

# Environment Scrutiny Panel

## PUBLIC MEETING

### Record of Meeting

Date: 3rd December 2007.

Meeting Number: 67

Present	Deputy R.C. Duhamel (Chairman) (RD) Connétable K.A. Le Brun of St. Mary (KB) (from 10 a.m.) Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire (PLC) Deputy C. Scott Warren
Apologies	Connétable A.S. Crowcroft (SC)
Absent	
In attendance	Mr. M. Robbins, Scrutiny Officer Mrs. C. Le Quesne, Scrutiny Officer

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
1.	<p><b>Minutes</b></p> <p>The Panel received and approved its Minutes of the meeting of 15th November 2007 and 20th November 2007.</p> <p>The Panel approved the Minutes of 15th and 20th November 2007 subject to minor amendments. The Chairman would sign the Minutes following those amendments being made.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Action Updates</b></p> <p>The Panel noted a list of action updates from previous meetings.</p> <p>In particular the Panel noted that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four Panel members' spaces and one officer space had been booked for SDUK Conference, 6th March 2008.</li> <li>• Part two of Hazard Review Group Report had been requested.</li> </ul>	

<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Matters for information</b></p> <p>The Panel noted the following matters for information –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a briefing paper outlining Panel activity for the Chairman’s Committee meeting of 7th December 2007;</li> <li>• A report from Deputy R. Le Hérissier following a visit to an Energy Recovery Facility, at Marchwood, Southampton. It was noted that the Deputy was suggesting a visit to the facility the Panel did not consider that the plant was a particularly good example as it was only achieving 35% recycling. The Panel considered that there were alternative sites that achieved much higher rates of recycling that would provide for a more informative visit for both the Panel and other States members.</li> </ul> <p>The Chairman agreed to circulate States Members with a list of more efficient sites that could be visited and he would outline the planned visit of companies at a waste exhibition. Thanks would be extended to Deputy Le Hérissier for his efforts.</p>	<p>RD</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p> <p>(Item 3 – 01/11/07 and Item 7 – 15/11/07)</p>	<p><b>Consultation Paper on Branchage, from the Comité des Connétables</b></p> <p>The Panel recalled that it had previously considered a consultation paper proposing changes to the existing Branchage Law.</p> <p>The Panel had agreed that it would invite Mr M. Stentiford and Mr. M. Freeman, Principal Ecologist of the Planning and Environment Department, and a Motor Traffic Officer to the next Panel meeting to discuss the matter.</p> <p>The Panel requested that Mr. Mike Stentiford, Mr. Chris Newton, Director of Environment and an officer from the Driver and Vehicle Standards be invited to attend its meeting of 13th December 2007. It was noted that responses were expected by 14th December 2004.</p>	<p>MR/CLQ</p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Machinery of Government Review Consultation</b></p> <p>The Panel received and considered the Draft Machinery of Government Review. It recalled that the Privileges and Procedures Committee had invited Scrutiny members to a meeting to discuss its proposals at which a number of issues of concern were raised.</p> <p>The Panel’s initial view was that the report was to some extent out of date.</p>	<p>CLQ</p>

The Panel noted that the report had been developed by a Privileges and Procedures Committee Sub-Committee.

The Panel made the following comments on the recommendations of the Privileges and Procedures Committee –

**Recommendation 36**

The Panel agreed that the Chairmen’s Committee should continue to have an overview of the work of Scrutiny Panels to avoid duplication, but it did not agree that it should ‘actively co-ordinate’ their work.

**Recommendation 37**

The Panel does not agree that the Chairmen’s Committee should be responsible for the prioritisation of resources. The Panel suggests that such an approach could result in delaying the start of reviews and preclude the less popular subjects from being scrutinised.

The Panel recommends that the existing approach which provides for the allocation of a set budget to each Panel should be maintained.

