OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

MICHAELMAS MEETING OF CHIEF PLEAS OF THE ISLAND OF SARK

HANSARD

Assembly Room, Sark, Wednesday, 30th September 2026

All published Official Reports can be found on the official Island of Sark Chief Pleas website www.sarkgov.co.uk

Volume 12, No. 7

Published by The Greffier of Sark, La Chasse Marette, Sark, GY10 1SF. *© Chief Pleas of Sark, 2025*

Present:

Seigneur
Maj. C M Beaumont Esq.

Speaker of Chief Pleas
P M Armorgie Esq.

Deputy Prévôt
J Godwin

Greffier
T J Hamon

Treasurer
S Hudson

Constable
P Burgess

Assistant Constable
Jonathan Godwin

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor of the Bailiwick of Guernsey
Lt. General Richard Cripwell KBE, CB, CStJ

Conseillers:

John Guille
Helen Plummer
Carol Cragoe
Michael Locke
Natalie Tighe
Christopher Bateson
David Curtis
Edric Baker MBE
James Martin
Frank Makepeace
Patrick Dewe
Samuel Keyte
Nicolas Moloney
Karl Rang
Joseph Perrée
Michael Lanyon

Business transacted

Apologies received 5
Welcome to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor 5
General Election – Statement by the Speaker 5
Statements 6
Appointment of Procureur of the Poor – Statement by Conseiller Locke 6
Appointment of Deputy Procureur – Statement by Conseiller Locke 7
69th Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference – Statement by Conseiller Martin 7
Sark's participation in the Normandy Summit in Caen on 15 September 2026 – Statement by Conseiller Tighe 8
Bailiwick Commission Interim Report – Statement by Conseiller Guille 9
Procedural – Electronic devices 10
Business of the Day 11
1. Matters arising from the Midsummer Meeting held on 8th July 2026 11
2. Questions Not Related to the Business of the Day 11
3. Report with Propositions from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'The Real Property (Transfer Tax and Rates) (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026' – Proposition carried 13
4. Report with Proposition from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) (No.2) Law, 2026 – Proposition carried 15
5. Report with Proposition from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled Proxy Voting and to approve 'The Elections (Proxy Voting) (Sark) Ordinance, 2026' – Proposition carried 17
6. Report with Propositions from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'Commencement of The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026' and to approve 'The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2026' – Proposition carried 20
7. Report with Proposition from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'Incorporation of the Interim Electric Company (Sark Power Limited) – Proposition carried 21
8. Report with Proposition from the Scrutiny Management Committee entitled 'Revisions to the Scrutiny Framework' – Proposition carried 26
9. Report with Propositions from the Douzaine entitled 'RPI Increases to Licences and Fees for 2027' – Propositions carried 30
Chief Pleas adjourned at 6.43 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 6.50 p.m. 34
10. Report with Proposition from the Douzaine entitled 'Public Works Extras Charges List 2026'– Proposition carried 34
11. Report with Propositions from the Douzaine entitled 'Firearm and Shotgun Licencing' – Propositions carried 37

Procedural – Reordering of Business – Motion carried 40

18. Report with Proposition from the Douzaine entitled 'Establishment of a Temporary Public Transport Service'– Proposition carried 40

12. Report with Proposition from the Education Committee entitled 'Education Fees for 2026/2027' – Proposition carried 42

13. Report with Proposition from the Medical & Emergency Services Committee entitled 'Medical Concessions for Travel to Guernsey' – Propositions carried 43

14. Recruitment of Constables – Douzaine Report considered 47

15. Sark School Annual Report – Education Committee Report considered 49

16. Committee Elections 51

17. Committee and Panel Elections Education Committee: Mrs Jade Perrée elected as a non-voting member 51

Budget Meeting – Statement by the Speaker 51

Chief Pleas closed at 7.44 p.m. 52

Michaelmas Meeting of Chief Pleas

Chief Pleas met at 5 p.m.

[THE SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

PRAYER
The Greffier

ROLL CALL
The Greffier

The Greffier: There are 16 Conseillers, the Seigneur and the Speaker of Chief Pleas present.

The Speaker: Very good. Thank you, Greffier. Thank you very much indeed. A warm welcome to the Michaelmas Meeting of Chief Pleas 2026.

Apologies received

The Speaker: I have apologies for absence from Conseiller Rose, who cannot be with us this evening. She has sent her apologies.

Welcome to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor

The Speaker: However, we are very pleased to welcome His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor of the Bailiwick of Guernsey, Sir Richard Cripwell, to this evening's meeting. You are very welcome, sir.

General Election –
Statement by the Speaker

The Speaker: I would like to make a statement to begin the proceedings. Therefore, as Speaker of Chief Pleas and the Returning Officer for Sark, I would like to take this opportunity to formally confirm that the next general election in Sark will take place on 25th November 2026; getting ever closer.

I remind all those who wish either to vote in that election or to stand as a candidate that they must ensure that they are registered on the electoral roll by 6th November 2026. Registration on the electoral roll is an essential requirement both for participation as an elector and for eligibility as a candidate. I would encourage anyone who is not yet registered to do so without delay via the Greffe Office.

A primary responsibility of the Returning Officer is to ensure that the elections are conducted freely, fairly, and impartially. This principle is a cornerstone of any democracy, and particularly so in a community as young, as close-knit, and unique as Sark. Every vote matters. Indeed, in Sark it is often the case that the difference between success and failure can be measured in only a handful of votes and sometimes in a single vote.

Our small administrative team will do everything within its power to ensure that all members of the Sark electorate are able to cast their votes freely, fairly and without hindrance. We are particularly mindful of the growing risks posed by interference, disruption and misinformation through digital channels, and the increasing use of artificial intelligence technologies by third party bad actors seeking to influence electoral outcomes. And we encourage people to think critically and to ask for evidence if and when they are exposed to persuasive political arguments that they believe perhaps are not genuine.

Any attempt to interfere or to manipulate the democratic process is not only unlawful, but it is also entirely contrary to the principles of free and fair elections. Such conduct undermines public confidence, damages democratic institutions, and is especially unacceptable in a community where electoral outcomes can be so finely balanced. I therefore urge anyone who believes that they are being subjected to undue influence, intimidation, bullying or the deliberate spread of misinformation, to report the matter immediately and without hesitation both to the Returning Officer and also to the Sark Constables. Prompt reporting will help ensure that any concerns can be properly investigated and that the integrity of the election is protected.

The strength of our democracy depends upon the confidence of its electorate. Together we must ensure that the forthcoming general election is conducted with fairness, transparency, respect and integrity.

Thank you for that. Those words are very carefully chosen.

STATEMENTS

Appointment of Procureur of the Poor – Statement by Conseiller Locke

The Speaker: I move on to Statements from Conseillers and we have this evening tabled four statements, and the first is from Conseiller Locke, the Chair of the Douzaine.

Conseiller Locke, thank you.

Conseiller Locke: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

This is reference to the appointment of a new Procureur of the Poor. Mrs Kathleen Dewe is now stepping down from that post, having served first as Deputy Procureur and, for the past two years, as Procureur. These posts are invaluable to the Island and to those of our community in need. The Douzaine would like to express our deepest thanks to her for carrying out this role with compassion and practicality to great effect. She, and the Douzaine, have been ably supported in this by the current Deputy Procureur, Ms Paula Williams, and we would like to appoint her as the new Procureur for the next two years.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Locke.

What we would like to do is to carry this item forward to be confirmed as an agenda item for approval at an Extraordinary Meeting of Chief Pleas to be scheduled for 30th October.

Appointment of Deputy Procureur –
Statement by Conseiller Locke

The Speaker: Conseiller Locke, you have a further statement?

Conseiller Locke: Thank you, sir.

In discussions, the Procureurs have suggested a new and willing volunteer as Deputy Procureur, Ms Louise Hill. The Douzaine would like to thank her for stepping forward and would like her to be appointed as Deputy Procureur.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Locke.

Once again, this will be carried forward and confirmed as an agenda item for approval at an Extraordinary Meeting of Chief Pleas to be scheduled for 30th October.

Thank you, Conseiller Locke.

69th Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference –
Statement by Conseiller Martin

The Speaker: The second statement is from Conseiller Martin.

Conseiller Martin, thank you.

Conseiller Martin: Thank you, sir.

Recently I attended the 69th Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in Cape Town, South Africa from 13th to 19th September. Firstly I would like to thank Conseiller Tighe for her invaluable support given to me from the beginning to the end of this journey, and to all the CPA Small Branches that attended the summit who, how could we say, looked out for Sark in such a large attendance.

The conference theme was Strengthening International Law and Parliamentary Democracy in a Changing World Order. There were over 1,000 delegates from across the Commonwealth, from large national parliaments to small branches like Sark, with observer delegations including Morocco, Ukraine and Brunei.

The overview of so many topics were Disability Rights and Accessible Parliaments; making chambers accessible while respecting heritage buildings, including livestreaming with subtitles and hearing assistance. Inclusive Small Parliaments; practical challenges shared by parliaments of around 20 members with small staffs, like ours. Parliament and adaptation; the role of parliaments in climate adaptation and scrutinising climate finance. Post-Legislative Scrutiny; how to review laws three to five years after they are passed to stop 'zombie laws', using citizen panels. CPA organisation; CPA finances are now as strong, with new initiatives including a Small Branches Fund, a 50% gender parity target by 2031, and new Greenmills environmental awards.

Benefits for Sark: attendance was highly relevant to Sark. Small parliaments face the same issues we do and it was valuable to hear how others approach them with limited resources. I have returned with some low-cost ideas that were discussed elsewhere, which could be explored further if Chief Pleas wishes, always with regard to our own context and capacity.

Funding: the CPA has a Small Branches Fund to support development such as exchanges and professional development. The next application window is in early 2027. I have been told that that window is now open. Sark has already been flagged at CPA executive level.

Efficiency: other parliaments shared their experiences of different sittings patterns and secure remote participation. Sark deliberately moved from daytime sittings to evenings after five o'clock in recent years to encourage working people to attend; a principle we should continue to protect. Any alternative model would need to be weighed very carefully against that aim.

Accountability: some jurisdictions use a formal timeframe for Government responses to committee reports, and pilot reviews of older legislation. While interesting models, I recognise that Sark has restricted capacity and that such a formal rule could add further pressure.

Our Chamber: simple, low-cost improvements for accessibility were discussed, such as hearing assistance and options for livestreaming, which could be looked at in due course.

I would like to thank the CPA for their contributions in helping get to South Africa, and our hosts in South Africa, and I am very happy to share my full notes with any Member of the Chief Pleas who would like me to.

Thank you, sir.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Martin, for that statement.

Sark's participation in the Normandy Summit in Caen on 15 September 2026 – Statement by Conseiller Tighe

The Speaker: The third statement this evening is from Conseiller Tighe.

Conseiller Tighe, your statement. please.

Conseiller Tighe: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

This statement provides an update on Sark's participation in the Normandy Summit, held in Caen on 15th September 2026. The summit brought together representatives from Normandy, La Manche, Jersey, Guernsey, Alderney and Sark to discuss shared regional priorities and strengthen cooperation across the Channel.

The meeting was chaired by President Hervé Morin, with contributions from Jean Morin, President of La Manche; the Regional Prefect Jean-Benoît Albertini; the Maritime Prefect Vice Admiral Emmanuel Slaars; and senior officers from both Prefectures. Jersey's delegation included Senator Lyndon Farnham and Deputy Kirsten Morel, while Guernsey was represented by Deputy Lindsay de Sausmarez, Deputy Steve Falla and Deputy Mark Laine. Alderney was represented by Deputy Edward Hill and James Robinson, whilst Sark was represented by myself.

The agenda covered various topics including maritime affairs, energy and environment; connectivity and tourism; immigration; maritime security and pollution; and the 2027 Norman Millennium. While many of these subjects relate primarily to the larger jurisdictions, several areas have direct relevance to Sark.

Connectivity: Sark's central priority connectivity remains a critical strategic issue for Sark. The summit included a dedicated item on Manche Îles Express and wider transport links. The Normandy region expressed continued interest in strengthening sea connectivity, which was reciprocated as the service is essential for visitors, and continuing to support the growth, strength and resilience of Sark's local visitor economy.

Normandy also raised potential air routes between the Channel Islands and the region. While these proposals primarily concern Jersey and Guernsey, the discussion recognised the importance of ensuring that any developments consider onward passenger flows and the practical realities of small-island tourism.

Immigration and tourism flows: the summit included updates on ETA/EES systems and the French ID card scheme. These changes will affect visitor movement between Normandy and the

Bailiwick. Clear communication to visitors and co-ordination across the islands will be essential to minimise disruption to tourism, which remains a cornerstone of Sark's economy.

Maritime safety and pollution response: for the first time, the Maritime Prefect attended the Summit. His contribution focused on cross-border co-operation in maritime safety and pollution response. Strengthened operational links between French authorities and the Bailiwick are of clear benefit to all jurisdictions, including Sark, given the Island's reliance on maritime access and emergency support.

2027 Year of the Normans – Sark's Contribution: a portion of the summit was dedicated to preparations for the Millenium – 2027 European Year of the Normans, marking the 1,000th anniversary of the birth of William the Conqueror. This programme will be one of the most prominent regional initiatives next year, with extensive cultural, historical, and community-led events across Normandy and the Channel Islands.

Sark is pleased to be contributing to this international programme and to be part of the wider network of Norman-themed projects. The Island will host: a new theatre production, written by Sue Daly and performed by the Sark Theatre Group; a Norman metalfest, offering a contemporary cultural angle within the historic theme; a printed pamphlet featuring a potted history of Sark and everyday Sarkese expressions, supporting both education and visitor engagement; and a commemorative set of stamps, released through Guernsey Post, drawing on Sark's Norman heritage and visual identity.

These events aim to encourage visitors with an interest in Norman history, cultural heritage and small-island traditions. Sark's participation demonstrates the Island's enthusiasm for celebrating its historic links with Normandy and contributing meaningfully to a major regional cultural moment.

The summit provided a valuable opportunity for Sark to ensure that the realities of small-island life are reflected in regional discussions. Connectivity, tourism flows and maritime co-operation remain central to Sark's future, and continued engagement with Normandy and La Manche will support the Island's long-term resilience.

