability and delivery. Deputy Farnham was the leader of the One Hospital Group and I understand his frustration in seeing a turnaround. The reality in truth is that the One Hospital site is not deliverable, as has been explained by the Minister for Infrastructure who has been forensic in his work in understanding what the facts are. It has become very clear. Members that have been saying that they are going to be voting in favour of this proposition are going to be approving a proposition for a like-for-like financial analysis of the multi-site option. The difficulty is, as I understand, that the costs associated with running the One Hospital site was not even there. So, in fact, I question whether or not it is possible to advance and approve a proposition of which the A and B - in other words, A for the One Hospital and B what the Council of Ministers is trying to advance in an open, transparent and speedy way in getting what the public want which is a hospital - the A is not there. The numbers are not there. The States decision of the budget allocation is an extraordinary decision, as a former Minister for Treasury and Resources, to see a proposition made which is a budget allocation authorising a budget out with a budget proposal. In my experience, I have never seen anything like it apart from a fiscal stimulus programme, but the previous proposition simply is invalid. It cannot be done. It has not been done. The alpha of the comparative data is not there for the running of the hospital. Members are aware. Each and every Member of this Assembly must know that the baseline costs of building One Hospital are simply not the numbers that were approved by the States. So what Deputy Farnham is asking to do is impossible for a number of reasons. I also politely suggest that the preferred arrangement with the contractor is also impossible to deliver because there has been some sort of issue in the relations with the contracting party.

[17:00]

So I understand Members' frustration and the scolding of the current Council of Ministers who are always going to be held accountable for decisions but you can only do what you can do and you can only do what you can do with the data that you have and the data is not there. The comparative cost

is not there. The money is not there. The money cannot be borrowed. It simply cannot be done and so Members are faced with a dilemma. Are they going to allow the Council of Ministers with the best of intentions given the circumstances, given the enormous backlog of years of delay which Members have spoken about ... and I have been part of previous Assemblies which have tried to advance matters. I have been known to advance matters such as police stations and other matters. I am quite familiar with these issues and all the scoldings that one gets. I see the Minister for Housing and Communities dealing with housing. Every single infrastructure project whether it is the incinerator; guilty as charged. Involved in that. The police station; guilty as charged. Involved in that. In each stage of these issues, we know we need to make decisions factually. We need to make decisions with the best of intentions with our oath of office in mind. This proposition by Deputy Farnham simply cannot be done and if it is passed by the Assembly, we will need to remember the words of the Minister for Infrastructure. There is a clue in the title. He is the Minister for Infrastructure. He is responsible. I do not know why the last Government put the responsibilities into other people's hands but they did. We know that our Minister for Infrastructure has seized upon these issues, he is dealing with them and under the direction of the Council of Ministers, our Chief Minister and under the guidance of the Minister for Treasury and Resources, he is advancing matters as expeditiously, properly and transparently as possible. So I am afraid it is impossible to accept criticism. One is accountable. There is one word in French. It is called *responsabilité*. That is responsibility, accountability and liability. The Council of Ministers is accountable and takes responsibility for the issues of advancing what is needed in the Island, which is a hospital, as the Connétable has said. Is the States going to make a decision to do what we have been doing in the last 10 years or more of putting decisions off and delaying matters? I ask Members to continue to have confidence in the Council of Ministers, the Minister for Infrastructure, the Minister for Treasury and Resources, our Minister for Health and Social Services, our Chief Minister to advance the solving of our hospital issues without the frustration, without this request, which I understand why Deputy Farnham is doing it, for whatever reasons, but it is impossible to achieve. If it is passed it is going to have enormous consequences of further delay. If this proposition is not passed, as it should not be, Members can be assured that the new Government, as said, will advance in transparency and give the right information at the right time, as soon as possible and solve the issue that we were elected to solve. Action not words, a delivery Government. It is 10 minutes, I will sit down and ask Members to please reject this, to encourage the Minister for Infrastructure to continue his work in conjunction with others, in conjunction with experts so that we cannot stand here in another Government Plan debate, in another 2 or 3-years' time and not deliver what Islanders need. If ever there was a reason, surely we understand post-COVID and post everything else of why we need a hospital that works with services now under the guidance of our Minister for Health and Social Services that is not only just a building but what goes on inside. I urge Members in the strongest and most respectful terms possible to reject the proposition.