The Panel suggest that the proposed changes to centralise the funding did not reflect the previous view of the Privileges and Procedures Committee or the States, whereby each Panel had been allocated a specific area of responsibility to ensure that potentially less popular areas of policy or legislation did not get overlooked. The Panel considers the prioritisation proposal would lead to such areas being overlooked as a result of a centralised funding approach.

**Recommendation 50**

The Panel does not consider the proposal to enable Assistant Ministers to act as Scrutiny members to be an appropriate way forward.

The Panel made the following comments on the recommendations of the Council of Ministers –

The Panel expressed concern at the recommendation that Assistant Ministers should be appointed to more than one Department. It was accepted that there appeared to be a huge variation in the work of Assistant Ministers between departments and that the Role required a full review, but just to extend the role across a wider area was not considered to be an effective solution.

	<p>The Panel agreed that its initial views should be forwarded to the Chairmen's Committee but it reserved the right to comment further at a later date.</p> <p>The officer was requested to forward the Panel's submission subject to its approval of the draft.</p>	
<p><b>6.</b></p> <p>(Item 3(d) – 1/11/07)</p>	<p><b>Puffins – new study on danger to the Atlantic Puffin – update</b></p> <p>The Panel recalled that it had previously requested information from BDK architects, Dr. Glyn Young and other interested parties in respect of the report danger to Atlantic puffins on the North Coast.</p> <p>It was noted that responses had now been received from the Société Jersiaise, Ornithology Section dated 8th November 2007 and from Mr. M. Stentiford MBE, dated 8th November 2007.</p> <p>It was noted that the correspondence received highlighted the issue that the Atlantic Puffins were now down to 10 non-mating pairs of birds. Whilst the Panel accepted that this may be an issue for concern, it agreed that it was essential that it ensured that the perceived interpretation of the breed being rare was evidenced. It was recognised that consideration of the wider issue relating to species protection required was that of habitat protection.</p> <p>The Panel decided that it would extend an invitation to Mr. M. Stentiford to its next meeting so that it could get a broader understanding of the issues.</p>	MR/CLQ
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Review of The Island Plan to rezone land for life-long retirement dwellings for the over-55s and first-time buyer homes.</b></p> <p>The Panel considered the consultation document in detail and expressed concern or requested further information on the following –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) The level of pressure exerted on parishes to provide 450 homes, in addition to concerns that the parish will have very little input into the selection of buyers as they are only permitted to nominate 10% of the first-time buyers;</li> <li>(b) The minimum impact that the move will have on reducing the 490 first-time buyer homes required in the next 5 years;</li> <li>(c) With regard to the first-time buyer homes, the Panel remains concerned that no policy has come forward in respect of keeping that category of homes within the first-time buyer market and that no progress appears to</li> </ul>	

