

## Environment Scrutiny Panel Meeting No. 33

7th December 2006

Le Capelin Room, Morier House.

Present Deputy R.C. Duhamel (Chairman) (RD)  
Deputy G.C.L. Baudains (Vice Chairman)  
Connétable K. A. Le Brun of St Mary (KB)  
Deputy R. Le Hérissier (RLH)  
Deputy S. Power (SP)

In attendance C. Le Quesne, Scrutiny Officer (CLQ)

Time Started 9.30 am

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
	<p><b>Minutes</b></p> <p>The Minutes of 8th, 16th and 21st November 2006 were approved. RD, RLH, KB, GB, SP.</p>	
2. Item 1. 21/11/06	<p><b>Deep Ground Water</b></p> <p>The Panel recalled that it had previously met with Mr. G. Langlois of the local Water Diviners Association and had agreed to consider the issues of concern which he had raised at the last meeting.</p> <p>The Panel had previously requested that Mr. Langlois provide his concerns in writing. These had been received on the 23rd November 2006 and were considered.</p> <p>The Panel was provided an update from Deputy G Baudains who advised that following the drilling of the first bore holes agreed for the deep water testing with the Planning and Environment Minister and the Water Diviners Association the bore at La Rocque had not been drilled to an acceptable standard. The standard had been so poor that it had required secondary drilling, that suggested that any samples taken would have been contaminated and not appropriate for assessing the presence of deep ground water through isotopic readings.</p> <p>The Panel noted the concerns expressed but were not minded to pursue any form of review into the subject of deep ground water at this time. It suggested that the Working Group set up on the subject should seek to pursue any areas of concern.</p> <p>The Panel considered reimbursing Mr Langlois for the purchase of some research books from the University of Caen, the Panel decided that it would be appropriate for members to make a personal contribution in this respect. The Chairman agreed to send the necessary payment to Mr. Langlois and pursue the matter with the Working Group as necessary.</p> <p>Officers were requested to advise Mr. Langlois that a review would not be pursued at this time.</p>	RD  MR

	RD, RLH, KB, GB, SP.	
<p>3. Item 2. 22/11/06.</p>	<p><b>Design of Homes - Questionnaire development - Call for evidence and funding of reviews managed by Lead members.</b></p> <p>The Panel recalled its previous approval for the development of a questionnaire for the Design of Homes Review and subsequent decision for the Chairman to meet with the Scrutiny Web-designer to discuss the quote in respect of the data base and interactive document development.</p> <p>The Panel discussed the proposal and agreed not to pursue the development at this stage but to opt for a manual distribution of the form. Data would be collated by officers and efforts would be made to develop a document that would provide some of the information in the form required by the lead member. Some disappointment was expressed that the IT interactive approach was not being pursued.</p> <p>On a related matter the Panel welcomed the Deputy Greffier of the States to the meeting to discuss the general development of the Scrutiny Web Site.</p> <p>The Deputy Greffier explained the role and remit of Evolutions together with the way in which the site was being developed and which aspects of development such as video links were considered to complex and costly to support.</p> <p>With regard to the Design of Homes review the Panel authorised a call for evidence advert to be placed in the Jersey Evening Post for a period of three nights under the usual terms and conditions.</p> <p>Issues of budget for reviews when managed by a lead member were discussed and the Panel was advised by the Scrutiny Manager that the method adopted by other Panels was to allocate a certain amount of the overall budget to the Review and to devolve an element of autonomy to the lead member to enable the rapid progression of any work required for the review. It was asserted that this should only be undertaken within the framework of a robust scoping and review budgeting documents so that members were clear on what was being approved in principle.</p> <p>The Chairman would discuss the issue of allocating a small budget to lead members under the above conditions with the Greffier of the States in his capacity as Accounting Officer to ensure that such action was compliant with legislation and codes of practice. In addition the Chairman would raise the issue at the Chairmen's Committee to initiate any changes that might be required.</p> <p>RD, RLH, KB, SP, GB.</p>	<p>CLQ RD</p>
<p>4</p>	<p><b>Panel Membership and officer support</b></p> <p>The Panel discussed its membership with the Scrutiny Manager and confirmed any likely movement of members and its anticipated staffing requirements in the overall availability of resources. The Panel confirmed that it would be producing one of its reports in the very near future and that both officers were required.</p> <p>RD, RLH, KB, SP, GB.</p>	