Sark is also proud to play an active role in the 2027 Year of the Normans, contributing to a programme that will attract visitors, strengthen cultural ties, and highlight the Island's unique heritage.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Tighe, for that statement.

Bailiwick Commission Interim Report – Statement by Conseiller Guille

The Speaker: Finally, we have a fourth statement this evening from Conseiller Guille.

Conseiller Guille, thank you.

Conseiller Guille: Thank you, sir.

Mr Speaker, the Policy and Finance Committee welcomes the Bailiwick Commission's interim report and the substantial progress made during the first phase of its inquiry. The report gives a clear and accessible account of the evidence gathered so far, the themes that have emerged and the questions that will shape the Commission's work in the year ahead. We thank Sir Bob Neill and his fellow Commissioners for approaching this important task independently, openly and with a genuine willingness to listen across all three islands.

We particularly welcome the values that the Commission has placed at the heart of its work: respect for the distinct identities, autonomy and ways of life of each island; trust through

independence and transparency; practical, proportionate and realistic recommendations; conclusions grounded in evidence and consultation; and sustainability. For Sark, respect for our identity and self-government is essential, but so too is an honest recognition that carefully designed co-operation can help protect the services and way of life that our community values.

The Committee also welcomes the balanced way in which the interim report describes the Guernsey-Sark relationship. It recognises both the strong desire in Sark to retain autonomy and the practical pressures created by a challenging financial and regulatory environment. It also acknowledges that many existing arrangements have developed individually over time, often relying on goodwill and personal relationships rather than a single clear framework. That diagnosis should not be seen as criticism. It is an opportunity to replace uncertainty with greater clarity, resilience and mutual confidence.

We therefore specifically welcome the Commission's intention to examine the Guernsey-Sark relationship in greater detail, particularly the provision of services. Clear, jointly developed arrangements should identify what is being provided, the standard and scope of each service, how costs are calculated, how performance is monitored, and how arrangements can be reviewed as circumstances change. This is especially important in areas such as health and social care and education, where reliability, continuity and responsiveness have a direct effect on Islanders' lives.

We encourage every Islander to take part as the Commission develops and tests its recommendations over the coming year. The strength of the final report will depend on the breadth and quality of the evidence it receives, including from people who may not usually engage with formal consultation. Residents, families, young people, businesses, voluntary organisations and service users all have experience that can help the Commission understand what works, what does not and what should change. We encourage Islanders to attend future engagement events and to submit their views directly to the Commission.

The Committee welcomes this important milestone and looks forward to working with the Commission, our Bailiwick partners and the people of Sark so that the final recommendations strengthen co-operation, secure sustainable services and preserve the autonomy, identity and distinctive way of life of each Island.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Guille, for that statement.

That completes the four statements that were requested at the beginning of this evening's meeting.

Procedural –
Electronic devices

The Speaker: A short statement from me. Just a reminder, you have heard me say this before, I say it again as a gentle nudge, please can I remind all Conseillers to switch their microphones on before they start speaking and then to turn them off again when they have finished speaking. You are all pretty good at that now, but just a quick reminder.

Now at this point, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, I would remind all present that electronic devices, mobile telephones, recording devices, cameras, etc., and other electronic equipment must be switched off now, less for those allowed to Chief Pleas Members in accordance with Rule 19.2.

Business of the Day

1. Matters arising from the Midsummer Meeting held on 8th July 2026

The Speaker: On to the Agenda proper. Agenda Item 1 is to deal with matters arising from the Midsummer Meeting held on 8th July 2026. Are there any matters arising from that Midsummer Meeting on 8th July? Any matters, any points, any points of reference? No, okay.

2. Questions Not Related to the Business of the Day

The Speaker: In which case we will move on to Agenda Item 2, which is Questions not related to the Business of the Day. I would just again remind everyone that, in accordance with Rule of Procedure 8, these questions were submitted within the statutory five clear days before today's meeting. This will be followed by an answer from the Chair or Deputy Chair of the Committee to whom the question has been addressed and, as ever, I cannot allow any further general debate about each question or any supplementary questions to enable everyone to focus on the question in hand.

Number one is from Conseiller Makepeace, and it is, I think, to Conseiller Martin as Chair of the Harbours, Shipping and Pilotage Committee.

Conseiller Makepeace, thank you.

Conseiller Makepeace: Yes, to the Chair of Harbours and Shipping. This is regarding unmet passenger demand during the summer.

Conseillers were informed recently that on several occasions during the summer Sark Shipping had been unable to provide additional sailings when passenger demand exceeded the available capacity. Can the Committee advise approximately how many passengers were unable to travel as a result and what the approximate loss of potential revenue to Sark Shipping was from those passengers?

Question two: winter sailings. With a reduced winter timetable and fewer alternative sailings available to residents, can the Committee give an assurance that advertised scheduled sailings will not be withdrawn simply because passenger numbers fall below the level required for that particular sailing to break even, and that cancellations will only occur where necessary for technical, operational, weather or safety reasons?

Thank you, sir.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace.

Obviously there are two questions there, as Conseiller Makepeace quite correctly pointed out, and therefore I am going to deal with them as two separate questions and possibly two separate answers. I believe that, Conseiller Martin, you have got the answer to the first part of Question 1.

Conseiller Martin, thank you.

Conseiller Martin: Thank you, sir, yes.

Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace for your questions. In relation to the first question, numerous sailings throughout the season reached their booking capacity, sometimes several days before the sailing, and both residents and visitors regularly reported difficulties securing places on particular crossings. Whilst we cannot yet put a precise figure on the number of passengers affected, it is clear that demand exceeded available capacity on a number of occasions.

The Committee is working closely with the new Board and the Managing Director of the Isle of Sark Shipping to better understand the scale of that unmet demand, the reasons additional capacity was not always available, and the lessons that can be learned for future seasons. Once our work has been completed, the Committee will share its findings with Conseillers.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Martin.

The second part of Conseiller Makepeace's question is more tourism related. Is that being dealt with by Conseiller Tighe on behalf of the Tourism Committee?

Thank you.

Conseiller Tighe: Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace, for your question.

In relation to the second question, the importance of maintaining confidence in the published timetable is fully recognised, particularly during the winter period when residents have fewer travel options available to them. Whilst it is not possible to provide an absolute guarantee that no sailing will ever be withdrawn, there are protections in place through the service level agreement between the Harbours, Shipping and Pilotage Committee and Sark Shipping.

The purpose of that agreement is to ensure the provision of an agreed level of lifeline service to the Island and to provide a framework within which service changes are considered. Any alterations to scheduled services would be expected to be justified by genuine operational, technical, safety or weather-related considerations rather than solely by the commercial performance of an individual sailing.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Tighe.

Conseiller Makepeace, you had a third question, I believe.

Conseiller Makepeace: Yes, this was to the Policy and Finance Committee/Tax Committee.

I would just like to ask, how can the joint Committees justify the use of the word 'scaremongering' in an official Government of Sark Taxation Report?

On page 22, under the heading 'Opting Out of Declaring Assets', the exact sentence is:

> There has perhaps inevitably been a certain degree of scaremongering around the proposed taxation changes.

This implies that those raising concerns about tax reform are deliberately creating unnecessary fear. Yet the same report admits that no final decisions have been made and that fundamental questions about valuation, administration, exemptions and fairness remain unresolved.

How can Islanders be accused of scaremongering about proposals when Government itself cannot yet tell them exactly what those proposals will be? People are not scaremongering by questioning changes that could affect their savings, assets, privacy and financial security. They are exercising their right to scrutinise their Government.

If any statements have been false or deliberately misleading, identify them and provide the evidence. Otherwise, legitimate public concern should not be dismissed with labels.

Thank you, sir.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace.

Who would like to respond to that question?

Conseiller Guille, thank you.

Conseiller Guille: Thank you, sir.

Mr Speaker, the Policy and Finance Committee and the Taxation Review Committee would like to take this opportunity to thank Islanders for the significant time, effort and thought invested in

the tax reform consultation process so far. The level of engagement has been extremely encouraging and demonstrates that Islanders care deeply about Sark's future, the sustainability of public services and the fairness of the Islanders' tax system.

The update published last week was intended to keep Islanders informed about the consultation response and the next stages of reform. There is nothing wrong with raising concerns about taxation or asking questions about valuation, administration, exemptions, privacy or fairness. Those concerns are welcome and have directly influenced the more limited approach for 2027 and the decision to develop the wider package of changes for 2028.

The concern arises where people with bad intentions, often external to Sark, deliberately misstate what is planned or circulate claims that decisions have already been taken when they have not. That misinformation is damaging to Sark and to confidence in our democratic processes. The wording was not directed at Islanders engaging honestly and constructively, and it should not be read as dismissing legitimate scrutiny.

As the update makes clear, much remains to be worked through. The 2028 work will carefully consider non-pension savings and similar arrangements reasonably set aside for retirement, healthcare, future care needs or later life security. It will seek to ensure that residents in that position are not unfairly disadvantaged, that those on low incomes are not disproportionately affected, that reform does not make Sark unattractive to newcomers, and that options remain which do not require disclosure of assets.

Both Committees remain committed to listening carefully and ensuring that final proposals reflect the concerns, priorities and aspirations expressed by the community.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Guille.

Conseiller Makepeace, thank you very much indeed for your three questions. Thank you for the answers from each of the Committees concerned. Always very enlightening to get some background information based on the questions.

3. Report with Propositions from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'The Real Property (Transfer Tax and Rates) (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026' – Proposition carried

To consider a Report with Propositions from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'The Real Property (Transfer Tax and Rates) (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026'

Proposition 1:
Chief Pleas rescinds its resolution (resolution 4, Midsummer Meeting, 8th July 2026) to approve the draft Projet de Loi entitled 'The Real Property (Transfer Tax, Charging and Related Provisions) (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026'.

Proposition 2:
That Chief Pleas approves The Real Property (Transfer Tax and Rates) (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026.

The Speaker: Moving along, if we may, to Agenda Item 3. Agenda Item 3 is: to consider a Report with Propositions from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'The Real Property (Transfer Tax and Rates) (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026'. I believe that Conseiller Perrée is going to introduce the Report.

Conseiller Perrée, thank you.

Conseiller Perrée: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

At its Midsummer Meeting 2026, Chief Pleas approved The Real Property (Transfer Tax, Charging and Related Provisions) (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026. The purpose of that legislation was to reduce the rate of Property Transfer Tax (PTT) payable on restricted dwellings, commonly referred to as Local Market properties, from 7.5% to 4%. The purpose of this reform is straightforward: to make transactions in the Local Market more accessible and affordable for those who live in Sark and rely upon that market for their housing needs.

Unfortunately, an error in the drafting of the legislation meant that, in addition to reducing the rate of PTT on restricted dwellings, the amendment would also have removed non-dwelling property, including land, from the scope of PTT altogether. This was not identified until after Chief Pleas had approved the legislation. Fortunately, the error was identified before the legislation received Royal Assent and therefore before it came into force. As a result, no transactions have been affected and no PTT revenue has been lost.

Chief Pleas is therefore asked to approve The Real Property (Transfer Tax and Rates) (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026 Sark. The revised legislation gives effect to the original policy intention by reducing the rate of PTT on restricted dwellings from 7.5% to 4% while retaining the existing 7.5% rate for all other property transactions. It is also necessary for Chief Pleas to rescind its previous approval of the earlier version of the legislation.

Mr Speaker, originally Items 3 and 4 were combined into a single law. Following updated advice from the Law Officers, they have been separated into two separate laws, which have been placed at the end of each bench and were circulated to all Conseillers ahead of this meeting. There is no change to the actual text from the original single law that was distributed.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Perrée. Thank you very much indeed.

Right, I see a hand up over there. Any questions or queries from the floor for Policy and Finance?

Conseiller Makepeace, thank you.

Conseiller Makepeace: I am asking this out of interest, really, because I am not too clear about the procedure. Obviously the Report states that the drafting error was not identified until after Chief Pleas had approved the legislation. Can someone explain what legal and quality assurance checks a draft undergoes before it is presented to Chief Pleas, and why those checks would fail to identify an error significant enough to remove land and other non-dwelling from Transfer Tax altogether? I am just inquisitive of how the actual process works.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace.

Conseiller Guille, thank you. Would you like to respond on that?

Conseiller Guille: Thank you, sir.

It is a very good and fair question from Conseiller Makepeace. All policy is drafted and checked at St James's Chambers before it comes to Chief Pleas and in this case, after it had come to Chief Pleas and been passed, it was St James's Chambers who realised that an error had been made in the policy drafting. So they have highlighted this and therefore that is why we find ourselves revisiting it today.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Guille.

Are there any other queries or questions for P&F from the floor regarding the Report and this law? Any other questions or queries? I should just point out before we get – there are two

Propositions attached to this; one is to rescind the original legislation that was passed at Midsummer and the second one is to approve the second piece of the legislation.

There is also a typo in the Proposition 2. If you could have a look at Proposition 2, I would like to propose that we remove the words at the end of the Proposition, so the Proposition will – well I will read it out in its full term: Proposition 2 – I am not voting on this just yet. Proposition 2, that Chief Pleas approves The Real Property (Transfer Tax and Rates) (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026; there are three words in there which do not need to be in there. So I am just pointing that out to you. That is Proposition 2, before it says 2026, is to remove the words 2026, Sark and Law.

I will recap that when we get to the Proposition. But if you can follow that, then we will deal with that when we get to Proposition 2. Slightly confusing.

So any further points or questions before we go to the two Propositions? No. Okay. So therefore Proposition 1 reads as follows: Chief Pleas rescinds its resolution (resolution 4, Midsummer Meeting, 8th July 2026) to approve the draft Projet de Loi entitled 'The Real Property (Transfer Tax, Charging and Related Provisions) (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026'. Those in favour of that Proposition please raise your hands. Thank you. Those against? And that is **carried.** Thank you very much.

The amended Proposition 2 reads as follows: that Chief Pleas approves 'The Real Property (Transfer Tax and Rates) (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026'. Those in favour, please raise your hands. Thank you. Those against? And that is also **carried**.

That amended legislation is now carried and I will present that to the Law Officers tomorrow.

Thank you.