	<p>have been made in developing any form of shared equity schemes;</p> <p>(d) The impact that the further demand of homes due to the planned population growth will have on the countryside. The Panel considers that such a large number of homes should not be considered in isolation or prior to the review of the Island Plan which is scheduled for 2008;</p> <p>(e) The lack of an in-depth environmental assessment and impact statement on proposals to develop the countryside to the extent proposed;</p> <p>(f) The lack of overall strategic planning for village areas to provide nucleated communities with adequate amenity facilities rather than urban sprawl into the countryside. The current proposed approach appears to depict bolt-on or ribbon developments without the provision of amenities. The Panel is concerned that the green-field sites should not be developed without the provision of community amenities which did not appear to be required for developments below 50 units. An example of that concern was that a development in St. Saviour with over 50 homes was required to provide amenities, whilst a development in St. Helier with 49 units did not: potentially such policies could allow for abuse of the system;</p> <p>(g) The proposals to proceed with such developments prior to the release of the integrated travel and transport strategy, to ensure that adequate transport links will be available to these developed sites without creating further reliance on private vehicles;</p> <p>(h) There is no indication as to the level at which the Planning and Environment Department has worked in consultation with other departments as outlined in its Annual Business Plan;</p> <p>(i) That the current proposals do not reflect the recent acceptance by the Minister of Planning and Environment to adopt recommendations made by the Panel in its Design of Homes report (see S.R.15/2007 Res.);</p> <p>(j) The proposals appeared to lack any alternative approaches to amenity space and would benefit from further consideration of the proposed density of 65 habitable rooms per acre which would be acceptable in the countryside. An increase of density around the outer edge of a development with some</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>innovative design could provide for additional units and increased central amenity space;</p> <p>(k) That most of the report is diametrically opposed to the efforts of developing areas as socially integrated housing schemes. With 21 lifelong social rented retirement units and 28 first-time buyers the mix of residents will lack diversity. Whilst it was noted that social rented units offer the opportunity for reduced rental, concern was also expressed at the forthcoming cessation of the rent rebate scheme and questions arose about the affordability of homes as a result;</p> <p>(l) The proposed phased development over a number of years in the countryside should be represented using an overlay model so that a clear picture would emerge of the impact to be expected; and,</p> <p>(m) There appeared to be a lack of clear and consistent policy on the use of glass-house sites.</p> <p>In principle the Panel accepts the concept of down-sizing subject to it being by choice.</p> <p>On a related matter the Panel requested that it be provided with a full list of glass-house sites.</p> <p>The Officer was directed to forward the Panel's response to the Planning Department subsequent to the Panel approving the draft to be circulated.</p>	
<p><b>8.</b></p> <p>(Item 1 – 27/11/07)</p>	<p><b>Air Quality Review</b></p> <p>The Panel recalled that the heads of report for its Air Quality Review had been agreed in principle and that its Advisor Professor D. Laxen would draft the technical draft of the report to be expanded upon by the Panel.</p> <p>It was noted that the transcripts had been sent off to the relevant witnesses and were expected for comment by 5th December 2007. A hard copy of all transcripts had been forwarded to Members.</p> <p>The Panel was advised that Jersey Gas had contacted the Scrutiny Office requesting consent for a late submission. The Panel agreed that it would receive a late submission on the vehicle initiatives adopted by the company.</p> <p>The officer would circulate the late submission upon receipt.</p> <p>On a related matter the Panel was advised of a possible Public Health issue at Fort Regent in respect of adequate extraction for</p>	<p>CLQ</p>

	<p>food outlets and the effectiveness of cooking filters in enclosed places. In addition, health and safety requirements in public buildings were questioned when requirements did not appear to extend to all users. Namely that the children using the 'Playzone' facilities at Fort Regent were required to remove footwear, yet adults retrieving children from that area were not required to do so. The Panel requested that information be sought on the variation of enforcement of the requirement between the two user groups.</p> <p>The Officer was requested to seek the view of the Head of Health Protection in this connexion.</p>	
<p><b>9.</b>  (Item 12 – 15/11/07)</p>	<p><b>Water Quality in St. Aubin's Bay</b></p> <p>The Panel received the transcript from the working meeting held with the Minister for Transport and Technical Services and the Minister for Health and Social Services and officers, in respect of issues relating to concerns over the quality of water in St. Aubin's Bay.</p> <p>The Panel noted that the transcript would be forwarded to attendees for information. It was advised that, as previously requested, clarification of some of the issues discussed at that meeting had been sought from the departments.</p> <p>The following matters were considered –</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Overflow going out to sea without treatment; Issues with treating foaming sewerage; Dilution of sewerage using storm water.</p> <p>The Panel further discussed the transcript and decided to request the following information –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of the settlement agreed following the failure of the sewerage treatment plant achieving the expected output.</li> <li>• Details of the number and length of time the sewerage treatment plant has broken down in the last 2 years.</li> <li>• Details of the number and length of time the nitrate plant has broken down.</li> <li>• If run off water from town is being separated from sewerage, is it being treated?</li> <li>• If so why, and have the calculations been done to show how long the current facilities at Bellozanne can continue to operate at the current loading?</li> <li>• What extent of funding would be required to update both of the aforementioned if necessary?</li> <li>• The is the anticipated impact of the increasing population on the current sewerage works infrastructure and at what level of population will the capacity to cope be reached?</li> </ul>	<p>CLQ</p>

