

Environment Scrutiny Panel

PUBLIC MEETING

Record of Meeting

Date: **1st March 2007.**

Meeting Number: **42**

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

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
1	<p>Membership</p> <p>The Panel welcomed Connétable A. S. Crowcroft as a new member of the Panel.</p> <p>RD. KB. SC. PLC. SP.</p>	
2. Item 6 22/02/07.	<p>Integrated Travel and Transport Plan</p> <p>The Panel discussed the Integrated Travel and Transport Plan as presented by the Transport and Technical Services Minister. The Panel identified issues within the plan that may require its consideration -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Plan attempted to address the immediate problems by the simplest means possible but did not provide a strategy for the Island to work towards a new era of traffic management, encouraging a step change in the lifestyle of the population; 2. There was insufficient attention to cycling, emissions or pedestrians; 3. Reference to car ownership failed to confront or focus on the key problem. It was considered that the level of car usage would be a more appropriate focus than car ownership due to multiple ownership by collectors etc. 4. There was too much focus in the plan on encouraging the use of buses. 5. The targeted reduction in peak hour traffic was likely to be thwarted by insufficient controls on population increase. 6. The plan lacked any solution in dealing with noise pollution. 	

7. The Plan did not adhere to the principles of the 'Hierarchy of Travel'.
8. Targets were not considered realistic or achievable.
9. Much of the baseline data was considered to be out of date.
10. There was a lack of evidence contained within the report to support many of the statements therein.
11. As a plan, it might achieve more by focusing a relatively small spend to make walking and cycling easier.
12. The drafting of the strategy should rest with the Planning Department to plan in traffic systems and address the problems faced by today's commuters. This would be a long-term strategy that would tie in with the Eco-Active initiative, which was only touched on within the Plan.
13. No consideration was evident to resolve long waiting lists for driving tests.
14. Barriers, obstacles and restrictions on allowing electric vehicles and other alternative forms of environmentally friendly transport on the roads of Jersey were not addressed.

In view of these concerns, the Panel regretted that it was currently committed to two reviews and was not in a position to launch a third review at this time. It agreed however to undertake a review of the Plan during the third quarter of 2007. It was considered that there might be a public consultation meeting on 10th March 2007, which the Panel would be interested in attending.

MR

In addition to these responses, the Panel considered parking on the Esplanade. It was understood that all parking would be lost during the construction of the new car park. This was not in accordance with reassurances previously given by the Minister for Transport and Technical Services during his meeting with the Panel of 2nd February 2007.

On that occasion, he advised that The Esplanade Car Park was to maintain 525 public spaces during the regeneration process of the area although there was also to be some private parking. Written confirmation of this would be requested.

SP.

RD. KB. SC. PLC. SP.

3
Item 10
22/02/07

First 12 Months of Ministerial Government.

The Panel considered a letter from the Privileges and Procedures Committee Machinery of Government Sub Committee dated 25th January 2007, inviting submissions from the Panel on the first twelve months of Ministerial Government. The Panel made the following observations.

- There was a notable contrast in the working practices of the two Ministers with whom the Panel worked;
- There were clearly insufficient resources for the Scrutiny

Panels to do the work needed for effective scrutiny;

- A Scrutiny Panel should be established specifically for each Minister and respective Department ;
- The previous Committee system had seven people involved in the decision making, where as the Minister was making a unilateral decision. That had made the decision-making process less robust and conferred more decision making on to the Public Employees;
- One Minister could not keep track of a large department. The former system meant there were more people to split the work between and there was a better overview of what departments were doing;
- The Corporate Management Board was making decisions that elected Members knew nothing about. There needed to be an elected representative on the Board;
- The Comité des Connétables was very diverse and gave clear focus for the Constables. It would be more appropriate if it were a Committee of the States;
- A Member's or Deputy's Committee would offer focus to other members in the same way as the Constables;
- There were unreasonable restrictions on the releasing of information from the Council of Ministers. Scrutiny would benefit from Part B Minutes being released to them;
- The Panel expressed concern that the influence of the States Greffe was too strong within the Scrutiny function and asked-
 - Would the Scrutiny Office function benefit from being completely independent;
 - Would Scrutiny benefit by a Scrutiny Department with its own Scrutiny Staff;
- The Ministers seemed to be doing whatever they want without coming to the House with issues;
- There were no Public controls on the Ministers, which allowed the Departments to take the lead in progressing projects;
- The matter of who the Government was remained unclear;
- What exactly was the function of the Ministers rôle; and,
- The Panel expressed regret that the legal advice issues had not been resolved.

The Panel would make itself available to meet the Review Sub-Committee to discuss the above.

In addition, the Panel also considered the responsibility held by Assistant Ministers when the Minister was indisposed. A briefing

MR.

MR.

	relating to this was to be prepared for the next meeting. RD. KB. PLC. SP	
4	<p>Waste.</p> <p>The Panel considered an invitation from the company 'Green Cone Ltd' to run trials in Jersey of their composting unit. The invitation had come about through the composting exhibition held in Jersey in September 2006.</p> <p>The Panel did not consider that to be a suitable use of Scrutiny funds and decided to decline the invitation to participate.</p> <p>The Panel would direct the company to some contacts who might assist.</p> <p>RD. KB. PLC. SP</p>	MR
5	<p>Any other business</p> <p>Her Majesty's Prison.</p> <p>The Panel noted that H.M. Prison had a composting unit purchased for them by an anonymous benefactor.</p> <p>It was further noted that the H.M. Prison approach to the Transport and Technical Services Department, some fifteen months ago, to obtain a blue recycling bin for waste paper had not been acted upon. An approach had now been made to St Brelade's Parish.</p> <p>Three local businesses were noted to have also expressed an interest in being involved with composting. The Panel agreed that the correct approach for these companies was a written approach to the Panel.</p> <p>RD. KB. PLC. SP</p>	SP.
6 Item 11 22/02/07	<p>Scrutiny Newsletter</p> <p>The Panel reconsidered its decision relating to the newsletter taken at the meeting of 22nd February 2007 and decided that it should decline to be involved or participate due to the proposed content and lack of value for money.</p> <p>The Panel requested that the Chairmen's Committee be advised of its decision.</p> <p>RD. KB. PLC. SP</p>	MR

Signed

Date:

.....
Chairman
Deputy R.C. Duhamel

.....