4. Report with Proposition from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) (No.2) Law, 2026 – Proposition carried

To consider a Report with Proposition from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) (No.2) Law, 2026'.

Proposition 1:
That Chief Pleas approves The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) (No. 2) Law, 2026.

The Speaker: Not unconnected with that, we move on to Agenda Item 4. Agenda Item 4, which is: to consider a Report with a single Proposition from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) (No.2) Law, 2026'. I would like to ask Conseiller Cragoe to introduce the Report.

Conseiller Cragoe, thank you.

Conseiller Cragoe: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker, Sark requires a taxation system capable of supporting present and future needs. Public services, central infrastructure, contingency planning and rebuilding reserves require a stable and sustainable revenue base. That said, tax reform is not simply about raising money. It must also be fair, proportionate, practical to administer and capable of supporting Sark's long-term resilience.

The ongoing tax consultation has been extremely valuable and constructive. Islanders have raised important issues about affordability, privacy, retirement savings, administrative simplicity and Sark's attractiveness as a place to live. As part of our response to that, this proposal before Chief Pleas is a limited and targeted measure for 2027.

Mr Speaker, box 2 on the tax form currently enables any and all people living in the same household as a forfait payer to elect to pay the minimum personal capital tax regardless of the claimant's income, assets, or wider circumstances. There is presently no limit on the number of household members who can make that election. One forfait payer can therefore support multiple minimum tax claims, including by individuals who may have substantial means.

While a limited household relief may be justified, such as for spouses or partners, unrestricted box 2 can produce outcomes that are difficult to defend. Individuals who may have the capacity to make a substantially greater contribution can nevertheless limit their liability to the minimum tax solely because they share a household with a forfait payer. Where that happens, the revenue required to support public services and essential infrastructure must instead be raised from other taxpayers. This does not reflect principles of fairness or the ability to contribute, which should underpin any modern tax system.

The amendment before Chief Pleas, therefore, retains box 2 but limits it to one person per household. The household will have the first opportunity to decide who claims. So this is one person in addition to the forfait payer, not one per household. If the competing declarations are submitted and no decision is notified within a reasonable period, the first declaration delivered to and processed by the tax assessor will take effect.

Now it is not currently possible to estimate exactly how much this will raise because box 2 does not currently require any disclosure of net assets. But it is not expected to reduce revenue. It is likely that anyone who can only afford the minimum tax would only pay minimum tax. Other people may pay more.

The proposal to restrict box 2 is a limited and targeted change for the 2027 tax year, response to the need for fairness and revenue protection while respecting the consultation feedback that wider tax reform should be developed more carefully for 2028, keeps box 2 in place, preserving a simple option for one eligible member of a forfait-paying household and introduces a proportionate safeguard against multiple minimum personal tax elections arising from the same forfait-paying household. The Policy and Finance Committee recommends approval for this draft law.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Cragoe.

There we have the introduction of the Report. Do we have any questions or queries from the floor?

Yes, Conseiller Makepeace, thank you.

Conseiller Makepeace: Yes, just some clarification required. Would we need to actually define 'household'? Does a household mean spouses, partners, adult children living with parents, unrelated adults share an accommodation? I am totally in favour of this proposal because I think everybody should pay their own way, but what if several financially independent adults happen to occupy one property limiting a tax relief because they can constitute one household, because this could produce quite different consequences from applying it to a married couple. Is there a definition of 'household' for the purpose of this law?

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace, for that question.

Conseiller Cragoe, could you respond to that, please?

Conseiller Cragoe: Yes, thank you, Mr Speaker; and thank you, Conseiller Makepeace. It is a good point.

The ability to claim box 2 is already in the existing Tax Law. This is actually intended to deal with exactly the situation that Conseiller Makepeace is describing. it allows for a forfait payer and

one additional person claiming box 2. We considered limiting that or making it more specific, making it a spouse or a civil partner, but we felt the complexity of potential family relationships, it is impossible to know really how someone might be structuring. There might be two friends who are sharing. So therefore, it is up to the individual – it is up to the possessor paying the forfeit, and if they have additional adults in their household, to choose who would pay the box 2 and then who would not do box 2, if there are additional people beyond those two. So that will be up to the household.

It is also the response to feedback in some of the consultations, particularly around the importance of not just getting rid of box 2 altogether, but recognising that there are households where people do share their finances.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Cragoe.

Are you content with that, Conseiller Makepeace? Yes. Okay. Do we have any further questions for the Policy and Finance Committee regarding this piece of legislation before you this afternoon? Any other questions, queries, points?

Would you like to sum up, Conseiller Cragoe? Or are you happy to go straight to the Proposition?

Conseiller Cragoe: I am happy to go straight to the Proposition.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Very good. Thank you.

Therefore the Proposition reads as follows: that Chief Pleas approves 'The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) (No.2) Law, 2026'. Those in favour. Thank you. And those against. That is **carried**.

Thank you very much indeed.

5. Report with Proposition from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled Proxy Voting and to approve 'The Elections (Proxy Voting) (Sark) Ordinance, 2026' – Proposition carried

To consider a Report with Proposition from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled Proxy Voting and to approve 'The Elections (Proxy Voting) (Sark) Ordinance, 2026.

Proposition 1:
That Chief Pleas approves the draft Ordinance entitled 'The Elections (Proxy Voting) (Sark) Ordinance, 2026.

.

The Speaker: Moving on to Agenda Item 5. Agenda Item 5 reads as follows: to consider a Report with Proposition from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled Proxy Voting and to approve 'The Elections (Proxy Voting) (Sark) Ordinance, 2026'. I would like to ask Conseiller Tighe to introduce the Report, please.

Conseiller Tighe, thank you.

Conseiller Tighe: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Sark's democracy is still relatively young and it is important that our democratic arrangements continue to evolve as the needs and circumstances of the Island change. The reforms introduced in recent decades were not intended to mark the end of that development. A healthy democracy should be willing to examine where practical barriers remain, learn from experience and make

proportionate improvements that enable entitled voters to participate. Proxy voting is a modest but meaningful next step in that continuing process.

The right to vote should not depend on being physically able to attend one place on one day. This is a real and practical gap in the current system. A resident may be fully entitled to vote and may have every intention of participating but can lose that opportunity because they are receiving medical treatment off Island, required to travel for work, dealing with family responsibilities or temporarily unable to attend because of illness or injury.

A modern and flourishing democracy should seek, so far as is reasonably practicable, to remove those unnecessary barriers. The proposal to introduce proxy voting does not change who is entitled to vote or the fundamentals of Sark's elections. It removes a practical barrier to participation. The arrangements have been developed with the Returning Officer and are deliberately straightforward as set out in the Report.

The entitlement to use a proxy will not extend the franchise or create a route for people with no voting right to participate. The voter must already be entitled to vote under Sark law and entered on the electoral register. The proxy must also be a person who is legally capable of acting and entitled to participate in the electoral process.

Proxy voting changes only the method by which an existing elector casts their vote. It does not change the residence requirements or any other qualification for voting.

There are of course limitations to any proxy system. It depends upon the voter choosing someone they trust and it cannot provide absolute certainty that the proxy will vote exactly as instructed.

The Ordinance addresses the risks that can be controlled. No voter may appoint more than one proxy, no person may act as proxy for more than one voter, a voter cannot cast another vote after a valid proxy appointment, and a proxy cannot vote if a voter has died or ceased to be entitled to vote before the election. False, deceptive or misleading statements and financial inducements connected with the appointment of a proxy are criminal offences.

The Committee has deliberately chosen a reform which is targeted, understandable and capable of being administered locally without placing excessive new burdens on election officials. It can be introduced in time for the forthcoming general election, then assessed in practice. That is a responsible way to improve participation now while preserving the integrity and resilience of Sark's electoral process.

The Policy and Finance Committee therefore recommends approval of 'The Elections (Proxy Voting) (Sark) Ordinance, 2026.'

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Tighe.

Are there any questions or queries from the floor from the Report that you have read and from what you just heard from Conseiller Tighe?

Yes, Conseiller Makepeace, thank you.

Conseiller Makepeace: Yes, I am in favour of the proposal. It is great to give everyone possible the chance to vote.

One question I have, one of the stated purposes of the Ordinance is to ensure that illness, injury or unavoidable absence does not prevent anyone from voting. Why then is the deadline a full week before polling day when many of precisely those circumstances could technically arise during the final week?

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace, for that question.

Policy and Finance, are you able to come back and answer that question?

Conseiller Tighe.

Conseiller Tighe: Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace, for that question, which is a really valid point.

As suggested in the introduction, this is the starting process and this can evolve and we will learn from practice. So we will take it from there.

The Speaker: Very good. Thank you.

Conseiller Plummer, thank you

Conseiller Plummer: Thank you.

I would just like to know, I know that this paper is being worked really very well; I will be supporting it. Can you say if it would be 100% guaranteed that the desires of the person would be taken to the voting booth, please?

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Plummer. Sixty four thousand dollar question for Policy and Finance, thank you.

Conseiller Tighe: No proxy system can guarantee that will happen; it really has to be someone that you absolutely trust in.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Tighe. Thank you, Conseiller Plummer.

Do we have any other questions, queries or points that you would like to ask of P&F before we go to the Proposition attached to the Report? Any other comments, observations? No. I do not see any hands going up. Would you like to sum up, Conseiller Tighe, on behalf of P&F? No. Okay.

So you have heard the Report, you have heard what Conseiller Tighe has said, and the Proposition attached to the Report reads as follows: that Chief Pleas approves the draft Ordinance entitled 'The Elections (Proxy Voting) (Sark) Ordinance, 2026. Those in favour. Thank you. Those against? That is **carried**.

Thank you very much indeed.

I would just like to make a point, not a political point, but a point as the Returning Officer. Following this vote, for the first time in Sark's history, it is now possible for Sark electors to cast their vote by proxy. This represents a significant development in our electoral arrangements and will help to ensure that those who are unable to attend in person are nevertheless able to exercise their democratic right to vote.

I therefore recommend anyone that would like to take advantage of this facility to familiarise themselves with the proxy voting timetable and the proxy voting form that are both available to download from the Chief Pleas website or for collection from the Speaker's Office during published hours. So they will be available, I am pretty sure, as from tomorrow. I am looking towards the admin team They will be available from tomorrow. I would urge anybody who wants to take advantage of that, please to do so and to tell your friends and people who perhaps might not be aware of the facility.

Thank you for that.

6. Report with Propositions from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'Commencement of The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026' and to approve 'The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2026' – Proposition carried

To consider a Report with Propositions from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'Commencement of The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026' and to approve 'The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2026'.

Proposition 1:
That Chief Pleas approves The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2026.

The Speaker: Moving, if we may, to Agenda Item 6, which is: to consider a Report with Propositions from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'Commencement of the Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026' and to approve 'The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2026'. I would like to ask Conseiller Baker to introduce the Report.

Conseiller Baker, thank you.

Conseiller Baker: Thank you very much, sir.

The background to this is that Chief Pleas, at its Easter meeting in 2026, approved The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026. The legislation redefines a dwelling as subject to tax if it has been constructed as a dwelling and used as such for one month or longer since 1st August 1976.

The legislation also allows for an ordinance to be set annually, in which Chief Pleas can agree the number of minimum of quarters on which the forfait is to be calculated. This is intended to ensure that all forfait payers make a fair minimum contribution, irrespective of the dwelling size, which also supports the Island's revenue base and long-term financial sustainability.

The draft Ordinance is the commencement Ordinance for The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026. If passed, the projet will be enforced from 30th September 2026. Policy and Finance would then bring an Ordinance to the Budget Meeting of Chief Pleas to set the specific minimum number of quarters in which a forfait is to be calculated. The Proposition is as you read it, sir.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Baker.

Does anyone have any questions for Policy and Finance or for Conseiller Baker regarding the Report and from what you have just heard?

Yes, Conseiller Makepeace, thank you.

Conseiller Makepeace: This is just a general question. Under the new 50-year test, what evidence will establish that a property was used as a dwelling for at least one month, since August 1976, and who bears the burden of proof where that historical use is disputed?

Thank you, sir.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace.

Conseiller Baker, are you able to answer that?

Thank you.

Conseiller Baker: I think it is down to the property owner to prove that fact.

The Speaker: Thank you, that is the answer. Are there any other questions for Policy and Finance regarding what you have heard, what you have read and from what you see under Agenda Item 6? Any other points or questions? No. In which case let us go – any summing up, Conseiller Baker? No, you are happy. Okay, thank you.

In which case let us go to the Proposition attached to this which reads as follows: that Chief Pleas approves The Direct Taxes (Sark) (Amendment) Law, 2026 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2026. Those in favour. Thank you. Those against? One against. Thank you, that is **carried**.

Thank you.

7. Report with Proposition from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'Incorporation of the Interim Electric Company (Sark Power Limited) – Proposition carried

To consider a Report with Proposition from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'Incorporation of the Interim Electric Company (Sark Power Limited)'.

Proposition 1:
That Chief Pleas approves the Articles and Memorandum of Incorporation for Sark Power Limited.

The Speaker: Moving to Agenda Item 7. Agenda Item 7, which reads as follows: to consider a Report with Proposition from the Policy and Finance Committee entitled 'Incorporation of the Interim Electric Company (Sark Power Limited)'. That is the Report before you and I would like to ask Conseiller Guille to introduce the Report.

Conseiller Guille, thank you.

Conseiller Guille: Mr Speaker, the compulsory purchase of Sark Electricity Ltd's assets will secure Sark's energy future for generations to come. It will allow the Island to determine its own direction and will help ensure that our electricity infrastructure is safe, reliable, sustainable and capable of meeting the current and future needs of residents and businesses.

The Policy and Finance Committee recognises that the compulsory purchase process has continued for longer than the Committee had hoped. We also recognise that this is stressful and concerning for residents and businesses, especially given the condition of the electricity network. However, the process is now progressing. A Lieutenant Seneschal has been appointed to determine the valuation methodology, and the hearing is expected to take place in October. Following the court's directions, Begbies Traynor, accountants, will undertake the valuation. The Committee is confident that compulsory purchase will be completed hopefully in the first half of 2027.