	<p>The Panel recalled that a publication entitled the Ends Report had recently considered blue beach standards in the United Kingdom. The Chairman advised that the ultraviolet process operated to treat sewerage locally dealt with the issues referred to in the blue beach standards. Subject to the flow rate being in tune with flow rate of waste it treated, bacteria were effectively neutralised. It was important to note that the process did not deal with viruses.</p> <p>The Panel requested that the matter be included on its next agenda.</p> <p>On a related matter, Deputy Scott Warren requested information on why the beach at Rozel had been closed for a period of 3 weeks.</p>	
<p><b>10.</b>  (Item 2 – 09/11/07 Item 13 – 13/11/07)</p>	<p><b>Waste Plant</b></p> <p><b>Conference</b> The Panel noted the costs involved for its officer attending conference on Kitchen Waste in London on 4th December 2007.</p> <p><b>Planning application</b> The Panel was reminded that the Chairman had previously agreed to provide documentation on the recent Transport and Technical Services Department Planning Application relating to ground works for energy from waste plant.</p> <p>The Panel expressed concerns relating to the appeal processes followed in connexion with that application, as it appeared some stages of consultation had not been followed: namely – the notification through the media advising that the appeal was taking place, and the notification through JEP advertising in the Gazette of the revised plans showing the proposed new height of the structure. It was concerned that relevant issues such as the possible re-use of existing buildings and the requirement to provide additional road infrastructure had been omitted from consideration by the Minister for Planning and Environment. In addition, it was understood that the Minister had considered the cost implications relating to the development, and any delays in such a consideration would not normally form part of that decision-making process.</p> <p>The Panel discussed the possible options available to it, in order to ensure that the Minister had been provided with all of the information required upon which to base his decision and to verify that the procedures laid down for the procedural management of an application had been adhered to. The Panel was aware that one of its options included a Third Party Appeal; however it was mindful that the action required habitation within 50 metres from the proposed site/development or ownership in full or part of the site, a Judicial Review or a Committee of Inquiry were other options to be considered.</p>	<p>RD MR</p> <p>MR</p>



The Panel was advised that as a Judicial Review was not a political matter, Scrutiny funds would not be available for this process. It was recognised that both of the latter options discussed by the Panel would require a States decision and would undoubtedly require States funding.

The Officer was requested to ascertain what the maximum period of time was following a planning decision that a Judicial Review could be initiated, should that be deemed the appropriate course of action.

### **Waste Adviser**

The Panel discussed the 3 companies selected for consideration as its advisers for the review. It recalled that it had tasked the Chairman with evaluating his preferred option and reporting back.

The Panel noted that the Chairman had selected 2 of the 3 as preferred options. Following consideration of both of the preferred candidates, the Panel agreed that it should approach Juniper to attend a meeting with it prior to Christmas if at all possible. The officer was requested to take the necessary action.

### **Channel 103**

The Panel welcomed representatives from Channel 103 to its meeting to discuss the formula and content of its forthcoming advertising campaign for its review.

The Chairman provided the delegates with an outline of the review's purpose and the situation to date.

The meeting discussed a number of approaches that could be taken to provide the most impact and to impart information to the public that would be thought-provoking and encourage them to engage and comment. The delegates assured the Panel that they had sufficient information from which to draft some initial advertisements. It was agreed that the opening and closing line in use in the air quality review advert would be continued. Music and voices were discussed and an overview of the variety to be used was agreed in principle, as was a mix of advert lengths to add further interest. It was confirmed that the previous quote provided to the Panel would be reworked to ensure that the overall package remained within budget with the exception of the additional script-writing costs for the increase in number of adverts.