7.1.9 Connétable R. Honeycombe of St. Ouen:

I think what we must remember is that regardless of what Deputy Ozouf says, it was passed by the last Assembly. There is a reputed £118 million been spent so far, which is taxpayers' money, surely the people of Jersey deserve the right to know what this new hospital is going to cost and that is all the proposition is asking for. Come back and tell us it is going to save god knows how many hundred million pounds, come and prove it. That is all we need to know.

7.1.10 The Connétable of St. John:

In looking at this proposal I looked back at my contribution like others did from the debate in October last year. I opened my comments then with: "I think we need to get on and build at Overdale but importantly not at any price." I spoke then about the fact that none of us are experts in every field, we have to rely on information and data presented to us. Some of us are experienced in compiling business cases and/or evaluating business cases. The business case that was approved was lacking

in such fundamental and basic information and in my opinion would never have been accepted in the commercial world. Despite Deputy Farnham's assertion in his opening that there was detailed information in the previous plans, the business case was lacking in information such as revenue costs, staffing requirements, potential income forecasts, justification for size, justification for the amount of carparking. A business case lacking such basic information and data would not even get to an executive meeting in my experience, let alone presented to a board for endorsements, yet Members were asked to support £804 million on a "trust me, it will be okay" scenario. We saw the change of the lavish roof, that did not provide any savings. We saw the reduction in size, no savings. Smaller car park, no savings. The Deputy earlier today questioned the new Minister for Infrastructure about the advice he has taken. Well, I would question the Deputy about the advice he took and I will give him an example. The previous project's clinical director told us that 40 per cent of Islanders had private health insurance. Just a week before that comment the Minister for Health of the day wrote in a written answer to a question that the figure of people with private health was actually lower than 25 per cent. That is a significant difference and when you saw the size of the new hospital that assumption of 40 per cent had been made. Islanders and taxpayers expect us to make a reasoned and professional decision and to act responsibly with their money. They may not agree with our decisions but generally they will respect them if they are made on sound information and data. Nobody is suggesting that we build a new hospital without coming back to this Assembly with all the information that is needed to make a decision. Shortly after my election I met with the then Chief Minister and the then Deputy Chief Minister for a briefing on the project that was approved. I asked them what kind of facility would we get for £200 million less. Again, it is not uncommon to be told in commerce that you have 20 per cent or 30 per cent less to spend on a project and be sent away to find a solution. Pretty similar to what the Minister for Infrastructure has done. I was told then that we would not get the hospital that we want. We now have a Minister who has commercial experience and he has come to us with what I believe is a workable solution that manages risk in a far more appropriate manner. Another question I asked at that meeting was about the plan for resilience. I will remind Members that when the planning inspector rejected Gloucester Street he was told not to review a 2-centre option. That was confirmed by the consultant that a 2-centre solution last time was not considered. Why? We heard from Deputy Feltham about the Green Book and, yes, we did question the use of the Green Book because if it had actually been followed then a 2-centre option would have been considered as well as the single centre. I believe, like Deputy Feltham, there is a lot of work to be done in this area. We were told last October about the silent majority who just want us to get on and deliver. I have said before, we do need a hospital and we need to get on with it. We have a responsibility. During the recent election I have to say the hospital featured very highly on St. John parishioners' questions. I met just 2 people who supported the previous decision and I knocked on every door in that Parish. I spoke to dozens of people who did not support the scheme that had been approved. I have heard people say it is too far between the 2 sites. Really? You can actually see one site from the other. Doctors do not appear to have any problem travelling between the current facility and the Lido or the current facility and Little Grove. They manage quite well. Deputy Howell spoke about the things that have not been included in the Our Hospital Site Project. It is vital that they are included in the project or we find solutions for those things. Any comparison would need to include those things. Deputy Ward spoke about her extensive experience in Health spanning more than 4 decades. Deputy Farnham spoke about the benefits of a single site hospital. I would remind him that there are many benefits from having 2 sites. From a risk perspective having 2 facilities is a good thing. One health expert who I have known for a good number of years has always stated you should not put all of your eggs in one basket. That man has worked with 4 American Presidents and is an ambassador for the Danish Health Authority. Having the ability to split private and public services is also, in my opinion, a positive. Too many private appointments have had to be cancelled at the General, leading to some surgeons moving their private practice to the U.K. In other jurisdictions 2-site hospitals are sited miles apart. There are probably campuses that are larger than the area covered by the proposed 2 sites. We all received a copy of a letter from