At an Extraordinary Meeting on 8th April, Chief Pleas directed Policy and Finance to establish a company limited by shares so that SEL's assets could be transferred to that company following compulsory purchase. Policy and Finance is now returning to Chief Pleas with the proposed Memorandum and Articles of Incorporation for Sark Power Ltd giving effect to that direction and ensuring that an appropriate operating vehicle can be ready when the assets transfer.

With serious apologies, the Memorandum itself was not included in the original papers. An electronic copy was distributed earlier today and a hard copy has been placed on each desk for Conseillers this evening. The papers will subsequently be updated online as well.

In the short term, as the assets move from SEL into Island ownership, it is critical that there is no disruption to the generation and distribution of electricity, that employees can continue to

operate with certainty and security, and that the existing infrastructure is made safe. Urgent remedial work will need to be undertaken wherever required.

Chief Pleas therefore need a structure which can take immediate operational responsibility once the compulsory purchase is complete. Establishing a company limited by shares, with Chief Pleas as the sole shareholder, is the prudent and practical way to do this. It also satisfies the law of compulsory purchase in which Chief Pleas is the purchaser.

It will allow electricity operations to be managed professionally with clear responsibilities and accountability while Chief Pleas retains full ownership and strategic oversight. It will also limit the Island's liability, provide legal and operational continuity, and allow the company to focus immediately on maintaining supply, supporting employees and carrying out essential safety and remedial work.

This is not intended to be the permanent ownership arrangement. It is a necessary stepping stone towards a community-based ownership structure, which it is hoped can be put in place within 18 months of purchase.

The community model should be developed for a position of certainty. Once ownership has transferred, once the true condition of the network is understood, once urgent safety work has been completed and stable operating arrangements are in place, at that point the structure can be reviewed against Sark's longer-term energy strategy as the Island moves towards a modern and sustainable energy system.

The memorandum and articles have been drafted by the Law Officers. They are based on standard constitutional documents for a Guernsey non-cellular company limited by shares, adapted for Sark Power Ltd's role. They provide the effective board management, while retaining Chief Pleas' influence as a sole shareholder, including control over the number and remuneration of directors, the ability to remove directors by ordinary resolution and a specific requirement for the board to adopt and implement a community-ownership plan in accordance with directions from Chief Pleas.

The board arrangements will be developed transparently. James Lancaster, the former Managing Director of Alderney Electricity, has already been approved by Chief Pleas as Interim Managing Director. Policy and Finance will now consider the skills, experience and independence required from the non-executive directors and will return to a future Meeting of Chief Pleas with proposed appointments and the associated governance arrangements for approval. Alan Bates, the current Managing Director of Guernsey Electricity, has already offered to sit as a non-executive director on the board if Chief Pleas wishes so; that will come to a future Meeting.

Chief Pleas will retain oversight of both the composition of the board and its performance. Policy and Finance recommends that Chief Pleas approves the Memorandum and Articles of Incorporation. Again, apologies for the missing paper. If people need to take a few minutes to read that first, then very well.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Guille, for the presentation of that report.

Let's go to questions from the floor. The first hand up was I think from Conseiller Keyte. Conseiller Keyte, coming to Conseiller Locke, followed by Conseiller Makepeace in that order. Conseiller Keyte first, thank you.

Conseiller Keyte: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

I would just like to ask for clarity of what community-based ownership means.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Keyte.

Conseiller Guille.

Conseiller Guille: In general, owned by the community for the benefit of the community. There are lots of different options of how you structure that. For example, you could give an ownership one share for each bill payer on the Island or you could give one share for each resident on the Island, then the shares would come with voting rights. You have to work through whether those shares are non-transferable.

There is a lot of detail to be worked out there: what level of decisions do the shareholders have voting rights on. Obviously you could not have everybody voting on day-to-day responsibilities for the company. Essentially, Conseiller Keyte, it is owned by the community for the benefit of the community, but the finer details of this are very much to be worked out in the future.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Keyte; thank you, Conseiller Guille.

The next hand up was Conseiller Locke, thank you.

Conseiller Locke.

Conseiller Locke: Thank you, sir.

I would just like to say that, having read the Memorandum and Articles, it does seem a completely standard set of legal documentation for setting up a company except for one item, the 33.1, which is whereby the board is instructed to adopt and implement a plan through a Sark community-based ownership structure, which is exactly as it should be. Having worked in an industry where that type of company exists, and having started up one myself, I would like to request that that plan is discussed with Future Energy and is then, at the appropriate time, taken to the community for consultation before it gets put into place too late.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Locke.

Are you able to confirm that, Conseiller Guille?

Conseiller Guille: Yes, absolutely. This whole thing is all about an energy company for the community. Once the new company is established, a new management are in place, there is a better idea of the condition of the company. Mr Lancaster and Chief Pleas will be holding multiple public meetings. It is at that point we can begin to work towards the community-ownership model.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Guille.

Conseiller Makepeace, thank you.

Conseiller Makepeace: I have actually got four questions and most of them are borne out of my confusion, as company law is not my main subject. I notice Article 2 allows the board to issue any number and different classes of shares on terms it sees fit. Can you point us to the specific provision preventing shares being issued to anyone other than Chief Pleas without Chief Pleas' prior approval? That is the first question.

The Speaker: Thank you.

We can deal with the questions one by one, if we may, Conseiller Makepeace, thank you. That is question number one.

Conseiller Guille, are you able to respond to that question?

Conseiller Guille: The Memorandum of Incorporation will be that Chief Pleas are the 100% shareholder. Not being an expert in company law either, Conseiller Makepeace, yes, I am not going to attempt to fudge my way through that answer. It would have been useful to have some questions in advance of that detail, but I believe there are provisions that Chief Pleas, for the interim company, will be the 100% shareholder.

The Speaker: Conseiller Makepeace, again.

Conseiller Makepeace: The reason I asked the question, sir, is I am not clear when Article 2.2 says:

> The company may hold Treasury shares in accordance …

I am not too familiar with Treasury shares or what type of shares they are actually. What does that actually mean? Can anyone explain that, please?

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace.

Anyone from P&F able to respond to that technical question? I have seen no hands go up from – Conseiller Cragoe, would you like to have a stab at that?

Conseiller Cragoe: I am going to make a moderately-educated guess that what it means is bonds; so Treasury bonds, I think, is what it would mean. It allows us to hold some kind of stock.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Cragoe.

Does that make sense, Conseiller Makepeace?

Conseiller Makepeace: I would not have any idea. I do not know the correct answer, sir.

The Speaker: I do not think you are alone in that, Conseiller Makepeace.

May I suggest that these questions maybe should be tabled more formally in order that P&F can go away and get some – Conseiller Guille.

Conseiller Guille: Yes, I will second that. We have proposed this on good advice from the Law Officers that this is as standard as documents of incorporation come for a company, albeit with the inclusion of the proviso to transition to a community-ownership company. This is as standard as these documents come.

I would be really happy to answer the questions of Conseiller Makepeace but we all cannot be experts in everything. We have taken the best advice from the corporate legal team at St James's Chambers and we would be happy to answer any detailed questions if Conseiller Makepeace wishes to follow them up.

The Speaker: Very good.

Just one second, Conseiller Makepeace, before I come back to you; we will answer that.

Conseiller Locke, you had a question?

Conseiller Locke: I would just really like to comment on that, although it has been some time since I was involved in this.

As a general rule, firstly, the initial shareholding of the company would be established by the Memorandum and that will have a single shareholder on it, which is Chief Pleas. Then for the company to actually be set up and get into operation, there would have to be a shareholder meeting to give instructions to the board.

It is difficult to see anything under that circumstance how the shareholders would allow any instructions to go to the board which would allow dilution of ownership or other things in that regard. That is my understanding, and dim memory, in any case. Do check it, though.

The Speaker: Thank you for that interpretation, Conseiller Locke.

Back to Conseiller Makepeace, thank you.

Conseiller Makepeace: Yes, I realise it looks like I have sprung this on Conseiller Guille and his Committee. The only reason I did not put questions to the Committee beforehand was because I thought I had gone past the deadline of the five days. Bearing in mind Conseiller Guille's comments there, I am prepared to withdraw the other two questions for now and submit them to Conseiller Guille and his Committee for consideration because I realise it looks like I have just sprung this on him tonight. If that is okay with everyone else, I will put the questions in writing to the Committee.

The Speaker: I think that is a very fair and reasonable suggestion. Are you happy with that, Policy and Finance, we can go down that route? Does it substantially change the Proposition based on the questions that Conseiller Makepeace is asking? No, okay.

Conseiller Makepeace, if you could do as you have suggested that will be very welcome, thank you.

Conseiller Keyte, you had your hand up, thank you.

Conseiller Keyte: Thank you, sir.

I do not support the compulsory purchase process. I believe there are too many unresolved risks involved. However, I recognise that, should everything go through, a company structure will be required, so to ensure continuity of service I will support the Proposition today.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Keyte.

Any comment to come back on that question? Does anyone else have any further questions about what you have heard, about what you have read on the Report? Does anyone want any extra time to consider the document that we were made aware of only this afternoon; it was mentioned in the Proposition, but the actual sight of the document, the Memorandum of Incorporation. Does anyone want any further time to read that or to consider that or to think about that before we go to the vote on the Proposition? No, I am not seeing any hands.

Conseiller Guille, thank you.

Conseiller Guille: Just for the benefit of the gallery, it was a single-page document that was left out of the original papers pack.

The Speaker: Thank you.

It will be incorporated in what is online based on what has happened today. Well, I think based on that, do we have any further questions for Policy and Finance from the floor? No? Does anyone from Policy and Finance want to sum up before we go to the Proposition? No? In which case let us go to the Proposition attached to the Report. The Proposition reads as follows: that Chief Pleas approves the Articles and Memorandum of Incorporation for Sark Power Ltd. Those in favour? Thank you. Those against? That is **carried**.

I am conscious we have been going now for about an hour and 15 minutes. I think we will crack on for a few more minutes, but please put your hand up if anyone is desperate for a comfort break.

8. Report with Proposition from the Scrutiny Management Committee entitled 'Revisions to the Scrutiny Framework' –
Proposition carried

To consider a Report with Proposition from the Scrutiny Management Committee entitled 'Revisions to the Scrutiny Framework'.

Proposition:
That Chief Pleas approves the revised Terms of Reference for the Scrutiny Management Committee and Scrutiny Panels, as attached to this Report, including the removal of the Scrutiny Panel Pool and the establishment of Scrutiny Panels on a case-by-case basis.

The Speaker: We come next to Agenda Item 8, which is: to consider a Report with Proposition from the Scrutiny Management Committee entitled 'Revisions to the Scrutiny Framework', and I would like to ask Conseiller Bateson to introduce the Report.

Conseiller Bateson, thank you.

Conseiller Bateson: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

As the Report says, this comes about after having discussions with Heidi Soulsby and Simon Fairclough from Guernsey, who have been absolutely fantastic. There are a couple of changes to the Terms of Reference which we are currently under that we would like to make. We are asking Chief Pleas if we can make some slight changes to the Terms of Reference.

As the Report says, the first one is, under the present Terms of Reference we are required to keep a standing pool of people. We have been advised we are better off not doing that. When we need a panel, we do it on a case-by-case basis and recruit people with relevant backgrounds, qualifications and such. So we wish to do away with the standing pool requirements.

There is, in the present Terms of Reference, a Scrutiny Report is to be presented to Chief Pleas. Well the Committee considers that Scrutiny should operate primarily as a mechanism for review and recommendation rather than just direct decision-making. We propose to do away with that and change it to, when the Scrutiny Report is produced by the panels it is transmitted by the Scrutiny Management Committee to the relevant Committee or Committees responsible for the subject of the review.

Those Committees would be required to consider the findings and recommendations and provide a formal response. The reasoning behind this is we are there to actually go and investigate stuff and then push it on to the Committees and they are responsible then for coming out with what they are thinking and they will take it to Chief Pleas, which would seem a better way of doing it.

There was again another thing on the present Terms of Reference. When we get a Scrutiny topic, at the moment we are required to take it to Chief Pleas for their approval. In the belief of the Committee, it is a bit like marking your own homework, so we would like to drop that idea.

We will oversee the programme but we do not want to have to bring it to Chief Pleas because they will put interference and say, 'No, you cannot do Scrutiny on that' so there was that possibility. We want to go away with that. There is also a downside to taking it to Chief Pleas: we have to wait for a Chief Pleas Meeting to do anything. Those are the changes we wish to make; not much. I would like to ask if anybody has any questions.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Bateson.

Does anyone have any questions – a number of hands up – for Conseiller Bateson? I think we will start with Conseiller Cragoe, then Conseiller Makepeace, and then Conseiller Tighe.

Conseiller Cragoe first, thank you.

Conseiller Cragoe: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker; thank you, Conseiller Bateson, for this Report.

I have to say I am struggling with some of the changes that are proposed. I think the flexible panel is a great idea. I am very concerned about the idea that the reports will simply disappear into a black hole of Committees. I think at a minimum, the report needs to be brought to Chief Pleas, as well as being given to the Committees. I do think that there is a real danger that a Committee might simply take the report and do nothing. I really have trouble with that.

I think the question as to whether all proposals for work need to be brought for approval to Chief Pleas, I see the argument, but I think at a minimum the programme needs to be presented at regular intervals. This is about accountability in Chief Pleas. I feel that simply giving a Committee of three elected members and two unelected members the responsibility for everything, I think at least it needs to be presented, those reports. We need to know, the whole body politic needs to know what is going on.

Really, for me, this is about decision-making, but it is also about ensuring that we have accountability. I think broadly this is a good idea. I hope we might be able to make some small revisions, particularly ensuring that reports and also knowledge of what is being worked on is actually brought to Chief Pleas.

Thank you very much.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Cragoe.

Conseiller Bateson, would you like to answer those points or do you want to wait until the end of the other questions?

Conseiller Bateson: I will wait until the end of the other questions.

Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: You will? Okay.

Thank you, Conseiller Cragoe; we will hold that for the time being. Conseiller Makepeace, your hand was up next, thank you.

Conseiller Makepeace: Yes, I have got the same concerns as Conseiller Cragoe, actually. It is just that if a panel makes recommendations or the Committee scrutinised rejects them, what mechanism guarantees that Chief Pleas itself can consider the panel's findings rather than the matter ending with that Committee?