Draft scripts would be forwarded to the Panel at the earliest opportunity for the first part of the campaign. Adverts would then be produced early January in preparation for the second campaign in the lead-up to the Panel's waste road-show

	<p>scheduled for 1st March 2008.</p> <p>The Panel agreed the slightly revised length and structure of the adverts and thanked the delegation for attending.</p> <p>Deputy Le Claire withdrew for a short time during a section of the waste item for a medical appointment.</p>	
<p><b>11.</b></p> <p>(Item 18 – 15/11/07)</p>	<p><b>The waterfront consultation document</b></p> <p>The Panel recalled that it had previously considered the draft consultation document entitled 'Masterplan for the Esplanade Quarter, St. Helier' and it noted that its response was required by the Planning and Environment Department by early January 2008.</p> <p>The Panel, while familiar with the proposals for the development, raised concerns over suggestions that there was a need to reconfigure the costs involved with the project as the land would require excavation and shipment off-Island due to contamination. The Panel discussed the issue and the Chairman advised that alternative technology was available to treat extracted shale material when the contamination was negligible, as in this instance</p> <p>The Panel recalled that reports had been commissioned on the requirement to clean up the area a number of years ago which had suggested that the contamination would spread if not dealt with. It was accepted that water impacts on the contamination areas and pushes the front of that contamination away, however the outcome of that is that it dilutes it down. It was suggested that 4 technical reports have been completed on the subject.</p> <p>The Panel discussed the proposal to sink the road and the way in which it was suggested that the whole development would be linked to the town. It was agreed that it appeared that the only link to the town would be at ground level and that innovative approaches of multi-level linking had not been included. The Panel was concerned that no ground level options with buildings over the top had been considered to reduce some of the costs.</p> <p>The major issue of concern to the Panel was the apparent lack of residential accommodation as it recalled that squares with large courtyards had previously been suggested in early discussions. The financial package proposed for the lease of the land was considered to be far below the real value of the site and it appeared that the whole area would be allocated to the finance sector. The Panel was unsure as to why a project of this size and scale had not gone to tender.</p> <p>The main question that remained with the Panel was where the residential accommodation would be situated.</p>	

	<p>The Panel agreed that it should give the document further consideration at its next meeting.</p>	
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p><b>Hill Street – Town Cycle Network Project</b></p> <p>The Panel received and considered a consultation document entitled ‘St. Helier Town Cycle Network Project – Hill Street Consultation Paper’ which was proposing some against the flow access to cyclists.</p> <p>The Panel expressed concern in respect of contra-flow cycling in general, and in particular that the proposal was only addressing one small access and link route area. The Panel suggested that any changes to the cycle networks in St. Helier should form part of a holistic review for the town, and should be developed in consultation with the Transport and Technical Services Department and reflect or take into account recommendations from the Integrated Travel and Transport Strategy.</p> <p>The Panel suggested that further consideration should be given to the proposed use of cast-iron bollards on the basis that these are currently being replaced at many other town locations.</p> <p>It was suggested that a copy of the proposal should be made available to Mr. Philip Blake, Road Safety Officer, States of Jersey Police Force to ascertain his views. The Panel also suggested that consultation in connection with this issue should include the Parish residents through their newsletter and should take place over a longer period of time.</p> <p>The Panel requested that its views be forwarded to the Parish of St. Helier.</p>	<p>CLQ</p>
<p><b>13.</b></p> <p>(Item 8 – 27/07/07 Item 16 – 17/11/07)</p>	<p><b>Tidal Energy Summit</b></p> <p>The Panel noted that members had attended a summit on tidal energy which had been held on 28th and 29th November 2007 at the Marriot Hotel in London.</p> <p>The Panel was advised that the officer had completed a draft report on the summit and would await comments for inclusion in the report from the Chairman, Connétables Le Brun and Crowcroft and Deputy Le Claire.</p> <p>The Panel members who had attended the summit agreed that it had been a very worthwhile event and that they had made some useful future contacts with regard to alternative energy initiatives.</p> <p>Comments would be forwarded to the Officer for inclusion in the report.</p>	<p>MR</p>

