

# Environment Scrutiny Panel

## PUBLIC MEETING

### Record of Meeting

Date: **10th July 2007**

Meeting Number: **53**

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

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
	<p><b>1. Minutes of Previous Meetings</b></p> <p>Minutes of the meeting of 27th June 2007 were approved, subject to a minor typographical amendment.</p> <p>RD. KB. SC. PLC.</p>	
	<p><b>2. Chairmen's Committee - Scrutiny newsletter - budget allocation.</b></p> <p>The Panel welcomed the Greffier of the States to the meeting, to discuss an issue that had arisen at the Chairmen's Committee on the 9th July 2007.</p> <p>The Chairman advised the Panel that the Chairmen's Committee was proposing that a second Scrutiny newsletter be produced and circulated. He advised that the proposal was that funding for the newsletter would be taken from each Panel's budget allocation.</p> <p>The Chairman advised that apart from value for money issues the precedent of having monies taken from Panel allocated funds was not one that should be encouraged, nor one that he considered had provision within the Standing Orders of the States of Jersey.</p> <p>The Panel recalled that previously it had not supported the development of the first newsletter and that it had at that stage decided not to participate in the funding of its production or development.</p> <p>The Greffier provided the Panel with his interpretation of the Public Finances (Jersey) Law 2005 and relevant Standing Orders as they related to the allocations of funds to the various Panels. It was explained that the Scrutiny budget was within the remit of the Privileges and Procedures Committee. For convenience a certain part of the overall PPC budget was then allocated to Scrutiny and the Chairmen's Committee had, in turn, agreed to the allocation of</p>	

funding to each Panel. He advised that legislation as it stood did not preclude the funds allocated to a Panel being called back by the Chairmen's Committee (and in theory even by the Privileges and Procedures Committee) should it be necessary. The Greffier further advised the Panel that its decision was in two parts procedural and political and whilst he could advise on the first he could not advise on the latter.

The Greffier advised that Standing Orders of the States of Jersey 143(b) in respect of the terms of reference for the Chairmen's Committee stated that the responsibility was -

*to oversee the prioritization and allocation of resources to the PAC and scrutiny panels;*

It was suggested that on that there was some scope for the Chairmen's Committee as a body to allocate funds to a specific activity. If not from the Panels' allocated budget then from the general scrutiny funds.

The Panel suggested that the proposal of the newsletter funding from Scrutiny funding did not reflect the intention outlined in Standing Order 128 (g) whereby the Privileges and Procedures Committee (PPC): terms of reference appoint PPC -

*to be responsible for the provision of information to the public about the work of the States and the work of the Council of Ministers. The scrutiny panels, and the PAC, and to keep these public information services under review*

The issue of responsibility for the dissemination of information relating to the Panels individual and collectively was considered in detail. The Panel suggested that the newsletter provided information that was quite clearly public information and on that basis should be distributed by PPC as part of its remit. It was suggested that whilst such a view might be taken it would not be the practical solution; the Council of Ministers for example retained the services of the Communications Unit as the conduit to release any information. The individual Panel Chairmen dealt with the press directly in respect of their reviews and the President of the Chairmen's Committee could approach the Press for the Chairmen's Committee.

The Panel suggested that it may be more cost effective and better placed for combined communications to be issued through the States existing Communications Unit on the basis that the resource was already available.

Some concern was expressed by the Panel as to whether the Standing Orders provided the necessary *vires* in Law to require a Panel to participate in the funding of any activity endorsed or selected by any one other than that Panel itself. It was agreed that it may be appropriate for a request to be made to PPC to consider the issue of funding allocation and management with a view to clarifying the apparently grey areas in the future.

The Greffier advised that clarification would be provided following the introduction of the Scrutiny Code of Practice which would be considered by the States during the week commencing 16th July 2007.

	<p>The Panel thanked the Greffier for his time and he withdrew.</p> <p>The Panel accepted that the recommendation and decision made at the Chairmen's Committee was a majority decision and on that basis it decided the following -</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">that whilst it still had concerns in respect of the value for money of the newsletter, it would participate and contribute to a newsletter subject to it retaining control of the material to be used about its work. The Panel would also wish to see a draft newsletter prior to its release.</p> <p>The officer was directed to provide the Scrutiny Manager with its decision.</p> <p>RD. KB. SC. PLC.</p>	CLQ
<p>Item 3 28/06/07</p>	<p><b>3. Design of Homes</b></p> <p>The Panel received and noted the draft Design of Homes report and was aware of the number of areas that required political input.</p> <p>The Panel extended its thanks to officers for their work on both reports in recent weeks.</p> <p>The Panel accepted that given its focus on completing the Waste report and the vote of no confidence it had been unable to give the Design of Homes report its attention. The Chairman and lead member agreed to work closely with the officer to provide the political input necessary to complete the report following the four to five day States sitting commencing the week of the 16th July 2007.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that it should seek to have its report presented to the States on the 31st July 2007 and that it would meet to give final approval to the draft report on the 30th July 2007. The Chairman agreed to take the necessary action to ensure that the report was finalised.</p> <p>The Panel was of opinion that it was likely that the issues relating to the design of homes and fluidity of design and technology were likely to result in further reports in this area.</p> <p>RD. KB. SC. PLC.</p>	<p>RD / PLC</p> <p>RD</p>
<p>Item 4 28/06/07</p>	<p><b>4. Waste</b></p> <p>The Panel discussed its Waste report which had been presented to the States and agreed that the Minister for Transport and Technical Services should be invited to attend upon the Panel at a hearing to respond to the findings and recommendations in a public forum.</p> <p>The Panel requested that the officer provide it with an update on the updated supermarket protocols as at end of May 2007 so that it could consider the United Kingdom strategies.</p> <p>With regard to the follow up to the Waste report the Panel requested that a road show type event be arranged. It was decided that in order for the Parishes to become involved the Connétables must be provided with clear information which outlined the potential improvements and savings which could be achieved from recycling</p>	MR

