

STATES OF JERSEY



ISLAND PLAN 2011: APPROVAL (P.48/2011): SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT

Lodged au Greffe on 21st April 2011
by Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré of St. Lawrence

STATES GREFFE

PAGE 2 –

After the words “the revised draft Island Plan 2011” insert the words –

“except that after Policy IM1 – Plan, monitor and change (page 459) insert the following new Policy –

‘Policy IM2 – Governance

Procedures will be applied to ensure proper segregation of duties, particularly between –

Policy Planning – development of policy; site identification; production of development briefs, and

Development Control – interpretation of policy as applied to individual applications’ ”.

DEPUTY J.A.N. LE FONDRÉ OF ST. LAWRENCE

REPORT

I would hope that this amendment speaks for itself, so my report is not going to be too long.

In the past it has been the experience that Planning Officers have been involved in the creation of the Island Plan, site selection, the drafting and finalisation of development briefs for particular sites, and then the handling of the individual application for a particular site.

For the avoidance of doubt, I make absolutely no criticisms of the individuals concerned. But in this day and age, it surely cannot be right that the same one individual deals with this type of process from beginning to end.

In the world of finance we have the principles of 6 eyes, i.e. that there is proper segregation of duties between various functions. In the accountancy and audit world this is sometimes referred to as dealing with the 'self-review threat', i.e. no matter how objective someone considers themselves to be, there is still a perceived risk that work that has already been prepared or performed by an individual will not be subject to the same degree of rigour or objectivity when brought back to that individual.

In planning terms, if someone has spent months, if not years, dealing with a specific site (all the way through from initial identification, zoning and drawing-up the development brief), or even if any one officer often deals with the same architect or developer, how do objectors to any particular part of that scheme have confidence that the same officer will treat their concerns with the depth of rigour and objectivity that they would normally have cause to expect? That is in no way a criticism of the individuals involved: that is a comment on the world in which we now live.

Accordingly, I am suggesting that clear guidance is in place to ensure that such procedures match current-day expectations.

Financial and manpower implications

On the basis that the Minister considers that there are no financial or manpower implications for the States arising from the proposition, then there are unlikely to be any arising from this amendment.