I must say on a different subject, I still maintain I think the best form of scrutiny and the quickest form of scrutiny from my point of view, and hopefully for others, is the ability to be able to put questions forward at the start of the meeting. It is direct, you can approach anyone, and I personally think that is far better than any Scrutiny Panel. It does not need setting up, it just needs a person to act and answer. Maybe in the future, who knows if we could incorporate questions from members of the public into that, but that is for a future date.

Thank you, sir.

The Speaker: Conseiller Makepeace, thank you for that.

We will hold those questions for the time being, Conseiller Bateson.

Conseiller Tighe, thank you.

Conseiller Tighe: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

I would just like to echo Conseillers Cragoe and Makepeace as well. I think getting rid of the panel is a good suggestion for flexibility, but I do have concerns around the next two changes. Given that Scrutiny was established as a mechanism through which Chief Pleas could hold

Committees, particularly the Policy and Finance Committee, to account in the amalgamation of the previous Principal Committees, I am just not understanding the good governance aspect to remove Chief Pleas' role in approving the Scrutiny programme and instead placing responsibility with three Conseillers and two non-Chief Pleas members as well.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Tighe.

Conseiller Guille, you have a question, thank you.

Conseiller Guille: Yes. Thank you, Mr Speaker.

First of all, I totally agree with Conseiller Makepeace that questions not related to the Business of the Day are an excellent form of scrutiny. A Scrutiny Management Committee is something different entirely where they can spend a lot longer investigating different subjects and requesting relevant documents. It is two different but very useful functions of Scrutiny.

Yes, I would be concerned if the report into a particular Committee, for example, goes to that Committee and then does not progress. My understanding from Conseiller Bateson's opening would be that it would go to that relevant Committee for comment. I do not think it was said but my natural understanding is it would go to that Committee for comment before going back to the Scrutiny Management Committee and then being presented to Chief Pleas. That would seem like a pretty logical way of doing things.

Apart from that, I would like to echo other Members. I think getting away from the permanent pool probably sounds like a sensible thing. I would also like to thank former Deputies Heidi Soulsby and Simon Fairclough for their generous help with the Committee and Chief Pleas in this important subject.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Guille.

Conseiller Locke first, followed by Conseiller Cragoe.

Conseiller Locke, thank you.

Conseiller Locke: Thank you, sir.

Just a general support both of the principle of getting rid of the standing panel, and training where it is approved, but also what has been said by other Conseillers. I think that any report could well go to the individual Committee but should also go to Chief Pleas as well, so that Chief Pleas can ask any questions if the Committee does not respond in any way.

Lastly I think that, while the general programme for Scrutiny Management could well be brought before Chief Pleas, I do think that there are times when the Scrutiny Management Panel may wish to get cracking on a subject that has been brought to their attention before Chief Pleas. It might be some months away before they have a chance to start their work. I think it is important that if they do have the general programme of their work approved by Chief Pleas, they are still able to start work on any other matter that they think may need investigating without undue delay.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Locke.

I will come back to Conseiller Bateson in a minute.

Conseiller Cragoe, you were next, thank you.

Conseiller Cragoe: Yes. Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Just really to add, I think that Conseiller Locke has probably said what I was just going to add to what I said before, which is that I would not want coming to Chief Pleas to stand in the way of

the Scrutiny Panel getting on with its work, but equally to be reporting back. If there is a system for doing that, that would be very good.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Cragoe.

So, Conseiller Bateson, there you have it. How would you like to respond to those various points? Wrap them up together or deal with them individually, Conseiller Bateson?

Conseiller Bateson: The Report is quite clear; it is not complicated what we have put. This is what we were after. Looking at it now, if we had had these things itemised it might have been better, but it is up to Chief Pleas how they vote. If they are happy with this Report, vote for it; if they are not, do not vote for it. That is it, because there is nothing more I can add to what we have got here.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Bateson.

So really effectively, you are saying you would like to continue with the Report and the Proposition? You would? Okay, that is your intention. Thank you very much indeed.

Before we start that process, does anyone have any further points that you would like to make based on what you have heard from the various – Conseiller Locke, thank you.

Conseiller Locke: Thank you, sir.

I think that a Scrutiny Management system that is 80% right is better than having one that is not there at all. Therefore, I will be supporting this proposal but would like to ask Conseiller Bateson and his fellow members of the Committee as to whether they would be able to consider what has been requested and commented on in here, and perhaps come back with a further revision at the appropriate time.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Locke.

Are you able to respond to that, Conseiller Bateson?

Conseiller Bateson: Yes, whatever the outcome of tonight, we will discuss this at our next meeting, yes.

The Speaker: Very good. So effectively an evolutionary process, I think is what I am hearing.

Conseiller Bateson: Yes, sir. Yes, very much so.

The Speaker: So you have read the Report, you have heard the presentations, you have heard the various questions and arguments from the floor, the Proposition, do you want to sum up at all, Conseiller Bateson, or are you happy to go with the Proposition?

Conseiller Bateson: I am happy go with it.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you very much.

In which case, we will go to the Proposition, and the Proposition reads as follows: that Chief Pleas approves the revised Terms of Reference for the Scrutiny Management Committee and Scrutiny Panels, as attached to this Report, including the removal of the Scrutiny Panel Pool and the establishment of Scrutiny Panels on a case-by-case basis. Those in favour of that

Proposition, please raise your hands. Thank you. Those against? That is **carried**, but not unanimously. That is **carried.**

Back to you, Conseiller Bateson, and your Committee to be able to refine that as you see fit. Agenda Item 8 is **carried**.

Very good.

9. Report with Propositions from the Douzaine entitled 'RPI Increases to Licences and Fees for 2027' – Propositions carried

To consider a Report with Propositions from the Douzaine entitled 'RPI Increases to Licences and Fees for 2027'.

Proposition 1:
That Chief Pleas directs the Douzaine to instruct the Law Officers of the Crown to prepare legislation to implement the proposed changes to Horse, Dog, Bicycle and Electric Bicycle Tax rates, as outlined in this report, and to bring that legislation before Chief Pleas for approval in due course.

Proposition 2:
That Chief Pleas approves the changes in charges to Tractor, Construction Vehicle and Mobility Scooter licence fees, as outlined in the above report.

Proposition 3:
That Chief Pleas directs the Douzaine to instruct the Law Officers of the Crown to prepare legislation to implement the proposed changes to Carriage Licence charges, as outlined in this report, and to bring that legislation before Chief Pleas for approval in due course.

Proposition 4:
That Chief Pleas approves the changes in charges to Carriage Driver licence fees, as outlined in the above report.

The Speaker: Moving along, we come now to Agenda Item 9, which is: to consider a Report with Propositions from the Douzaine entitled 'RPI Increases to Licences and Fees for 2027', and I would like to ask Conseiller Locke to introduce the Report.

Conseiller Locke, thank you.

Conseiller Locke: Thank you, sir.

The Douzaine has this year reviewed all of the licence fees it sets as part of a review of budgets for 2027. As reported to Chief Pleas last year, the Douzaine has many tasks within its brief and budget, all of which, other than rubbish and sewage collection and disposal, require funding requested from the Island's general budget.

An important one of these is maintenance of the roads. While the Douzaine does not receive the income from fees and licences from road users, it does set the level of fees and licences and hence their contribution to the Island budget. We therefore have a responsibility to get the right balance raised between the funds raised from these sources and general taxation for the maintenance of the roads, and that balance is an ongoing debate.

Last year, analysis revealed a significant shortfall between income from road users and the costs of maintaining roads of nearly £20,000. The big changes that we were able to introduce last

year have partially gone to offset that. The gap is still there, just not as big as it used to be. Given those major changes, especially to tractor licences, we do not feel, the Douzaine, that another major change should be made this year and so the proposed fees are simply adjusted by the most recent 12-month RPI which is 4.3% to June 2026. The individual fees have been rounded for convenience and are as per the attached schedule.

The Douzaine would wish to point out that, even with this increase, there is still a shortfall between the amount we spend on the roads and the amount that licence fee payers raise. The funding required from general taxation is going to carry on growing, and that is just maths, unfortunately. It may well be that a future Douzaine would want to increase by more than RPI to close the gap once more. In fact, the demands on our infrastructure mean that it is likely that the costs are going to increase by more than inflation.

We know the areas, we have only been able to do 'patch and mend' instead of a proper rebuild. We also know that the demands caused by the weather, rainier winters and drier summers, means it is going to be more difficult and challenging to keep the roads maintained, so we just bring that up as a future comment.

There has been much discussion about principles for future changes. For example, should there be a higher fee for bigger tractors and heavier tractors that cause more wear? Should that be weight, power, size or a combination? Perhaps there should be import licence fees to help control the number of tractors. It is pointed out that dogs create waste, which we have to collect. Electric bicycles have motors and are generally heavier than ordinary bicycles. Should they have a different licence fee? These are matters for wider debate and discussion in the coming months. We invite comments from Conseillers and the general public on such matters which will help inform our discussions on licences for 2028 and beyond.

The Propositions in this Report match those presented to Chief Pleas on previous occasions, except for firearms and shotguns, which are dealt with in a separate Report with Propositions. To take them in turn: Proposition 1 covers horse, dog, bicycle and electric bicycle licences. It is proposed to increase these by 4.3% rounded to the whole pound.

Proposition 2 covers tractor, construction vehicle and mobility scooter fees and it is proposed to increase those by the most recent RPI rate and rounded. If those changes are approved, the Douzaine will draft and sign a regulation to bring them into effect. The regulation will be laid before Chief Pleas at the next available Meeting. Proposition 3 covers carriage licences, again an RPI increase. Proposition 4 covers carriage driver licences, also RPI similarly.

In summary, the Douzaine does not like increasing fees. We are very aware that they are costs that many people have to pay on the Island. After last year's rebalancing, we feel it is reasonable to make no major changes for 2027 and simply apply an RPI increase. We ask these Propositions are carried.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Locke, on behalf of the Douzaine, for the summary of the Report. Shall we go to the floor for any questions or queries or points?

Conseiller Keyte, thank you very much indeed.

Conseiller Keyte: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

I believe that costs of services should fall as closely as possible on those who use them. I welcome the reduction in the shortfall between road user income and road maintenance costs from nearly £20,000 to under £8,000; therefore, I intend to support the Propositions today.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Keyte, thank you.

Are there any other questions or points from the floor?

Conseiller Bateson, thank you.

Conseiller Bateson: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

I would just like to say I do not think that the total cost of road maintenance should lie with just people who have bicycles, tractors, whatever, buggies. The roads are an infrastructure item and everybody on the Island, whether they own a tractor, bicycle or whatever, everybody benefits, like the harbour, for instance, and it is wrong.

I do not know where this idea has come from that licence and tax fees should cover the road maintenance. It is a new concept to me; I do not know where it has come from. No, I do not agree with the idea. I do not know whether Chief Pleas have ever instructed the Douzaine to do this or gave them an authority to do this, but it is a new one on me.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Conseiller Makepeace: Well –

The Speaker: Just one second, Conseiller Makepeace.

That is effectively a direct question for the Douzaine. Conseiller Locke, are you able to answer Conseiller Bateson's –

Conseiller Locke: I am indeed.

The Speaker: Thank you very much.

Conseiller Locke: These fees, and indeed the fees last year, do not seek to cover the entire cost of road maintenance from licence fee and taxpayers, in part for the very reasons that Conseiller Bateson made with some vigour and reason when he was a member of the Douzaine. So we do not seek to do that, we just merely wish to point out that in future the gap may again grow so wide that the Douzaine may need to take bigger licences. That is for a future Douzaine, hopefully not me.

Thank you, sir.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Locke.

Are you happy with that answer, Conseiller Bateson?

Conseiller Makepeace, thank you.

Conseiller Makepeace: Yes, I agree with Conseiller Bateson there. I think it is unfair to try to pass the burden on to what would be so-called users, for example, the carters. They are only carting the stuff that we need, and the tradesmen that are working for us for what we need. So I think if you were going to target users, then that is probably all of us indirectly.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace.

Conseiller Locke, thank you.

Conseiller Locke: As a matter of just historical record – and I am extremely grateful to the Greffe for sending the minutes of the Chief Pleas where this was mentioned in 1959, as it happened – back in those days, as they say, actually I believe it was every able-bodied man had to contribute their time to fixing the roads. In that case, everybody who used the roads contributed to their upkeep.

There is a general principle which has been made with quite some force previously, that the roads are indeed infrastructure, they are also available to the visitors, and they are being well kept

as a benefit to the Island as a whole; I thoroughly agree with that. This is why we did not seek to cover the entire cost at this stage, either last year or this year, or I suspect in future, of maintaining the roads.

It is going to get increasingly more expensive, not only with the size and weight of various types of road traffic, but also with the worse weather that we have. When you get very wet winters, as is forecast for next year and happened a bit earlier this year, then the water runoff really impacts the roads and there is a lot more maintenance that needs doing as and when that happens. I think we can see that for the foreseeable future.

Thank you, sir.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Locke.

Conseiller Makepeace, followed by Conseiller Cragoe.

Conseiller Makepeace, thank you.

Conseiller Makepeace: I think we just have to face the facts, really. Over the years I think the general problem is that all the Committees have been underfunded. In the past we may have had large reserves but they were probably at the fact that we were not doing anything. We were not keeping the roads and keeping the place up to scratch, whether they are dramatic increases we are looking for or just really catching up with what we maybe should have been spending over the years.

Thank you, sir.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace.

Conseiller Cragoe, thank you.

Conseiller Cragoe: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

I think really just to make a small observation that in terms of individuals such as business owners, carters, and so on perhaps being overburdened, even a tractor is less than £1 a day, so it is 85p or 90p per day across the course of the year. I think it is also fair that people who are using vehicles for work and making money out of them and damaging roads most should be the most heavily charged for that.

There is a principle of we do pay, it is split. We are not all paying; everyone is paying for your taxes as well. It is also reasonable that those who damage the roads the most should pay the most.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Cragoe.

Conseiller Martin, thank you.

Conseiller Martin: Yes, I would just like to comment on that from Conseiller Cragoe, really. The tractor drivers are effectively doing work for the businesses; they own a tractor, it costs money. To set that up as a work cost, it costs money. To keep pushing for tractor drivers is a wee bit naughty, really. It should be spread between the bigger people, like the contractors that need the tractor and the builders that use it. It is a kind of fifty-fifty one, yes?