<p><b>14.</b></p> <p>(Item 9 – 15/11/07)</p>	<p><b>Draft Code of Practice</b></p> <p>The Panel considered the Scrutiny draft Code of Practice for the purpose of preparing its comments for the Chairmen’s Committee meeting of 7th December 2007.</p> <p>The Panel considered and commented on the proposed Chairmen’s Committee amendments as follows –</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 483 1211 1727"> <thead> <tr> <th>Page</th> <th>Item</th> <th>Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>4.9 (k)</td> <td>The requirement to seek to involve other non-Executive Members should not be included.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>4.9 (l)</td> <td>accepted</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14</td> <td>7.1</td> <td>accepted</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14</td> <td>7.2</td> <td>accepted</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14</td> <td>7.3</td> <td>accepted</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18</td> <td>9.19</td> <td>Whilst confidentiality is accepted as necessary the Panel was concerned that the inclusion of this item is too restrictive and could curtail the Panels intervention on matters of public interest in light of the amount of material that is deemed confidential. It considers that the term confidential can be overused and should relate only to very few issues, including personal information.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>23</td> <td>11.8</td> <td>The Panel did not agree that the Minister’s comments should be appended to Scrutiny reports at the time of presentation to the States, but that they should follow and be presented separately.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>24</td> <td>11.16</td> <td>accepted</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25</td> <td>12.3</td> <td>accepted</td> </tr> <tr> <td>26</td> <td>13.6</td> <td>accepted</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30</td> <td>Appendix 2</td> <td>Accepted, although the Panel would appreciate information on the structure of the ‘Corporate Supplies Department’.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Panel considered and commented on the proposed Council of Ministers amendments as follows –</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 1865 1211 2047"> <thead> <tr> <th>Page</th> <th>Item</th> <th>Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>3.5</td> <td>The Panel has 2 concerns relating to this inclusion, that it could be overused should an issue arise, and secondly that the inclusion negates</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Page	Item	Comment	10	4.9 (k)	The requirement to seek to involve other non-Executive Members should not be included.	10	4.9 (l)	accepted	14	7.1	accepted	14	7.2	accepted	14	7.3	accepted	18	9.19	Whilst confidentiality is accepted as necessary the Panel was concerned that the inclusion of this item is too restrictive and could curtail the Panels intervention on matters of public interest in light of the amount of material that is deemed confidential. It considers that the term confidential can be overused and should relate only to very few issues, including personal information.	23	11.8	The Panel did not agree that the Minister’s comments should be appended to Scrutiny reports at the time of presentation to the States, but that they should follow and be presented separately.	24	11.16	accepted	25	12.3	accepted	26	13.6	accepted	30	Appendix 2	Accepted, although the Panel would appreciate information on the structure of the ‘Corporate Supplies Department’.	Page	Item	Comment	8	3.5	The Panel has 2 concerns relating to this inclusion, that it could be overused should an issue arise, and secondly that the inclusion negates	<p>CLQ</p>
Page	Item	Comment																																										
10	4.9 (k)	The requirement to seek to involve other non-Executive Members should not be included.																																										
10	4.9 (l)	accepted																																										
14	7.1	accepted																																										
14	7.2	accepted																																										
14	7.3	accepted																																										
18	9.19	Whilst confidentiality is accepted as necessary the Panel was concerned that the inclusion of this item is too restrictive and could curtail the Panels intervention on matters of public interest in light of the amount of material that is deemed confidential. It considers that the term confidential can be overused and should relate only to very few issues, including personal information.																																										
23	11.8	The Panel did not agree that the Minister’s comments should be appended to Scrutiny reports at the time of presentation to the States, but that they should follow and be presented separately.																																										
24	11.16	accepted																																										
25	12.3	accepted																																										
26	13.6	accepted																																										
30	Appendix 2	Accepted, although the Panel would appreciate information on the structure of the ‘Corporate Supplies Department’.																																										
Page	Item	Comment																																										
8	3.5	The Panel has 2 concerns relating to this inclusion, that it could be overused should an issue arise, and secondly that the inclusion negates																																										

