

Environment Scrutiny Panel

Thursday 30th March 2006
Le Capelain Room, States Building
11th Meeting

Present Deputy R.C. Duhamel (Chairman)
 Deputy G.C.L. Baudains (Vice Chairman)
 Connétable K. A. Le Brun of St Mary

Apologies Deputy S. Power
 Deputy Le Hérissier

Absent
In attendance Mr I. Clarkson, Scrutiny Officer
 Mr M. Robbins, Scrutiny Officer

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
1	<p>Minutes</p> <p>The Minutes of the meeting held on 16th March 2006, having been circulated previously, were taken as read and were confirmed.</p>	
2 21/03/06 Item 2	<p>Matters Arising</p> <p>With regard to the proposition entitled, 'Composting Facilities at La Collette II (P.31/2006) lodged 'au Greffe' on 14th March 2006 by Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier, the Panel noted an account from the Chairman that the Bailiff, on receipt of advice from the Chief Executive Officer, Transport and Technical Services, had declared the proposition out of order. Deputy R.C. Duhamel expressed concern that the aforementioned Chief Officer had been permitted to attend what was clearly a political meeting and that he had apparently been permitted to influence proceedings.</p> <p>The Panel then held a general discussion on alternative waste management policies. Matters raised included: the existence in the United Kingdom of operational green and food waste plants; the viability of creating three separate composting sites in the Island (rather than the twelve suggested in P.258/2005, as lodged 'au Greffe' by Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire), and the general concept of 100 per cent recycling. The Panel contended that a recycling rate of 75 – 80% was an achievable and realistic aim and that a decision of the States to embrace food and green waste composting would help to achieve this higher rate. In turn this would leave enough fuel for Energy from Waste Plant to operate, although any such plant was likely to be much smaller than that which the Minister for Transport and Technical Services was expected to recommend to the Assembly.</p> <p>The Panel subsequently discussed a number of other possible alternative policies relating to the remit of the Minister for Planning and Environment and the Minister for Transport and Technical</p>	

	<p>Services. These included: traffic management issues relating to the current La Collette site and the possibility of further land reclamation in that area; the lack of a Mineral Strategy in Jersey; flooding Ronez Quarry to create a deep water port, and the need for strategic planning to be carried out on a 20 to 30 year timescale.</p>	
3	<p>Combined Scrutiny Meeting.</p> <p>Deputy R.C. Duhamel reported that the Chairman's Committee had asked the Panel to discuss the concept of combined public meetings involving all Panels and covering the full remit of Scrutiny. The Panel considered that such meetings might be lengthy, unwieldy and that they might be less productive than the current practice of holding individual panel meetings. Favour was nevertheless shown to the idea of each Panel having a stall where people could walk about and stop to discuss matters relating to that particular Panel. Deputy R.C. Duhamel undertook to report the views of the Panel to the Chairman's Committee.</p>	RD
4 16/03/06 Item 5	<p>Work Programme – Planning Process</p> <p>The Panel noted that three advertisements had now appeared in the Jersey Evening Post. Three submissions from members of the public had been received. Over 40 individual letters had also been sent inviting professionals and organisations with experience of the planning process to make a written submission. Arrangements to observe a meeting of the Planning Applications Panel had been made and Senator F. E. Cohen, Minister for Planning and the Environment, and the Director of Planning had agreed to brief the working group on the implementation of recommendations made by Mr. C. Shepley in his report of November 2005 entitled 'Review of Planning and Building Functions'.</p> <p>Deputy G.C.L. Baudains apprised the Panel of a recent meeting between a Mr. G. Noel, developer of the Category A housing sites known as Hodge 2 and Rue de Jambart, St. Clement, and himself. He reported that he had become aware of concerns that development briefs produced by the Department of Planning and Building Services were constraining developers to an excessive degree and that the planning process was resulting in economic irregularities on first time buyer and social rented housing sites. Deputy G.C.L. Baudains explained that he had instructed the Scrutiny Office to establish possible dates for a visit to the Hodge 2 site in St. Clement, which was now nearing completion. The Panel was advised that it would be possible to visit the site during the course of the following week, although the developer required 48 hours notice of the Panel's preferred date. Officers were instructed to write to Panel members by e-mail following the conclusion of the meeting seeking confirmation of their preferred date for a site visit.</p> <p>The Panel then considered the degree to which ongoing developments concerning the St. Helier Waterfront fell within the published terms of reference. Deputy R.C. Duhamel submitted that the working group should consider as part of its ongoing review the long term impact on St. Helier of the policy being pursued in respect of the St. Helier Waterfront. The Panel was advised that the terms of reference had been constructed at the lead member's request in such a manner as to exclude, as far as was considered practical, planning policy matters. It was reported</p>	Planning Sub Group / IC

