## Environment Scrutiny Panel Meeting 17

## 1<sup>st</sup> June 2006 Le Capelain Room, States Building

| Present                              | Deputy R.C. Duhamel (Chairman)<br>Deputy G.C.L. Baudains (Vice Chairman)<br>Connétable K. A. Le Brun of St Mary (9.45 am)<br>Deputy Le Hérissier (9.40 am)<br>Deputy S. Power |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Apologies<br>Absent<br>In attendance | I. Clarkson, Scrutiny Officer   |
|                                      | M. Robbins, Scrutiny Officer  |

| ltem (Ref<br>Back)             | Agenda matter  | Action |
|--------------------------------|--|--------|
| 1                              | Minutes  |        |
|                                | The Minutes of the meeting held on 18th May 2006, having been circulated previously, were taken as read and were confirmed.  |        |
| 2                              | Matters arising  |        |
| Item 8,                        | Making the Most of Jersey's Coast.   |        |
| 18/05/06<br>Item 9<br>18/05/06 | The Panel discussed the Coastal Zone Management Scheme and<br>reiterated concerns regarding possible resource implications.<br>Although it was acknowledged that the consultation period had<br>expired, officers were requested to establish whether further<br>submissions would be accepted and whether it would be possible<br>for the Panel to discuss the draft with the Minister for Planning and<br>Environment.   | IC     |
|                                | Water Pollution Complaint  |        |
|                                | The Panel noted that letters to various parties including: Mr. M. Pollard, former Constable of St. Peter; Mr. P. Rondel, former Deputy of St. John, and the Environment Department, concerning the alleged water pollution issue in St. Peter had not yet been sent due to demands placed on officers arising from the three current reviews. The Panel required that the matter be progressed prior to its next meeting. Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire had been invited to provide the Panel with copies of any documentary evidence in his possession regarding the alleged problem. | IC     |
| 3                              | Homes and Lifestyle Exhibition   |        |
| ltem 3(d)<br>18/05/06          | The Panel confirmed that it intended to use a stand at the Homes<br>and Lifestyle Exhibition to address the public on matters relating to<br>the Panel's ongoing work, to give publicity to the many areas of<br>the Panels' remit and to advocate the principles of Scrutiny in<br>general. The Panel approved the selection of stand A7 at a<br>confirmed cost of £988 on the basis of its prominent position within<br>the hall. It instructed officers to finalize the necessary<br>arrangements.  | MR     |
| 4                              | Scrutiny Officers - rôle   |        |

|                                   | Mrs Tremellen-Frost, Scrutiny Manager, attended the meeting and<br>presented a paper entitled 'Rôle of Scrutiny Officers'. The<br>background to this had been a complaint from outside the Panel<br>that officers had, on occasions, taken actions which were "political"<br>and beyond the rôle of an officer. Having monitored the situation<br>for a period of time, the Scrutiny Manager advised that there had<br>been various occurrences across the Panels which had prompted<br>the matter being raised at individual Panel meetings. These<br>situations were noted as detailed in the Manager's paper. It was<br>noted that Scrutiny Manager was attending a meeting of each<br>Panel to consider this issue.<br>A general discussion ensued relating to areas including meetings<br>with and without Scrutiny Officers in relation to the collection and<br>collation of evidence, storage of information and evidence being<br>centralised in the Scrutiny Office and the Scrutiny Officer Job<br>Description. It also considered the degree of Officer advice to the<br>Panel, officers and members levels of expectation in respect of<br>this and responsibilities for the management of reviews.<br>Having considered and noted the aforementioned paper, Panel<br>members explained that they had no concerns regarding the<br>officer support. If officers had any matters which they believed to<br>be of the benefit of the Panel, or if they perceived any difficulties,<br>they should feel comfortable in making these known to the Panel. | None |
|-----------------------------------|---|------|
| 5                                 | Items to Note         The Panel noted the following matters for information         i)       Former Jersey College for Girls – Removal of         covenant         ii)       Amendments to Road Traffic (St Peter) (Jersey)         Order 1992 regarding         La Rue du Craslin and La Ruelle es Ruaux.         iii)       Ministerial Registration and Listing Advisory         Group.         vi)       Avian Influenza.         vii)       P60/2006 Provision of Pedestrian Crossings.         In relation to item i), the Panel noted the view, expressed by the Chairman, that the Former Jersey College for Girls Site could be split into two parts. It was considered that members outside of the Executive were short of office space and that the building in guestion could be used to alleviate the problem.   |      |
| 6<br>Item 6<br>04/05/06<br>Item 8 | <ul> <li>Work Programme – Planning Process</li> <li>The Panel considered a progress report, dated 25th May 2006 and prepared by the Scrutiny Office.</li> <li>The Panel endorsed the need for public hearings to be held. In view of a perceived reluctance of potential witnesses to make submissions, the Panel agreed that it was not minded to compel any witnesses to attend public hearings. It was agreed that the purpose of the first round of public hearings should be to establish more clearly the broad extent of any issues affecting the planning process. A second round of hearings might then be used to drill down into the detail of those issues.</li> <li>The Panel approved the list of witnesses as recorded in the report and further agreed that Deputy C. H. Egré of St. Peter should be invited to attend on the basis of his acknowledged experience in monitoring a number of significant recent developments. It was considered that witnesses should, if possible, be interviewed over</li> </ul>  | IC   |

