

Environment Scrutiny Panel

PUBLIC MEETING

Record of Meeting

Date: **4th September 2008**

Meeting Number: **82**

Present	Deputy R.C. Duhamel (Chairman) (RD) Connétable K. A. Le Brun of St Mary (KB) Deputy C. J. Scott Warren (CSW) Connétable A. S. Crowcroft (SC)
Apologies	Deputy P. V. F. Le Claire (PLC)
Absent	
In attendance	Mrs. C. M. Le Quesne, Scrutiny Officer (CLQ) Mr. M. Robbins, Scrutiny Officer (MR)

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
	<p>1. Minutes</p> <p>The Panel received and approved Minutes of the meeting of 22nd July 2008 both Public and Private.</p>	
	<p>2. Matters Arising</p> <p>The Panel noted the following matters arising from previous Minutes -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) That arrangements had been made for Connétable Crowcroft to attend a sustainable procurement conference 30th September - 2nd October 2008; b) Notes from a meeting between the Chairman and a Scrutiny Officer dated 4th August 2008; and, c) Minutes of the Cycling Strategy Working Group relating to safer routes to school would be requested for the Panel. Follow up on the expected invitation for a Panel member to attend the group should be undertaken. 	MR/CLQ
Item 1	3. 2nd Tidal Energy Summit	MR/CLQ

<p>20.11.07</p>	<p>The Panel noted receipt of details of the 2nd annual Tidal Energy Summit, 11th and 12th November 2008 and considered whether it was appropriate for Members to attend.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that the issue of harnessing energy from tidal movement was likely to be of significant importance not only to Jersey but also to the Channel Islands. It noted that the Energy Strategy was still awaited.</p> <p>Concern was expressed at the lack of funding for environmental protection and innovation. The Panel considered that the situation was potentially worse owing to the fact that funds inscribed for specific environmental projects could be redirected should the Minister require funding to provide another service within his/her remit of responsibility. The Panel discussed the importance of a dedicated funding allocation for environmental matters to ensure that projects and initiatives into new clean energy sources could be supported.</p> <p>The Panel decided that the Chairman, Deputy Le Claire and an Officer should attend the conference. The Chairman reminded the Panel that he was involved with the Tidal Energy Group and that he was likely to be funded for his attendance through the Planning and Environment Department. The Panel would therefore only require funding for Deputy Le Claire and one Officer.</p> <p>The Officers were requested to make the necessary arrangements.</p>	
<p>Item 5 22.7.08</p>	<p>4. 2008 Work Programme</p> <p>The Panel recalled that at its last meeting it had requested that scoping documents, budgets and terms of reference be prepared for its consideration in respect of possible reviews on Transport, Bathing Water Quality and Urban Regeneration.</p> <p>The Panel was presented with the requested documents together with detailed timetables of the Officers and Panel time available until the 4th December 2008. The Panel accepted that its resources were not sufficient to undertake more than one review in the time available.</p> <p>The Panel considered the subjects it had selected and decided as follows -</p> <p>Transport - the continued lack of a finalised Integrated Traffic and Transport Policy (ITTP) and time constraints were such that a review on the subject was not feasible. The Panel recalled that it had previously considered undertaking a fact finding visit to Transdev in Nantes, to see the new bus system in operation there.</p> <p>On the basis that the Panel was not going to undertake a review relating to transport and because of its other commitments it was decided to advise Transdev that the Panel would be unable to visit in the near future.</p> <p>Bathing Water Quality - the Panel recalled that it had undertaken</p>	<p>CLQ/MR</p>

<p>Item 10 23.8.07 Item 9 3.12.07 Item 2 22.8.08</p>	<p>significant background research on the matter during 2007. The lack of information on what had been done to upgrade the treatment plant, extending the outfall in St. Aubins Bay, the amount of seaweed on the beaches, no removal of phosphates and only some nitrates from the water together with no liquid waste strategy was of concern. The Panel was mindful of concerns raised over recent pollution incidents but was aware that a number of corrective actions were being taken.</p> <p>The Panel decided that it would not undertake a review on the subject, but that it would maintain its previous stance of a watching brief and requested that an update on water quality and the method of sampling collection be requested from the relevant departments.</p> <p>Some concerns were expressed over the areas of responsibility for water quality with regard to the role of tester and enforcer being placed within the remit of the same Minister. The Panel requested that correspondence be prepared and delegated the Chairman to approve the content.</p>	<p>CLQ/MR</p>
<p>Item 6 22.7.08</p>	<p>Urban Regeneration -</p> <p>The Panel considered two possible options for undertaking an Urban Regeneration Review.</p> <p>It discussed in some detail the current proposals relating to the 10 Character Areas for St. Helier and considered that proposals did not adequately reflect the activity in those areas. The Panel considered the importance of any development being approached from a holistic stance and providing not just more buildings but also community areas.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that it should examine density and amenity together with the projected urban sprawl statistics available from the Planning and Environment Department. It would also look at the progress made since the EPIA's to the current 10 Character Areas and what if any factors have affected or curtailed the potential for change.</p> <p>The Panel selected the second Urban Regeneration Review option which had focused terms of reference. The Chairman agreed that he would advise the media of the Review launch.</p> <p>The Panel discussed the appointment of an advisor to the Review and noted that Mr. D. Mason had submitted a tender for the work. Some confusion had ensued since the last meeting and an account had been received from Mr. Mason in error. The Panel was advised that the Accounting Officer required a formal Panel decision prior to any payments being made and that a contract and terms of engagement were required for an appointment. In addition to this, no retrospective payments could be made under the existing financial framework.</p> <p>The Panel noted that an error had occurred; it discussed advertising for an advisor for the review, but decided, that given the short period of time available to complete the review that it would retain the services of Mr. Mason to assist it at a total cost not exceeding</p>	