		the power of summons.
17	9.9	accepted
19	9.24	accepted
19	9.25	accepted
19	9.26	The Panel was content with this subject to papers only being denied in exceptional circumstances.
19	9.27	Accepted subject to the President of the Privileges and Procedures Committee being included in the resolution of any disagreement.
19	9.28	accepted
19	9.29	accepted
19	9.30	The Panel agrees that some indication as to the certainty of the advice given should be included.
20	9.31	Accepted with the caveat that the legal position should include information relating to the test that was applied to the law or position in each case.
20	9.3 - to 4	accepted
20	9.3 - 5.	Accepted subject to the proposal being reciprocal.
20	9.3 - 6	The Panel recommends that where a dispute occurs it should be the relevant Scrutiny Panel Chairman that attends a meeting and not the President of the Chairmen's Committee.
20/21	9.3 - 7 and 8	accepted
23	11.8	Accepted subject to Ministers receiving draft reports in confidence and maintaining that until they are presented to the States or early release is agreed with the relevant Chairman.
23	11.9	The Panel recommends that 'draft report' should read the 'main body of the draft report'.
28	14	The Panel recommends that any alleged infringements should be referred directly to the Privileges and Procedures Committee.

The Panel also proposed its own amendment to the Code of Conduct as follows –

	<b>Page</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Comment</b>	
	23	11.10	That the following 'timely accurate and evidence based report. Where a diversity of views exists this should be made clear in the report or a minority report should ensue' be inserted after the words 'to produce a'. The Panel agreed that the work 'consensual' should be removed.	
	<p>The Panel requested that its response be prepared to meet the 4th December 2007 submission date for the Chairmen's Committee. The officer was directed to prepare a draft for the Panels consideration during the States meeting.</p>			
16	<p><b>Jersey Heritage Trust Sites and consultation documents</b></p> <p>The Panel recalled that concern had been expressed in connexion with the issue of consultation documents and Mont Orgueil Castle at a previous meeting, and that the officer had been requested to ascertain what the situation was.</p> <p>The Panel was advised that following an approach to the Trust a Mr. John Carter called to confirm that the document currently circulating about the Castle was not a public consultation relating to any planning or building plans, but an updating of the recorded history of the site as a result of finds in recent years. Private consultants have been retained to produce the report.</p> <p>The consultation on the historical work was done through a standing working party on conservation. It would be reviewing the work of the consultants retained to examine the site's history to date. The current document that was circulating was a formative draft and would go to a broader professional consultation in the new year. The Standing Working Party has representatives from Conservation, Planning and Environment, Société Jersiaise, National Trust and the Channel Islands Occupation Society. Those bodies in turn consult with professional individuals of choice and report back. The Trust had no issue with providing the Panel with a copy of the document in the new year and it was requested that this be done. The document being produced was similar to that commissioned for all 18 sites on a rolling programme every few years, and was for the purpose of ensuring the national best practice of managing historical sites and ensuring documents are available to explain the history of those sites is adhered to in Jersey.</p> <p>It was advised that historical documents were produced separately to any development proposals for sites. It was explained that, should any development plans for any site be considered, the historical overview played a role in that</p>			CLQ

	<p>consideration process.</p> <p>The Panel was advised that the Jersey Heritage Trust had agreed that it would in future be included on consultation circulation lists.</p> <p>The Chairman requested that Mr. M. Green be advised of the situation.</p>	
<p><b>15.</b></p>	<p><b>Future meetings –</b></p> <p>The Panel noted that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the States members' lunch was scheduled for 5th December and the Chamber of Commerce lunch-time presentation on sustainability was due to take place on the same day at the Pomme D'Or Hotel. Officers would attend the Chamber of Commerce event on behalf of the Panel;</li> <li>● the Chairman would attend a Public Consultation on Energy on 4th December at St. Paul's Centre;</li> <li>● the next Panel meeting would take place on 13th December 2007.</li> </ul>	

Signed

Date:

.....

.....

Chairman  
Environment Panel