	<p>that a specific e-mail sent by Senator F.E. Cohen to the Council of Ministers (in which he had reportedly complained that the Waterfront Enterprise Board had acted inappropriately) had been called for on the basis that the incident concerned a major scheme that a developer had apparently publicised in order to assess public opinion were such a scheme to be formally submitted as an application. Notwithstanding the foregoing, it was suggested that the Panel should consider carefully the limitations of its terms of reference. Deputy G.C.L. Baudains contended that consideration of planning policies affecting the St. Helier Waterfront and the wider town centre would impact heavily on the time frame set for the review. He invited the Panel to consider conducting a dedicated review of that matter.</p>	
<p>5 16/03/06 Item 4</p>	<p>Work programme – Design of Homes (Room Sizes and Parking)</p> <p>The Panel, having recalled that the working group charged with progressing the Design of Homes review had met only once, expressed disappointment at the lack of progress made to date. Although the Panel considered that the review was not time critical, it noted that the Minister for Planning and Environment was due to miss his own deadline, as published in his Departmental Business Plan, for publication of a consultation draft of Planning Advice Note No. 1 entitled ‘The Design of New Homes’.</p> <p>The Panel, having been informed that officers were fully engaged in progressing two other reviews, agreed that the lead member should call a meeting of the working group in early course and, further, that the working group should aim to meet on a weekly basis thereafter.</p>	<p>Design of Homes Sub Group / IC / MR</p>
<p>6 16/03/06 Item 6</p>	<p>Work Program – Waste.</p> <p>Deputy R.C. Duhamel invited the Panel to authorize the engagement of Professor C. Coggins in relation to certain aspects of the review and, in particular, for assistance with Term of Reference 3, “To investigate European and International markets for recycled goods and recyclable materials“ and Term of Reference 4, “To examine existing technology for the treatment of food waste with the green waste in a composting facility.” The Panel agreed in principle that it should appoint an adviser and that Professor C. Coggins should be the preferred choice on the basis of his previous detailed involvement in scrutinizing the Solid Waste Strategy. It further agreed that the working group should compile a project brief and draft budget concerning the proposed appointment for subsequent endorsement by the Panel and the Chairmen’s Committee.</p> <p>Deputy R.C. Duhamel reported that he had engaged in discussions with a company that manufactured rubber-hosed goods. He advised that the company was prepared to come forward with a bid for all recycled tyres. In addition, the Deputy apprised the Panel of opportunities for recycling glass.</p> <p>In relation to Term of Reference 1, “To quantify the composition of waste within the residential and commercial collections”, the Panel noted that the figures used by the Transport and Technical Services Department were directly taken from the UK. The Panel</p>	<p>Waste Sub Group / MR</p>

	<p>had previously determined that it disputed the validity of UK data in determining an appropriate way forward for Jersey. Accordingly it had determined that work needed to be done to establish statistical data showing the specific composition of waste arising in Jersey. As this work had not been carried out the Panel concluded that it would need to obtain the necessary data itself. To that end Deputy R.C. Duhamel reported that the Connétable of St Helier had agreed that one of the seven St Helier refuse rounds should be analysed to ascertain the contents and establish exactly what percentage of those contents could reasonably be recycled. A letter was to be written to the Connétable inviting him to formalize his offer.</p> <p>On a related matter the Panel gave further consideration to the proposition lodged 'au Greffe' by Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire, entitled 'Composting Facilities' (P.258/2005 refers). The Panel, having considered the views expressed by Deputy R.C. Duhamel regarding the scope of the terms of reference for the waste review, concluded that the comments submitted by the Minister of Health and Social Services and by the Minister for Transport and Technical Services in respect of P.258/2005 could be considered during the course of that existing review. It determined that public hearings would be necessary in order that the Ministers and the Medical Officer of Health were afforded an opportunity to justify their submissions. It was agreed that the Chairman would make a statement to the House at the next States meeting to explain how the Panel intended to progress the matter.</p>	RD.
7	<p>Items to Note.</p> <p>The Panel discussed the ministerial decision concerning a capital bid for £0.5 million over and above the monies previously allocated to the Urban Task Force. It requested that further information be obtained regarding the status of the funding arrangements for the Urban Task Force and the related comments made by Senator P.F.C. Ozouf to the States on 28th Feb 2006.</p>	IC / MR
8	<p>Time and date of next meeting</p> <p>The Chairman advised that the Minister for Planning and Environment intended to invite members of the Panel to attend a series of site visits on Thursday 13th April 2006. Accordingly the Panel agreed that the Chairman would set the time and date of the next meeting once details of the proposed site visits had been confirmed.</p>	MR

Signed

Date

.....
Chairman, Environment Panel

.....