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Martin.

Some interesting points being made here. Any further points or questions for the Douzaine based on what you have heard?

Conseiller Bateson, thank you.

Conseiller Bateson: Just an observation, really. It will cost what it costs to maintain the roads and the taxpayer will pay for it. What we are discussing here is which taxpayers will pay for it and which ones will not or which ones will pay a lot and which ones will not.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Bateson.

There you have it. We have got four Propositions attached to this Report. Conseiller Locke, would you like to sum up before we go to the Propositions?

Conseiller Locke: No, I am happy with what has been said, sir.

The Speaker: Okay, thank you.

So there we are, you have heard the various arguments, points, observations and discussions. We have four Propositions attached to this Report. I think if you are all happy we will go to the Propositions one by one. The first Proposition reads as follows: that Chief Pleas directs the Douzaine to instruct the Law Officers of the Crown to prepare legislation to implement the proposed changes to Horse, Dog, Bicycle and Electric Bicycle Tax rates, as outlined in this Report, and to bring that legislation before Chief Pleas for approval in due course. Those in favour? Thank you. Those against? Proposition 1 is **carried**.

Proposition 2 reads as follows: that Chief Pleas approves the changes in charges to Tractor, Construction Vehicle and Mobility Scooter licence fees, as outlined in the above Report. Those in favour? Thank you. Those against? That is also **carried**.

Proposition 3: that Chief Pleas directs the Douzaine to instruct the Law Officers of the Crown to prepare legislation to implement the proposed changes to Carriage Licence charges, as outlined in this Report, and to bring that legislation before Chief Pleas for approval in due course. Those in favour? Thank you. Those against? That is also **carried**.

Finally in this Report we have Proposition 4 which reads: that Chief Pleas approves the changes in charges to Carriage Driver licence fees, as outlined in the above Report. Those in favour? Thank you. Those against? That is also **carried**. All four of those Propositions are carried for the Douzaine.

At this point, we have been going for almost an hour and three quarters. I do not know about anybody else, but I fancy a comfort break. If we may, let us take five minutes. If we can come back here, let us say at 10 to seven to resume, so just over five minutes. Come back at 10 to seven.

Thank you very much indeed.

Chief Pleas adjourned at 6.43 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 6.50 p.m.

The Speaker: Thank you very much indeed for sticking to the seven-minute rule. It is now 10 to seven; thank you very much indeed for coming back promptly.

10. Report with Proposition from the Douzaine entitled 'Public Works Extras Charges List 2026'– Proposition carried

To consider a Report with Proposition from the Douzaine entitled 'Public Works Extras Charges List 2026'.

Proposition 1:
That Chief Pleas approves the revised Public Works Extras Charges List as attached, to take effect from 1st November 2026.

The Speaker: We will move on to the next Agenda Item, which is Agenda Item 10, which is: to consider a Report with Proposition from the Douzaine entitled 'Public Works Extra Charges List 2026' and I would like to ask Conseiller Cragoe, I believe, to introduce this Report.

Conseiller Cragoe, thank you.

Conseiller Cragoe: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Yes, this Proposition is for a revised set of charges for rubbish extras, as they are known. This is builders' waste, green waste, one-off disposals which are outside of the regular rubbish collection. This is very slightly different than the licence fees and other fees that we have previously discussed. This is very much a 'polluter pays' and the charges have been designed – our Public Works team has done a fantastic job.

We did consider a blanket increase but actually our amazing Public Works team has taken a real hand in these revisions and they have gone back to each item to consider the amount of time it needs to process it and dispose of it. In many cases, the charges have actually remained completely unchanged because they think that is a reasonable reflection of what they are having to do.

There are some raises and some new items, particularly lithium-ion batteries which were not previously charged for and are actually extremely expensive and very complicated to dispose of. Catering appliances have also gone up and, again, they are very expensive; they are large and they are expensive to process. There are a few other items like garden waste that have gone up and we, and they, think that this charging schedule will better reflect public works, the actual work they need to put in, and the costs that it accrues to them, while at the same time it will not unduly burden residents with higher costs.

Indeed, most items that residents might dispose of like doors or ordinary fridges and that sort of thing have really not gone up very much, if at all. I would commend these to you and also again thank the Public Works team, Jill and Sean in particular, for their hard work.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Cragoe. Thank you very much indeed.

Does anyone have any queries or questions based on what you have read and what you have just heard?

Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace.

Conseiller Makepeace: Yes, just for clarification again.

So, for example, it says, 'Skip - Plasterboard, £257', does that include the trailer being dropped off, the client or the customer filling it with plasterboard and the trailer taken away? Is there not a cost then of sending it to Guernsey or such? How does that work?

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace.

Conseiller Cragoe, thank you.

Conseiller Cragoe: Yes, Mr Speaker, and Conseiller Makepeace.

Generally any costs of actually filling it would probably likely to be accrued by the customer with the builder. Builders bring down their trailers to the harbour; this is very much about taking that plasterboard, taking it to Guernsey and processing it in Guernsey.

Those charges where it says, 'Plus Island waste' and, 'Isle of Sark Shipping', those skips and trailers are shipped off Island. There is a skip that can be filled where people can put things into

for the plasterboard. It is why there are also charges for ton bags and link boxes. They go into a common or plasterboard skip which is then taken off at intervals, but that particular one is for if you bring down enough to fill your own skip. That has all been calculated in relation to how much it actually costs to get it to the place in Guernsey where they do something about it.

The Speaker: Very good. Thank you, Conseiller Cragoe.
Next hand up was Conseiller Martin, thank you.

Conseiller Martin: Thank you, sir.
I would like to just ask Conseiller Cragoe this one. Last week I personally took a trailer full of metal down to the harbour. I was asked to leave the trailer, and I got a phone call five hours later to come and collect the trailer once it had been emptied. It used to be that you would put any metals directly into the skip, but I was informed when I was down at the harbour that you now have to cut the metals that you take down into probably the size that are better fit and then put them in the skip, which would take the extra time.
The pricing does not add up. It does not cover the Island man's working hours for actually cutting that trailer down. I know you could go through every one and say, 'Look, well, we can maybe tweak them' but, yes, it does not add up.
Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Martin.
Do you want to respond to that, Conseiller Cragoe?

Conseiller Cragoe: Yes, that is an interesting point. These charges were devised by the Public Works team. They clearly feel that this reflects what they feel the costs are. I think if perhaps residents or other Conseillers have specific issues about something like that or their experience, maybe send a note into the office and perhaps ask a better question. I do not have a better answer; I do not go down and cut metal up. As I say, these charges were devised. They do not come from the Committee, they come from the Public Works team. They feel confident that this is accurate; they are reflecting what they are doing.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Cragoe.
Conseiller Rang, you would like to make a point?

Conseiller Rang: Yes, thank you, Mr Speaker.
Conseiller Martin, I believe the reason that you would have been asked to have left the trailer down at the harbour is so that the boys can cut up the material to be safely stacked into these skips so they are not protruding these skips when they are being shipped off Island. I do not think they get cut down into foot pieces, it is just more stacking the skips correctly to be safely shipped off the Island.
Thank you.

The Speaker: Lovely; thank you for that clarity, Conseiller Rang.
Conseiller Locke, thank you.

Conseiller Locke: Yes, thank you, sir. Thanks to Conseiller Cragoe and Conseiller Rang, both of whom are correct.
In addition, there is an element of efficiently filling the skips because we get charged per skip, not only by Sark Shipping, but also per skip by Island Waste at the other end. We also have to be quite careful about separating out ferrous and non-ferrous metals which sometimes means disassembling some various things. I think, as Conseiller Cragoe said, these prices were worked

out by the office, knowing the costs of the operation as a whole and also the amount of work that we have to do, as well as getting them off Island and dealing with them at the other end in an efficient manner.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you for that confirmation, Conseiller Locke.

Does anybody else have any queries or questions for the Committee before we go to the Proposition attached to the Report? Any further comments or observations that anyone would like to make based on the Report? No? Very good.

Well in that case, let us go to the Proposition attached to this Report, and the Proposition reads as follows: that Chief Pleas approves the revised Public Works Extras Charges List as attached, to take effect from 1st November 2026. Those in favour? Thank you. Those against? That is **carried**. Thank you very much indeed.

11. Report with Propositions from the Douzaine entitled 'Firearm and Shotgun Licencing' – Propositions carried

To consider a Report with Propositions from the Douzaine entitled 'Firearm and Shotgun Licencing'.

Proposition 1:
That Chief Pleas approves the Firearms and Shotguns Licencing forms as attached.

Proposition 2:
That Chief Pleas approves the fees for Firearms and Shotguns as described in Appendix 2 and authorises the Douzaine to ask the Law Officers of the Crown to draft the required Ordinances to bring to the Budget Meeting of Chief Pleas.

The Speaker: Next up we have Agenda Item 11, which is: to consider a Report with Propositions from the Douzaine entitled 'Firearm and Shotgun Licencing', and I would like to ask Conseiller Rang to introduce this Report please.

Conseiller Rang, thank you.

Conseiller Rang: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Since January 2017 the Douzaine has been responsible for the licensing of firearms and shotguns, although the administration of this has been done through the Constables' Office with the Constables carrying out home checks on the storage arrangements for any new applications. The Douzaine would like to thank the various Constables' secretaries and Constables for the invaluable support they have given during that time.

We, in conjunction with Guernsey Police, have been reviewing the licensing of firearms and shotguns and would like to bring the licensing process more in line with Guernsey, if Chief Pleas agrees the new application forms – see Appendix 1 – which would be the same as those used by Guernsey which were agreed with the Home Office.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Rang.

So you have had the Report, you have got the Report before you, together with the attachments. Does anybody have any questions for Conseiller Rang and the Douzaine regarding

the Report and the two Propositions that we will be coming to very shortly? Any questions? We will start off with Conseiller Plummer; sorry, my peripheral is not up to speed.

Conseiller Plummer, thank you.

Conseiller Plummer: Thank you.

What I would like to ask, I have two guns and I do not shoot anymore. They will be returned to me very soon because they were confiscated with some other guns. I have a cabinet to keep them in, locked away. Because of my age and the damage I have done in the past, I cannot shoot. Do I still need a shotgun licence; can you tell me that?

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Plummer. There is a question for you, Conseiller Rang. Are you able to answer that?

Conseiller Rang: Thank you, Conseiller Plummer.

Yes, you will still require a gun licence. You are not the first person to actually mention this to me today, so I have asked to put this on our next Douzaine agenda for trying to sort out any people wishing to dispose of their guns so that they can be dropped off safely and disposed of.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Rang.

Conseiller Plummer, thank you.

Conseiller Plummer: May I just ask, you can dispose of guns, can you? I will have three guns to be disposed of. Will the Douzaine be able to dispose of them?

The Speaker: If I might just interrupt there. Thank you for the question, Conseiller.

I am not sure this is relevant to the Report.

Conseiller Plummer: Okay.

The Speaker: I will give Conseiller Rang the quick chance to be able to respond to that, but we are going down a rabbit hole, I think, with all due respect. Conseiller Rang, would you like to just confirm?

Conseiller Rang: Yes, we can make arrangements for these guns to be safely disposed of.

Conseiller Plummer: Thank you.

The Speaker: That is helpful; thank you very much indeed.

I am sorry, Conseiller Locke, I am not ignoring you.

Conseiller Locke: No, indeed. The subject of amnesty, as Conseiller Rang has said, we have had it brought to us before by Constables and it is under active consideration. The route through that will be ultimately via Guernsey Police because they have arrangements for so doing.

I would like to just bring to Chief Pleas' attention something that was brought to my attention by my estimable colleague, Conseiller Curtis, as appeared in *Farmers Weekly*, 4th September, where it says:

Watchdog calls for a new national firearms licensing body.

This is for England and Wales:

> One of the most significant proposals is to bring shotgun licensing rules closer to those governing firearms such as rifles. The Inspectorate is also recommending mandatory in-person medical assessments and a verification system. The Home Office will consult later this year on the proposals.

I would like to commend the Constables, the office and Guernsey Police for being several steps ahead of the Home Office in this regard, so congratulations, all, for getting that.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Locke; ably supported by Conseiller Curtis. Thank you very much indeed for making that point.

Meanwhile, back with the Report. What you have heard from Conseiller Rang, based on what you have read, obviously substantial appendices attached to this for obvious reasons, does anyone have any other questions or queries they would like to ask the Douzaine while we are about to – Conseiller Perrée, thank you.

Conseiller Perrée: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Can I just confirm that it will be Sark that will be carrying out the checks and it is not coming under Guernsey Police?

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Perrée.

Conseiller Rang, are you able to answer that?

Conseiller Rang: No, sir.

The Speaker: Conseiller Locke, thank you.

Conseiller Locke: The procedures agreed with Guernsey Police have been approved by Home Office but the vetting and so on and the home visits will happen here on the Island. We are just bringing things into line, so there is no data. One of the important factors – and this applies to people who no longer have guns for shooting; they just have guns locked away – is that, should there be an incident on the Island and we have to call on the help of Guernsey Police, they need to know where things are, where the guns are, who has got them, and whether there are any medical markers or whatever on those particular licences. That is why it is a very good idea to have the two systems in line with each other.

The Speaker: Thank you for that confirmation, Conseiller Locke.

Does anyone else have any questions or queries of the Douzaine specifically about this report or any of the – once again, Conseiller Perrée, thank you.

Conseiller Perrée: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Can you just confirm how much the cost difference will be if this is going to be a three-year licence in comparison to the one-year term that is currently in place?

The Speaker: Conseiller Locke.

Conseiller Locke: Yes, as far as I am aware, the fees are those in Appendix 2 for the period.

The Speaker: Appendix 2. Conseiller Perrée, would you like to just … ?

Conseiller Perrée: Sorry, how much is it currently for a one-year licence?

Conseiller Locke: Good question; I do not know. We do not really have that to hand.

The Speaker: Appendix 2 contains the new prices?

Conseiller Locke: It does.

The Speaker: It does, okay. So here we are, does anyone have any further questions for the Douzaine regarding the Report on Firearm and Shotgun Licencing before we go to the Propositions? Any questions, queries, points, observations? No? Very good. Well, would you like to sum up, Conseiller Rang, or are you happy with what you have heard? Yes, okay.