the former Minister for Health and Social Services that has been published in today's local paper. The Minister wrote about some of the challenges with the existing building. I will remind Members it was that Minister who closed Samarès Ward, therefore reducing the bed space available and therefore adding pressure. I fully agree with Deputy Mézec that the site selection cannot be reopened. We have the Overdale site and we have the Gloucester Street site. Due to the urgency of providing new facilities we simply cannot start from scratch again. Where I disagree with Deputy Mézec is that the proposal simply cannot be delivered in the time given, as stated by the Minister for Infrastructure. In recognition of the remarks made by my colleague to my left, the Constable of St. Martin, perhaps an amendment to this proposal, moving the timetable to the end of September would have been a better solution. In terms of safe comparisons the Deputy spoke about playing the man and not the ball. I raised my concerns in the original debate about the lack of detail and I have no issue raising them now because I believe it is the ball that is in play and not the man. I do not believe in rejecting this proposal we have given the green light to a development without the detail; on the contrary I expect the Minister to bring back fully costed plans but not within 3 months but within 9 months. I believe 9 months is a realistic time expectation. One of the most attractive elements of the revised plan is to be able to do things in a staged way. Having the build project in phases allows more contractors to tender for the work, making it more competitive when it comes to pricing. I am delighted that the Deputy has accepted the Constable's amendment because in my extensive logistic experience that super highway was never needed and hopefully will be. I ask Members to reject the proposal and allow the team to focus up on drawing their plans.

7.1.11 Deputy K. Wilson:

I speak as somebody who has worked at the front line, who has managed clinical services, who has been a director of nursing in 3 large organisations, who has been a chief executive of an N.H.S. trust of similar size to the services that we are operating now. What I want to talk to the Assembly about is that in that experience what I have known is that healthcare constantly evolves and the delivery of that healthcare constantly evolves. So it is likely that whatever building facilities that we end up with they will change in the future. The reason I make that point is because we need to have facilities that can respond and be flexible to this change in the delivery of healthcare going forward and to be able to adapt as and when those changes occur.

[17:15]

Of course we will need to refresh the current functional briefs and determine the optimalness of services. Of course we will need to remodel the workforce, of course we will need to make sure that patients are first and foremost in our thinking as to how we deliver modern healthcare facilities. While many clinicians were in support of the single site many have thrown their support behind the change in direction. That is to be welcomed because that shows that staff themselves recognise the evolution of healthcare, particularly the advantages that can be gained by developing the technological solutions that support them in their everyday work. The requirement for a new hospital is not in dispute. With every year that passes we know that we are spending millions of pounds on backlog maintenance and so it is absolutely vital that we expedite the work on our new health facilities as quickly as possible. We need to move on, we need to resolve the issues of struggling to attract a workforce that does not want to come and work in facilities that are falling apart. We need to be able to offer a service that is operating in modern, fit-for-purpose facilities and those facilities will be adaptable according to the changes that are presented. The options around multi-site facilities will deliver safe, clinical services so please do not be under any assumption that it would be unsafe or it will not be manageable, or there will be operational difficulties between it. Most healthcare systems, modern healthcare systems, find ways to become efficient and effective in operating around a multi-site option. One of the things that I want to say to the Assembly is that we have to make sure that we can come to an agreement quickly, and I agree with the Constable of St. John, around the assurances that we need to give to the public and patients about the cost as well as the clinical

effectiveness of the care that we are providing. I would urge the work that we do to come to fruition quickly so that we can assure the public that we have the right model of service in place for them and I would urge Members to reject this proposition, thank you.