| 24/01/06                | a period of 4 days between Friday 23rd June and Monday 17th<br>July 2006. The officers were instructed to produce a draft schedule<br>of interviews for final approval by the Panel at its next meeting.<br>Panel Members noted that files containing background information<br>and copies of written submissions had been produced for Planning<br>Process Working Group members. It agreed that similar files<br>should be produced and made available to the remaining<br>members of the Panel for their consideration. Deputy G.C.L.<br>Baudains requested that individual members draw up draft<br>questions for each witness to be interviewed and, further, that any<br>draft questions should be forwarded to the Scrutiny Office for<br>collation and subsequent consideration by the Panel.<br>The Panel discussed its method of working on this and other<br>reviews and noted that it had previously agreed that the Chairman<br>should chair any hearings, although the lead member of the review<br>would lead the questioning. It was agreed that this method would<br>be evaluated after the first full public hearing. The Chairman<br>requested that Panel Members make every effort to attend public<br>hearings.   | IC<br>IC<br>Panel<br>Members / IC<br>Panel<br>Members |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| 7<br>Item 5<br>18/05/06 | Work Programme – Design of Homes<br>The Panel considered a briefing document, prepared by the<br>Scrutiny Office, concerning progress made on the Design of<br>Homes review. It recalled that the Design of Homes Working<br>Group had agreed to invite Mr. D. Mason, Architect, to propose a<br>series of site visits to the United Kingdom and Europe to view<br>examples of best practice in home design.<br>The Panel welcomed Mr D. Mason, Architect. Mr D. Mason gave a<br>presentation to the Panel concerning a series of proposed site<br>visits encompassing sustainable developments in: London, U.K.;<br>Milton Keynes, U.K.; Vienna, Austria and Malmo, Sweden. It was<br>suggested that the four locations could be covered in two trips.<br>The first would take place in August, while the second would take<br>place during September.<br>On the matter of detailed financial and logistical arrangements, Mr.<br>D. Mason requested that the Panel take full responsibility for<br>organizing and paying for flights, accommodation and transport for<br>all those attending, including himself. He added that he would<br>expect to be given permission to conduct a full dry run of the<br>proposed itinerary on his own and in advance of the formal visits.<br>All expenses incurred as a result of such visits would also be<br>charged to the Panel.<br>Mr Mason, having been thanked by the Panel for his attendance,<br>withdrew from the meeting.<br>The Panel agreed that the trip would be invaluable to its ongoing<br>review and that it was minded, subject to detailed consideration of<br>the full cost of organizing the visits, to instruct its officers to make<br>the necessary arrangements. It further agreed that Mr. D. Mason<br>should be invited to accompany the Panel on the visits as an<br>expert adviser, and that an invitation should also be extended to<br>the Minister for Planning and Environment. The Panel agreed that<br>the Chairman should write to Mr. D. Mason requesting written<br>clarification of his terms of engagement.<br>The Panel noted two books used in the presentation namely "The<br>Phaidon Atlas of Contemporary W | IC / MR<br>RD / IC                                    |

| 8<br>Item 7<br>18/05/06 | Work Programme – Waste.<br>The Panel considered a briefing document, prepared by the<br>Scrutiny Office, entitled Waste Review, position as 24 <sup>th</sup> May 2006.  |        |
|-------------------------|---|--------|
|                         | Deputy R.C. Duhamel disputed the accuracy of a number of statements made within the body of the document. After some consideration, the Panel decided that the document should be withdrawn. The Panel nevertheless agreed that written reports outlining progress made by the Waste Working Group should be added to agendas for future Panel meetings. It further agreed that there was a need for the Panel to engage with the media at a more pro-active level. |        |
|                         | The Panel noted that the review was on target for completion at<br>the end of July 2006, although it was possible that the final report<br>might not be ready for presentation to the States until August<br>2006.  |        |
| 9.                      | Date of next meeting  |        |
|                         | The Panel agreed to meet at 11 am on Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> June 2006 in Le Capelain Room, States Building.  | IC/ MR |

Signed

Date

.....

------

Chairman, Environment Panel