Let us therefore go to the Propositions. As I say, there are two attached to this Report. Proposition 1 reads as follows: that Chief Pleas approves the Firearms and Shotguns Licencing forms as attached. Those in favour? Thank you. Those against? That is **carried.** Thank you very much indeed.

Secondly, Proposition 2 which reads as follows: that Chief Pleas approves the fees for Firearms and Shotguns as described in Appendix 2 and authorises the Douzaine to ask the Law Officers of the Crown to draft the required Ordinances to bring to the Budget Meeting of Chief Pleas. Those in favour? Thank you. Those against? Thank you. That is **carried**. Thank you very much indeed.

Very good.

Procedural –
Reordering of Business –
Motion carried

The Speaker: At this point I would like to bring to your attention the following Statement from me. In accordance with Rule of Procedure 11, I propose that Item 18 from the Addendum be introduced now before we move on to Agenda Item 12. I need a simple majority in order to do this. Those in favour of moving now to Agenda Item 18, please raise your hands. Thank you. Those against? That is **carried**.

18. Report with Proposition from the Douzaine entitled 'Establishment of a Temporary Public Transport Service'– Proposition carried

To consider a Report with Proposition from the Douzaine entitled 'Establishment of a Temporary Public Transport Service'.

Proposition 1:
That Chief Pleas approves, under and for the purposes of section 21(2)(c) of the Road Traffic Offences (Motor Vehicles and Bicycles) (Sark) Law, 2013, the operation of a public transport service, that is: the transport of fare-paying passengers by trailer drawn by a tractor at the motor bike trials event scheduled to take place at La Ruette Vert, Rue Hotton, and La Genetiere on 10 and 11 October 2026 (or such later date as is notified to, and agreed by, the Douzaine if, as a result of weather conditions or some other cause, the event is rescheduled).

The Speaker: We are going to go to Agenda Item 18, which was the Addendum which reads as follows: to consider a Report with Proposition from the Douzaine entitled 'Establishment of a

Temporary Public Transport Service' and I would like to ask Conseiller Locke to introduce the Report, please.

Conseiller Locke, thank you.

Conseiller Locke: Thank you, sir.

This Item relates, as people may be aware, particularly for the motorcycle trials event that is scheduling to take place on private land on 10th and 11th October 2026. The Douzaine had a request to allow that riders should be transported, together with their machinery, on the back of a trailer between the events on private land. There is apparently no other practical way in which this can be done within the timescale of the event that is available.

We consulted with the Law Officers as to how this may properly be done and their advice was to approve the transport of these motorcycle riders, together with their motorcycles, under a temporary public transport service. We have brought this Proposition to Chief Pleas to allow the establishment of that temporary public transport service under section 21(2)(c) of the Road Traffic Offences (Motor Vehicles and Bicycles) (Sark) Law, 2013. The permission is limited to this particular route between La Ruette Vert in Rue Hotton, and La Genetiere and it is restricted to 10th and 11th October.

I did a completely unscientific online poll on this matter and I am aware, at the time I last looked at the figures, that the approval rating for the event was something like 85%, although there were dissenting voices, as you would expect.

Therefore, unfortunately, we are in a position of having to do something which is a bit out of the ordinary. It does appear that the event itself will depend on allowing this transport service to take place. I am told so far that it is getting great traction on various social medias. It is very popular, many accommodation places are full, and it is a shoulder-month event which we should, where we can, encourage people to come to the Island and encourage events of this sort.

This is why the Douzaine is bringing this to Chief Pleas, so that Chief Pleas can either pass or not as it sees fit the establishment of this service specifically for the purposes just of this event and for this one time only.

Thank you, sir.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Locke, for that introduction.

There were some private discussions going on there. Without getting too heavy with you, could you please make sure that you do not have conversations going on while someone is giving a presentation. It is disarming, from this point of view.

Right, any questions on the floor based on what you have just heard?

Conseiller Makepeace, thank you.

Conseiller Makepeace: How would this fit in? I mean recently the fire in Little Sark, is this sort of legislation that we have got now linked to that –I am not really sure how it goes about now if we have got a situation like that, is it just the Constable that issues people the permission to go and take people on the back wall. Is there a law in place already or not?

Thanks.

The Speaker: Thank you for that question.

Back to you Conseiller Locke.

Conseiller Locke: Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace.

This actually is not a matter for the Constables in any way shape or form. Perhaps it used to be by custom and practice but no, it is under the Road Traffic Offences Law, 2013. In that law there is a specific exemption for various things such as emergency services, for medical transport and others. That is already in the law.

This is a separate exemption, specifically because it is for what we term a member of the public, i.e. the motorcycle riders, to be carried more than one of them on the trailer, together with their rather specialist motorcycle, which are not like normal bikes. They actually have to have proper people holding them up, otherwise they will just fall over. So it is for this purpose that this one exemption is being made.

The Douzaine will also be considering whether we should have a more general exemption, perhaps again subject to the will of Chief Pleas, for other events that may need specialist transport events at some future time. But this particular proposal just refers to this one event that is going on at the moment on 10th and 11th October.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Locke.

Are there any other questions or queries from the floor regarding the Report and the Proposition we are about to vote on? Any other questions, queries? No? In which case, let us go to the Proposition which reads as follows. Quite a long Proposition: that Chief Pleas approves, under and for the purposes of section 21(2)(c) of the Road Traffic Offences (Motor Vehicles and Bicycles) (Sark) Law, 2013, the operation of a public transport service, that is: the transport of fare-paying passengers by trailer drawn by a tractor at the motor bike trials event scheduled to take place at La Ruette Vert, Rue Hotton, and La Genetiere on 10th and 11th October 2026 (or such later date as is notified to, and agreed by, the Douzaine if, as a result of weather conditions or some other cause, the event is rescheduled). Those in favour, please raise your hands? Thank you. Those against? That is **carried.** That proposition attached to Agenda Item 18 is carried.

12. Report with Proposition from the Education Committee entitled 'Education Fees for 2026/2027' – Proposition carried

To consider a Report with Proposition from the Education Committee entitled 'Education Fees for 2026/2027'.

Proposition 1:
That Chief Pleas approves, in accordance with Education (Sark) Ordinance 2003, the prescribed fees for 2026/27.

The Speaker: Thank you for that.

Now we revert to the Agenda proper and we come to Agenda Item 12. Agenda Item 12, which is: to consider a Report with Proposition from the Education Committee entitled 'Education Fees for 2026/2027'.

Conseiller Cragoe, would you like to introduce the Report, please?

Conseiller Cragoe: Yes, thank you, Mr Speaker.

Sorry, I have mislaid my notes for this.

The Speaker: Could you turn your microphone on please, Conseiller Cragoe.

Conseiller Cragoe: Sorry, apologies, I have mislaid my notes for this.

Sorry, I might ask Conseiller Keyte to fill in the figure which is missing. Our Proposition is to adopt the annual fees which are paid for children who are eligible, who are attending in years 9 to 11, which is to say ages 14 to 16, who are attending school off Island at schools that the Education Committee funds. It is based on £9,720 per student, which is the cost that Guernsey

would charge us for a student to attend Les Beaucamps High School, and this is an increase from last year and reflects RPI at 3.42% from Guernsey. That is set by Guernsey.

Then the rates for term-time hosting, which are also set by Guernsey, and this has also been raised. The total hosting cost if a child were to stay with a host would be £9,297.99. There is also an additional contribution equivalent to one return trip to and from Guernsey during term time only.

The accommodation term-time hosting contribution is made in proportion to the number of years the child has been in school, ranging from a 50% maximum contribution to a zero per cent for children who have two or fewer years in the school. Conseiller Keyte has pointed out that there is an error in the fee paid for four years, 20%, which should be £1,800 and something or other, which is what I cannot find where I wrote it. Here it is. Sorry, £1,859.60 and not £2,281.61.

These fees are paid at the moment to children who are boarding – parents of children who are boarding in England and contribute to their tuition, if that is used and also for accommodation. I will actually come back at some point to actually the schools that the children – the types of schools these children are going to in my second paper.

Thank you very much.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Cragoe.

Could you just repeat, please, for the sake of *Hansard*, the figure, the 20% figure, for four years? It is £1,800?

Conseiller Cragoe: It is £1,859.60, and that applies to children who have four years in Sark School, and it amounts to 20% of the overall fee that would be the accommodation cost that would normally be paid.

The Speaker: Thank you.

So that is a correction to the Report you have in front of you, under that section, four years attendance at Sark School, from school year 1, four years, 20%. The figure in the third column now reads £1,859.60. That is a change to the Report that you have in front of you. So there we have it.

Do we have any questions for the Education Committee regarding the education fees for 2026/2027? Any questions, queries, observations, points that you would like to raise before we go to the Proposition? I do not see any activity, I do not see any hands. No? Any summing up from the Education Committee? No? No summing up either?

In which case let us go to the Proposition which reads: that Chief Pleas approves in accordance with the Education (Sark) Ordinance, 2003, the prescribed fees for 2026/2027. Those in favour? Thank you. Those against? That is **carried**.

Thank you very much indeed.

13. Report with Proposition from the Medical & Emergency Services Committee entitled 'Medical Concessions for Travel to Guernsey' – Propositions carried

To consider a Report with Proposition from the Medical & Emergency Services Committee entitled 'Medical Concessions for Travel to Guernsey'.

Proposition 1:
That Chief Pleas agrees that the Government through the Medical and Emergency Services Committee should consider offering some financial support to residents traveling to Guernsey for health appointments.

Proposition 2:
That Chief Pleas approves the amendment to the Medical and Emergency Services Committee's mandate as attached.

The Speaker: That was Agenda Item 12. This is Agenda Item 13. Agenda Item 13 which reads: to consider a Report with Propositions from the Medical Committee entitled 'Medical Concessions for Travel to Guernsey'.

Conseiller Plummer, is this for yourself to introduce?

Conseiller Plummer: Yes, thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Plummer.

Conseiller Plummer: For the sake of *Hansard,* may I read out the Report?

At the end of June 2026, the Medical and Emergency Services Committee (M&ESC) was told that following a review of their fare structure, the Isle of Sark Shipping Company was no longer able to continue offering concessions for Sark residents travelling to Guernsey for medical reasons. The M&ESC have since considered whether they should offer any assistance with IOSS travel costs for people attending medical appointments in Guernsey. However, their mandate does not currently allow them to consider subsidies for residents travelling to Guernsey for health appointments and they feel that doing so would be a new policy decision that would need to be approved by Chief Pleas.

The Committee is therefore asking Chief Pleas, in Proposition 1, whether it feels that the Sark Government, through the M&ESC, should consider offering some financial support to residents travelling to Guernsey for health appointments. If Proposition 1 is approved, the Committee then asks that Chief Pleas approve Proposition 2 to amend its mandate to include:

... to consider subsidies for residents travelling to Guernsey for health appointments.

I would be interested to see if there is any debate, please.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Plummer, for that introduction to the Report.

Are there any questions for the Medical and Emergency Services Committee, based on what you have heard and what you have read? Right, no particular order, let us start with Conseiller Locke, then Conseiller Cragoe, followed by Conseiller Tighe.

Conseiller Locke, thank you.

Conseiller Locke: Thank you, sir.

This is sort of a sideways question. It is pertaining to this particular report from Conseiller Plummer, but I would like to know what is contained within the SLA and the MOU which tells the Isle of Sark Shipping Company what the fare structure should be in relationship to Islanders. This is a question that has been previously raised. Did the Medical Committee have sight of this SLA when Isle of Sark Shipping decided to withdraw their concession?

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Locke.

Conseiller Plummer.

Conseiller Plummer: No, the IOSS emailed us on the Thursday for it to be introduced on the Monday; the following Monday. We did ask if it could have been withheld until we had a Committee meeting. So the answer is no.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Locke.
Conseiller Cragoe, your question was next.
Thank you.

Conseiller Cragoe: Thank you very much.
Yes, I find the withdrawal of the subsidies generally by Isle of Sark Shipping frustrating, to put it mildly. I just have a question for Conseiller Plummer, whether considering subsidies would then require the financial implications of subsidies to be brought back to Chief Pleas.
Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Cragoe.
Conseiller Plummer.

Conseiller Plummer: We would be investigating this as this is new to us and, of course, as you know, it is not on our mandate so we would have to come back. It is all according to how the vote goes today.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Plummer.
Conseiller Tighe, your question.

Conseiller Tighe: Thank you, Mr Speaker.
Are there any preliminary costs and to give an idea of what this might be, and also would it be a consideration for any subsidies to be means-tested?
Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Tighe.
Conseiller Plummer, are you able to answer that?

Conseiller Plummer: Yes, thank you, Conseiller Tighe.
As I say, we have not looked into this because it is not on our mandate. We would have to have a meeting and come back to Chief Pleas. It will be all according to how this is voted upon today.
Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Plummer.
Right, Conseiller Bateson, followed by Conseiller Makepeace.
Conseiller Bateson, thank you.

Conseiller Bateson: Thank you, Mr Speaker.
I would just like to support Helen because I am on the Medical Committee as well. We are getting ahead of the game here. The essence of what we are doing here is a simple question, is Chief Pleas, the Government, going to do a subsidy? I would not at no point ask us anything else because if Chief Pleas is against subsidising people and they vote no, that is the end of. So we have not looked into anything else yet, because there is no purpose to it.

The Speaker: So this is the starting point, effectively?

Conseiller Bateson: Yes.

The Speaker: Okay, thank you, Conseiller Bateson.

Conseiller Makepeace, I think you had your hand up.

Conseiller Makepeace: Yes, sir.

I agree with what Conseiller Bateson says. It is just simple steps, and my question would be a bit further ahead.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace.

Conseiller Guille, thank you.

Conseiller Guille: Thank you, sir.

The way I read the Propositions is: does Chief Pleas agree for the Medical Committee to look into a subsidy? I do not think it is for Chief Pleas to agree now that they want a subsidy. It is for the Medical Committee to put it in its mandate and then to go away, have some discussions and bring a further proposition to Chief Pleas. I think that is the way I understand this process working, and everybody can consider, after the Medical Committee have had a good look into it, whatever the propositions are at a later date.