	<p>as opposed to incinerating.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Town Hall should be the venue of the first road show and that it should take place during September 2007 and should provide people with the opportunity to view what could be achieved with recycling, products etc, much the same as the event which the Panel had previously undertaken. In addition companies providing alternative solutions should be invited to make presentations. It was agreed that the Public Hearing with the Minister should also take place at the Town Hall at the end of July 2007 at a time to be agreed.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that a summary document should be produced to outline the findings of the review. It was noted that such a document was now produced as a matter of course following all scrutiny reviews. In addition it was requested that a Waste recycling and associated costs frequently asked questions paper should be drafted and uploaded to the Scrutiny website and disseminated to all schools and Parish Halls.</p> <p>On a related matter the Chairman advised that the Panel had been offered access and space on the Eco Active website. It was agreed that a newsletter type style with a link to the Scrutiny site may be an appropriate way forward and that the link could be located on the Eco Active Site.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that follow up information in a simple format should provide the public with information relating to the potential savings in detail which could be achieved through recycling as opposed to incinerating. Details of shipping costs and such like must be made available. It was considered essential that the information was provided in a clear and concise manner.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that it would meet with the Comité des Connétables to present its findings and to outline the real options with regard to shipping recyclables and the potential business opportunities such an approach could represent.</p> <p>On a related matter the Panel noted the receipt of correspondence from M. Lamballais and agreed that the Chairman would follow up any necessary action.</p> <p>The Panel requested that its thanks to the review officer be recorded for his efforts.</p> <p>RD. KB. SC. PLC.</p>	RD
<p>Item 5 28/06/07</p>	<p><b>5. Vote of no confidence</b></p> <p>The Chairman thanked Panel members for their efforts in preparing for the States debate.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that it would discuss its responses to the comments made during the debate of P.85/2007 following the release of the States Hansard transcript and prepare a response to the statements made during the debate at that point.</p> <p>Of particular concern to the Panel were the comments relating to issues of retaining information.</p>	MR/CLQ

**6. Future reviews**

Officers

The Panel considered some areas which it may wish to scrutinize and requested that initial information be sought relating to the following possible subjects -

**1. Integrated Transport Policy -**

The officers were directed to obtain a date when the policy would be available to the Panel for consideration.

**2. Air Quality -**

The Panel requested that information be sought to ascertain the type of air quality monitoring currently undertaken on the island and how that complied with standards in other jurisdictions.

**3. Energy - Emissions from waste plant;**

The Panel suggested that if the States opted for incineration as its waste treatment following its debate to be held on the subject then the issue of carbon emissions had been omitted. It was requested that information be sought on the emissions from the current incinerator and the projected emissions for any possible replacement option.

**4. Recycling of inert waste;**

The Panel requested that some information be sought in respect of the removal of inert waste to extend life for use in the recycling industry and the development of concrete products.

**5. Tidal energy;**

Information was to be sought in respect of the work undertaken to date by Alderney with regard to investigating the generation of power harnessing energy from the tidal flow.

**6. Planning -Hopkins master plan;**

The Panel would seek early sight of the art gallery and connecting road project.

**7. Waterfront;**

The Panel requested information on the proposed future developments at the waterfront and the related costs.

**8. EDAW Report -**

The Planning Department report assessing the report should be requested for consideration.

**9. Waste - Energy from waste next step**

Confirmation would be requested on the work to date on the preparation for energy from waste plant. The Panel requested information on the planned ground works relating to the energy from waste plant.

**10. Design of Homes -Follow up review**

The Panel would consider further work on Design of Homes and planning issues subsequent to the completion of its current report.

The officers were requested to draft a time line and plan for future reviews subsequent to the completion of the Waste Review follow up work and the Design of Homes Report.

	RD. KB. SC. PLC.	
	<p><b>7. Press releases and the website</b></p> <p>The Panel decided that all information coming to it in respect of reviews should be uploaded to the web-site subsequent to it having been circulated to members, unless the matter was subject to a confidentiality agreement.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that all press releases should be co-ordinated through the Chairman and emailed to members prior to release through the office.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that consideration should be given to improving the Environment Panel section of the Scrutiny web-site to make it more interesting. Members would submit ideas at the next meeting.</p> <p>RD. KB. SC. PLC.</p>	RD
	<p><b>8.Future Meetings</b></p> <p>The Panel requested that its meeting dates be provided to the end of the year.</p> <p>The Panel noted that the next meeting would be on Friday 27th July 2007 at 9.30 am in Le Capelain Room, States Building.</p> <p>RD. KB. SC. PLC.</p>	MR

Signed

Date:

.....

.....

Chairman  
Environment Panel