5	<p><b>Fact finding visit to Cardiff for the Waste Review and the Energy Conference</b></p> <p>The Panel received a paper from Mr. M. Robbins, Scrutiny Officer highlighting the key findings from the visit.</p> <p>It was noted that the pace of the visit had ensured maximum use of the attending members' time. The Panel had found the visit to be very well organised and extended its appreciation to Mr. Robbins for his efforts.</p> <p>The Panel had found the visit to the recycling plant very interesting and it had afforded them with an opportunity to view an alternative process which received all waste to one site where it was cleaned and sorted. Recyclable products were sold on at profit.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that following the visit and in light of what they had learnt every effort should be made to complete the waste report during the Christmas recess so that States members and the public could be advised of the options which could be explored. The Chairman agreed to draft the report with the lead officer and to take a report and proposition to the States early in 2007. It was agreed that a 2 day road show event should be arranged to raise the reports profile and to achieve some media coverage.</p> <p>The Panel recalled that it had previously undertaken a similar event for States members and the public, the Chairman would provide officers with a list of companies to be invited by the end of the week and costings for the event should be prepared at the earliest opportunity with deposits to be paid where possible from the 2006 budget allocation. Funding for the whole event would have to be allocated from the 2007 budget.</p> <p>The Chairman agreed to make all of the Waste Review documentation that he had available to the officers so that it could be prepared for use in the report as appropriate.</p> <p>It was agreed that the level of speakers at the Energy Conference had been of a very high standard and that members had been afforded a valuable insight into a likely future review. The Panel had also found the opportunity to meet its Welsh counterparts very helpful and that useful network links had been made.</p> <p>The Panel requested that the appropriate thanks be sent on its behalf.</p> <p>RD, RLH, KB, SP, GB.</p>	MR
6	<p><b>Register of Local Persons</b></p> <p>The Panel received correspondence from the Scrutiny Manager dated 14th November 2006 relating to the establishment of a register of local persons willing to assist Panels as advisors on a no fee basis. The development of such a register had been supported by the Chairmen's Committee.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that as and when required it would approach appropriate individuals and associations and build a register over</p>	Panel members

	<p>time. If appropriate, media links would be approached to highlight the need for local advisors.</p> <p>RD, RLH, KB, SP, GB.</p>	
7.	<p><b>Building bye-laws draft technical guidance document.</b></p> <p>The Panel considered the above consultation document and noted that the closing date for consultation was the 31st December 2006.</p> <p>The Panel discussed the document and it was agreed that Deputy S. Power would draft a response to the Planning and Environment Department on behalf of the Panel. It was noted that many of the issues raised in the document would be addressed in part or as a whole within the findings of the Design of Homes Review. Deputy Power agreed that the response would be circulated to members for ratification prior to be submitted.</p> <p>RD, RLH, KB, SP, GB.</p>	SP
8.	<p><b>The Planning Process Report - draft 1.0</b></p> <p>The Panel received and discussed its Planning Process Report and agreed that Mr. I. Clarkson, Scrutiny Officer had drafted a robust and well balanced report which reflected the Panels findings accurately. The Panel extended its thanks to Mr. Clarkson.</p> <p>The Panel provided guidance on its recommendations and amended some areas of text with regard to conclusions and clarification.</p> <p>The Panel would consider a further draft of the report in due course and emphasised that it would wish to present its findings to the State prior to the end of the year if possible.</p> <p>RD, RLH, KB, SP, GB.</p>	IC
9.	<p><b>Matters for information -</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the Panel noted a letter from Accelerated Compost Limited advising of its pre-validation certification;</li> <li>2. the Record of Proceedings from the National Assembly of Wales dated 29th November 2006;</li> <li>3. that the Panel visit to the composting initiative at H.M. Prison La Moye had been confirmed and that the final details should be forwarded to members;</li> </ol>	

Signed

Date

.....  
Chairman, Environment Panel

.....