The Speaker: Very good, thank you, Conseiller Guille.

Conseiller Plummer, would you like to come back on any of those points you have just heard?

Conseiller Plummer: Yes, thank you.

They are all very good, valid points. As Conseiller Bateson was saying, we are going to be looking into this but, until we get direction from Chief Pleas, we will not be doing anything until we have this vote.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Need approval from Chief Pleas, very good. Thank you, Conseiller Plummer.

Conseiller Bateson, thank you.

Conseiller Bateson: Again, the point I would make is it is not normal practice for Chief Pleas to subsidise people. We have the Procureur, which is always a loan. I know the farmers do get subsidised with a lime subsidy, or they used to do, I do not know, but we cannot think of any other subsidies which Chief Pleas has ever done. So what we are talking about here is possibly the thin end of a wedge, set the precedent or whatever.

It is quite possible that once we start subsidising something, where do we stop? This is what we have got to decide on tonight and then if Chief Pleas are in favour of that, then the Medical Committee can get on with it.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Bateson.

Yes, Conseiller Makepeace, thank you.

Conseiller Makepeace: Someone mentioned about means testing, which I think is probably a good idea and, as Conseiller Bateson says, we do have the Procureurs. Well, I suppose they will be involved in that, deciding whether someone needed help or not.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Makepeace.

Does anyone else have any points, comments, observations or questions for the Medical and Emergency Services Committee before we go to the Proposition?

Conseiller Baker, thank you.

Conseiller Baker: I would like to ask if the Treasurer has been consulted in this as well?

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Baker.
Through the Committee, can you answer that question regarding the Treasurer?

Conseiller Plummer: Yes. No, the Treasurer has not been consulted because we are waiting for the result of this.
Thank you.

The Speaker: Okay, thank you for that answer to that question. So there you have it. I do not see the appetite for many more hands going up. Does anyone else have anything they would like to add before we go to the Propositions? Proposition 1, Proposition 2? No? In that case, Conseiller Plummer, would you like to sum up at all?

Conseiller Plummer: No, I do not think I can say anything more; I just would be interested to see how the vote goes.
Thank you.

The Speaker: Right, very good. Thank you. In which case let us go to Proposition 1 attached to this Report. Proposition 1 reads as follows: that Chief Pleas agrees that the Government, through the Medical and Emergency Services Committee, should consider offering some financial support to residents traveling to Guernsey for health appointments. Those in favour? This is going to be close. Thank you. Keep your hands up if you could, please. Thank you, put your hands down. Those against? I believe that is **carried**. Thank you for your patience there. That is carried, not by a huge majority, but that is carried.
Moving on to Proposition 2, which reads: that Chief Pleas approves the amendment to the Medical and Emergency Services Committee's mandate as attached. Those in favour? Thank you. Those against? Okay, that is **carried.** Not unanimously but, thank you, it is carried nonetheless.

14. Recruitment of Constables – Douzaine Report considered

To consider an Information Report from the Douzaine entitled 'Recruitment of Constables'.

The Speaker: Next up, we have Agenda Item 14, which is: to consider an Information Report and verbal statement from the Douzaine entitled 'Recruitment of Constables' and I believe that Conseiller Rang is introducing this.
Conseiller Rang, thank you.

Conseiller Rang: Thank you, Mr Speaker.
The current Constables have advised that they will be stepping down from their office at the end of September 2026. The Douzaine wishes to place on record on behalf of the Chief Pleas and the wider Island community its sincere thanks for their service, commitment and dedication during their tenure. The Constables perform an important public function and their contribution to the administration of justice, maintenance of public order and service to the community has been greatly appreciated.
While the current Constables will formally leave office at the end of September 2026, arrangements have been made with the current team for continued Constable cover throughout

October 2026 to ensure continuity while the recruitment process is completed. The Douzaine is grateful for the assistance being provided during this transition period.

In anticipation of these vacancies, the Committee officers have been conducting a recruitment campaign, including advertising the roles, engaging with prospective applicants and administrating the application process. It has also worked closely with Guernsey Police on recruitment arrangements, suitability requirements and support for successful candidates.

A number of applications have been received and are currently being considered, however the recruitment process has not yet concluded and the Douzaine is therefore not in a position to bring recommendations for appointment before Chief Pleas at this meeting.

The Office of Constable and Assistant Constable are an important part of Sark's constitutional and policing framework. These are appointed to undertake a range of strategy and public duties and act as a key link between the Island's authorities and Guernsey Police. It is therefore essential that suitably qualified individuals are appointed to ensure these functions continue to be delivered effectively to the community.

On 8th and 9th October, interviews will take place with the applicants and then there is to be an Extraordinary Chief Pleas Meeting at the end of October to approve the appointments.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Rang. Thank you very much indeed.

That is an Information Report from the Douzaine. Does anyone have any questions of the Douzaine you would like to ask about the Report and the update that you have just heard from Conseiller Rang? Any points or questions? No? Okay.

The Proposition from me, with the approval of the Seigneur and the Lieutenant Governor, is to propose an Extraordinary Meeting – Greffier, can you confirm the date, please?

The Greffier: I do not know, sir.

The Speaker: It is the last Wednesday in October.

The Greffier: I believe it is 28th.

The Speaker: 28th, thank you. I wrongly said earlier when we were discussing the Procureur that it was going to be the 30th. With the approval – not tonight – but the approval of the Seigneur and the Lieutenant Governor, the proposal would be to request an Extraordinary Meeting of Chief Pleas on that Wednesday, 28th October, to deal with two items. One, to deal with the Constables and, number two, to confirm the Procureur's position.

Can I just confirm with the Douzaine that that fits in with your timeframe?

Conseiller Rang: It does indeed, sir, yes.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you for that.

So that will be confirmed in the next 24, 48 hours once I have had a chance to speak with His Excellency and with the Seigneur to get approval for that process. Does anyone in the meantime have any points that they would like to raise based on what you have heard from the Douzaine regarding the situation with the recruitment of the Constables at this stage? No?

In which case, thank you to the Douzaine for that Report and for that update and we will bring it back hopefully at the end of October.

15. Sark School Annual Report –
Education Committee Report considered

To consider an Information Report from the Education Committee entitled 'Sark School Annual Report'.

The Speaker: Next up we have Agenda Item 15, which is to consider an Information Report from the Education Committee entitled 'Sark School Annual Report'. I believe, Conseiller Cragoe, this is for you to present.

Thank you, Conseiller Cragoe.

Conseiller Cragoe: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

I am sure you will be glad to know that I do not intend to read this entire Report out. So this is the Annual Report, it has been into Sark School last year and we have also put some information about Sark School going forward. I think we have brought to this House quite a lot of discussion about some of the trials and tribulations of the school this year. But I want to commend all of the staff and thank them so much, the staff, the board, support from Guernsey, because despite all this uncertainty and change, the standard behaviour and learning in Sark School across all three classes was very positive. Even where the children were very uncertain, they were still able to develop successfully, to behave well and to learn as we would hope they would.

I think, as you know, we saw a number of staff changes at Sark School, including the suspension and departure of the head, Ms Brady, resignation of the Higher Level Teaching Assistant (HLTA), Mrs Turner, in March, Ms Swanson in early July, and then Mr Smith and Mrs Smith departed in September or the end of August, as had always been planned.

The community governors, Ms Guy, Mrs Magell and Professor Parry also resigned at the end of the summer term. Mrs Jade Perrée remains as the parent representative. The Committee is conscious that its current mandate provides for the appointment of a new Board of Governors, and we are considering the appropriate arrangements going forward. Many of the functions of the board that are currently on the board's mandate are currently being covered by arrangements with Guernsey, and we will ensure that any changes that would require approval are brought back to Chief Pleas.

As I say, I think, again, we really wish to thank all of the staff and community governors who have departed. Also to thank very highly Gemma Knight, who assumed the role of Higher Level Teaching Assistant and also helped to bridge the move from the administrator position, and Julia Cross-Turner, who stepped up to a full-time teaching assistant role. They were and are absolutely invaluable in keeping the school going.

We benefited greatly from our co-operation last year with help from the States of Guernsey Education, including Sophie Roughsedge, Nick Hynes and Jo Siddall. We are really very grateful to all of them.

Just a couple of other quick things. FOSS, which is Friends of Sark School, they have funded new benches and contributed to swimming lessons, and they have a number of community events that they use to fund this, and they are continuing to do that. Last year for secondary school children, we had four children. They are set out in the table of the type of schools they go to.

Then looking forwards, for this present school year, for this year the school is very pleased to welcome Mrs Sue Coughlin as the part-time Executive Headteacher coming from Guernsey and she brings – she is just amazing. She comes from Hautes Capelles in Guernsey as well as serving as Chair of the Island Safeguarding and Protection Online Safety Committee in Guernsey.

We also have James Gould as lead teacher, Kiia Walker who is a newly qualified teacher and Khiya Gillingham as its new administrator. So we have set out the new structure for this year.

Sark School, as you know, teaches children to age 13, but with the agreement of parents this year the children in what is known as Key Stage 3, which is years 7 and 8, will be taught using

online provision from King's InterHigh. Teaching for younger children remains in person. In addition, we have one child in year 9, which is the final year of Key Stage 3, who is taking advantage of the Education Committee's online on-Island offer of King's InterHigh, hosted within the Sark School setting. Thank you to other Conseillers, including Conseiller Lanyon in particular, for getting this done to provide new WC facilities and also upgraded IT. So we have set out the school role.

We are also funding this year – we have six children off Island in various different schools as they move through. We only do three years of funding, so that number tends to change quite often.

In terms of future plans and looking ahead for the rest of the year, we recognise that parents and Islanders may still be uncertain and concerned. The present arrangement with Guernsey was put in place to ensure continuity of education and appropriate professional leadership for the 2026/27 academic year following this exceptionally difficult period. This future structure of Sark School remains under discussion, and the Committee is currently considering possibly some form of continued co-operation with Guernsey. There are various different staffing models that we could use with that, and they have significantly different financial implications, together with operational continuity considerations.

We will be seeking feedback from Guernsey, from school staff and parents before any final decision and any strategic decisions around funding and requiring approval will be brought back to Chief Pleas. Our initial proposals form part of the budget process. I will say that it is likely that further discussion will be required in the new year because we need to give the present system some time to bed in so that we fully understand all of the implications of any decisions.

Thank you very much.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Cragoe, for that whistlestop tour through that Report.

You have the Report, you have read the Report. Does anyone have any questions of the Education Committee? There is no proposition attached to it, it is an Information Report. Does anyone have any questions that they would like to ask of the Education Committee? No?

Conseiller Tighe, thank you.

Conseiller Tighe: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Conseiller Cragoe, thank you very much for that. You have answered a couple of questions that I made you aware of earlier on, so thank you. Firstly, I would like to commend the Education Committee, board, officers, school staff and all those involved in responding to the significant challenges faced by Sark's education system earlier this year. The arrangements now in place appear to have provided a positive and professional resolution to what was an extremely difficult situation. I am particularly grateful for the support that Guernsey has been able to provide in helping to secure continuity and stability for Sark's children.

I very much look forward to hearing the longer term education strategy for consideration by Chief Pleas, and whether the current model, including the Executive Headteacher arrangement and support from Guernsey's Education Services, is intended to continue beyond July 2027, and look forward to receiving information regarding the costs of the current arrangements.

Asking these questions in a supportive spirit, the outcome achieved following the challenges faced earlier this year appears to have been positive and I believe that clarity on the future strategy, anticipated arrangements and associated costs would be helpful both for Chief Pleas and for families planning in the future.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Conseiller Tighe, for those comments.

Does anyone else have any comments to make about the report or what you heard from Conseiller Cragoe. Do you have anything further to add Conseiller Cragoe?

Conseiller Cragoe: No, not really. Just to say that we will be including at least some initial funding implications as best we can, working with the Treasurer, in our Budget for 2027 because that will carry on into September of 2027, which is the next school year. So we do need to work this out but it is challenging to get – it is such a new arrangement that it is challenging to work it out at this very early date, but we will try our best.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Very good. Thank you for confirming that. Thank you very much indeed.

16. Committee Elections

To Elect Conseillers to Committees as required

The Speaker: Right, that deals with Agenda Item 15 I do believe. Agenda Item 16 is Committee Elections but according to my record all the Committees are currently fully occupied. We have no vacancies on any Committees currently. So that is Agenda Item 16 which has nothing to discuss or debate.

17. Committee and Panel Elections
Education Committee: Mrs Jade Perrée elected as a non-voting member

To Elect Non-Chief Pleas Members and Panel Members to Committees and Panels, as required

The Speaker: Agenda Item 17, however, Committee and Panel Elections to elect non-Chief Pleas Members and Panel Members to Committees and Panels as required. Are there any points from the – yes, Conseiller Cragoe, thank you.

Conseiller Cragoe: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

Yes, the Education Committee is not allowed to have parents as voting members, parent Conseillers, however, we would like to include as a non-voting, non-Chief Pleas Members, Mrs Jade Perrée, who is currently the parent representative on the Sark School Board.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you very much indeed, Conseiller Cragoe.

So just for clarity, we are going to go to the vote on that. The nomination is that Mrs Jade Perrée should join the Education Committee as a non-voting, non-Chief Pleas Member of that Committee. Those in favour? Thank you. Those against? That is **carried.**

Are there any other nominations from the floor to join any other Committees from Non-Chief Pleas Members? No? In which case, thank you for that.

Budget Meeting –
Statement by the Speaker

The Speaker: I will just make a very brief closing comment. I remind Conseillers that the next scheduled meeting of Chief Pleas is the Budget Meeting on Wednesday, 18th November 2026, at

5 p.m. The closing date for reports and submissions is 12 noon on Tuesday, 20th October. Please can you submit your reports and papers and budgets in good time appropriately to the office, and not least of all for the sake of the Treasurer as well. You have heard me say that previously. This comes around every year. Please if you could do that no later than Tuesday, 20th October, for that next meeting on 18th November.

Regarding the meeting at the end of October, I will update you on that when I have had conversations with His Excellency and the Seigneur.

At which point, we have been going for two and three-quarter hours, and I would like to say, Greffier, a closing prayer, please.

PRAYER

The Greffier

Chief Pleas closed at 7.44 p.m.