	<p>£5,000.</p> <p>It was agreed that a full and comprehensive contract should be drafted to outline the professional assistance required. The provision of the following was identified for inclusion -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans for an innovative scheme to address the need for homes; • Examples of community development projects in other jurisdictions; • Pencil drawing proposal and supporting information for a project in one or more areas of the town within the set fee; and • Written advice on the proposed 10 character areas and comments on proposals to reduce density in some areas of the urban area and the need to provide alternative increased density. <p>The Panel requested that its Terms of Reference be amended to reflect its comments and that the required contract be prepared for consideration by telephone meeting at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that the following action should also be taken in addition to the normal administrative requirements of a review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Naish Waddington, Architect should be invited to attend upon the Panel to discuss proposals for a glass tower in the Wesley Grove Methodist church; • Architects should be invited to comment on the 10 Character Areas as outlined in the Willie Miller Report, dated October 2005, entitled 'St Helier Urban Character Appraisal'. 	<p>CLQ/MR</p> <p>CLQ/MR</p> <p>CLQ/MR</p>
	<p>5. Waste Recycling and Shipping Company delegation</p> <p>The Panel welcomed a delegation from Séché éco industries, the attendees being Mr. S. Deshayes, Mr. L. Chassin and Mr. F. D'Hulst, of Manche Anglo Normandes Export.</p> <p>The Chairman welcomed the delegation to the meeting. The Panel received an oral presentation on the history of the company, the services it provided within the waste industry, together with information on how it might assist with increasing the value of recyclable materials sourced from Jersey and shipped to France.</p> <p>The company explained its access to landfill and recycling facilities, its recycled material outlets, the processes it supported together with its certification credentials. It advised on the condition in which it could accept materials such as paper, card, plastics, tyres, electrical goods, possibly tyres and which of the aforesaid should undergo baling or shredding before collection. It also discussed how it could assist with the re-use of bottom ash. The delegation provided the</p>	

	<p>Panel with details of the possible revenue streams that could be achieved from the various recyclable products together with an overview of the streams prone to significant revenue fluctuations. The export element of the proposal was explained by Mr. D’Hulst together with details of the vessels at his disposal and the destination ports used.</p> <p>Issues relating to critical mass required to render any agreements worthwhile were discussed and the unique waste collection arrangements in the Island were explained. The delegation was advised that any agreements for access to recyclables would need to be addressed through the Connétables of the individual Parishes. The delegation confirmed that this was the first contact that had been made to any Jersey authority.</p> <p>The delegation was advised that the States had decided to approve the construction of a new energy from waste facility.</p> <p>In addition the Panel advised that it was not currently undertaking a review into waste recycling although the subject was within its remit.</p> <p>It was reiterated that contact should be made directly with the Connétable of St. Helier who would facilitate a meeting with the Comité des Connétables or other interested individuals. He also advised that the Parish of St. Helier had recently employed a Waste Recycling Manager whose remit would be to investigate developing links with French service providers.</p> <p>The Panel agreed to make information relating to waste arising volumes and contact details available to the delegation and wished it well in its endeavours.</p>	<p>SC</p> <p>CLQ/MR</p>
<p>Item 3 22.07.08</p>	<p>6. Mr. Lundhus visiting speaker 16th October 2008</p> <p>The Panel recalled that it had previously considered approving some funding for a venue and advertising for Mr. Lundhus, an expert in bridge building technology invited to Jersey by the Jersey Society of Engineers</p> <p>The Panel considered the request for a small amount of funding to cover room hire and advertising but decided that it would not be appropriate for it to do so.</p> <p>The Connétable of St. Helier offered the Chairman access to the Magistrates Court, Town Hall as a venue should he wish to host the speaker independently. The Chairman advised that he would take over all room hire issues as a personal issue inclusive of the pencil booking at St. Paul’s Centre. The officer would advise St. Paul’s of the change in contact details.</p>	<p>SC/RD</p> <p>CLQ/MR</p>
	<p>7. Dr. Van Steenis, Energy From Waste Speaker</p> <p>The Panel considered a request for speaker’s fees in the amount of £260 for Dr Van Steenis, who would be visiting Jersey in the near future to speak on the dangers of energy from waste plants.</p> <p>The Panel decided that it would not support the request for funding.</p>	<p>SC/RD</p>

	<p>8. Matters arising</p> <p>The Panel noted the following matters for information -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) notes of a meeting with the Minister for Planning and Environment dated 27th August 2008; b) that the Panel had not made a decision on whether or not to prepare a comment on the forthcoming proposition to the States about the separation of the role of the Minister for Planning and Environment; the Panel would advise officers if it required an additional meeting for this purpose; c) the Panel agreed that no time remained in which to submit any amendments to the business plan; and, d) that both the Chairman and Connétable Crowcroft would be speaking at Architecture week 2008. 	
	<p>9. Date of next meeting</p> <p>The Panel noted that the date of its next meeting was 23rd September 2008 at 9.30 am in the Le Capelain Room, States Building.</p>	