7.1.12 Deputy M.R. Scott:

This has been an interesting debate with many interesting and valid points made on each side. I think the real problem here is process, because as was mentioned by Scrutiny, the rather hastily put together Future Hospital Panel, what we probably should be debating here is the revoking of the proposition that was passed by the former States Assembly and it has not actually happened. This is not what this is. That would be the proper way, in the same way as Deputy Farnham and Deputy Gorst are seeking to revoke the former States Assembly to remove Senators. That would have been the thing to do but that is not what has happened here. Instead we find we are debating an amendment that would affect the Government Plan, that would affect the budgeting and, ultimately, I think we just have to be quite honest that what is really informing our positions are basically how we feel about the hospital itself, about the way ... the actual plans, what our electorate have told us about it, how we feel about the public spending generally. How we feel about multi-site hospitals. In fact there are 2 schools of opinion there, one that is saying it must ... it is so much better for the patients to be on one single site. Another saying: "Well, it is better, in fact why would you have your maternity ward in an area where people might get infected?" All these questions that perhaps have never really been resolved because of the original processes, because of past processes, each time a hospital proposal has been considered by this States Assembly. While I can probably understand about the current Minister for Infrastructure is that it is not really so great with all this red tape and processes, he is just being quite pragmatic about trying to do something that will get a hospital that is reasonably within our means within a short time. Instead I am hearing people talking about valuing accountability, delivery and transparency, outlined business cases as well as public spending. I would be interested to see whether those issues come up when I bring in my own amendment to the Government Plan in the form of amendment 14, but that is a different story. It is quite interesting how inconsistent people's positions can be on different propositions. I have listened to this debate, I do know what my own constituents feel about the hospital and about the process and the way it is gone about, and the sense of relief that a lot of people have expressed to me about the fact that the Minister for Infrastructure, the Council of Ministers have decided to review this decision and use the advice of somebody who can produce something within a shorter time. Yes, I know the clinicians actually, or certain clinicians, have expressed a certain point of view about what they would like and I also know that this is indeed an Island 9 miles by 5 so our clinicians will not be travelling huge distances to get from One Hospital building to the other. I will be, regrettably, Deputy Farnham, voting against your proposition.

7.1.13 The Connétable of St. Helier:

As Members will know, if they have read the report accompanying my amendment, on 3 occasions I attempted to change the course of the previous hospital project by removing what came to be called the super highway from it. I do not think I coined that term but it certainly became one that is quite current. That is why, to be consistent with those 3 amendments, I put an amendment to Deputy Farnham's proposition because I knew I would not be able to support it while the risk of carving up People's Park, Westmount Road, the bowling club, the trees and so on was still a risk. The disappointment for me from the 100-day review, although of course it went on a bit longer than 100 days, by Government was that the outcome was not at all clear cut. I still do not know whether the new multi-site option being pursued by Government will lead to that collateral damage to St. Helier's environment and to its heritage, of which I have been fighting against for the last several years. That is why I believe it is important, if we are going to have this review of the true costs involved, that that sum is known because clearly it may well influence what we do in the future. I am very grateful to members of the public, former Minister for Health and Social Services Deputy Renouf for his letter

in today's paper, and to the Constable of St. Clement who cannot be with us today but he emailed us with his reservations about proceeding without having more financial detail. I am also aware that Deputy Feltham, as chair of the Public Accounts Committee, spoke very well, very cogently. She does not want to be in a position with her committee to have to review with hindsight, because that is what P.A.C. does, of course. They cannot stop things happening, they can only look at the disasters after they have taken place. I have been in this Assembly long enough to know that there sure have been some disasters when it comes to capital projects. I do not know whether Deputy Ozouf was being ironic when he referred to the incinerator, but that is certainly one of them. I have just come back from a Crown Dependencies meeting in our sister Island in Guernsey and they showed us very well why we made a big mistake in pursuing that project and not thinking really carefully before we went ahead. So I believe there was definitely merit in Deputy Farnham's proposition. I think it is a shame that some Members have been playing the man, not the ball. That seems a very timely phrase to be using in these days of the World Cup. But as far as his changing his mind about the so-called super highway goes, I am sure Deputy Farnham can reply for himself as to why he has had a change of heart about that. I will be supporting his proposition.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

There are only a few minutes left and we have a very long week, can I call for the adjournment? Other people may want to speak fresh in the morning.

The Bailiff:

Let me just sound out the Assembly. Could Members indicate if they are intending to speak if they have not already spoken? There are at least 2 speeches, which may be of some significant dent, together with the summing up. Deputy Ward is entirely right. Standing Orders require I wait until half past but I do not think there is anything wrong in considering the question of the adjournment now. The Deputy proposed the adjournment and I will take it is proposed and seconded. **[Seconded]** Do Members agree? Very well, the States stands adjourned now until 9.30 a.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

[17:26]