STATEMENT TO BE MADE BY THE
CHAIRMAN OF THE EDUCATION AND HOME AFFAIRS SCRUTINY PANEL
ON TUESDAY 20TH NOVEMBER 2012

Members will have received a copy of the Panel's report – Relocation of Police Head Quarters to Green Street Car Park.

I would like to explain the reasoning for and process that the Panel undertook during the review. Conscious that Deputy Martin had lodged her proposition the Panel decided to take a proactive approach to provide States Members with information from an Operational Policing perspective. We decided not to include the greater planning aspects raised in Deputy Martins report as the planning process would deal with these issues, we did not want to duplicate that process and I would like to remind Members that the Scrutiny Code of Conduct discourages duplication of work.

Whilst not doubting the professionalism of the Officers involved, nevertheless the Panel were conscious that these officers would be compiling the comments to respond to Deputy Martin's proposition and no independent perspective would be provided. Therefore, my Panel sought to produce independent comments to assist Members. I would like to take this opportunity to point out to Members that my Panel was operating under a tight time scale in order to have a report and we delivered on time. Under normal circumstances we would have liked to have more time to refine our comments and dig deeper.

We have produced several recommendations in our report and whilst we acknowledge that the Police could operate out of the Green Street site in the short term, we are unable to say that we believe that the proposed Police HQ will be fit for purpose in the longer term as we do not accept that enough room has been left for growth. We are not convinced that this proposal is therefore good value for money.

In our report the Panel also highlighted issues regarding parking provision for visitors and staff. Looking at the evidence specifically the graph provided on Page 42 of the report, illustrates the concerns of the Panel that due to the number of visitors to the current Police HQ we are unable to say that 3 visitor parking spaces located at snow hill are sufficient. Especially when considering the visits to the Police HQ during peak times and lack of provision of car parking spaces in the area for commuters and that is without factoring the extra demand that any extra police staff may add to the current situation as illustrated on page 43 of our report.

Matters have further changed since the publication of our report in the last 24 hours; I have to apologies to Members as I have to point out that one section appears incorrect. This refers to page 19 of our report this concerns the attitude of the Police Association. During our evidence gathering stage we questioned the then President of the Police Association and the panel was under the impression that the Association bar some minor matters were supportive. I have attached a time line to explain the contact that the Panel had with the then President of the Police Association for Members.

During the presentation yesterday my Panel Members have informed me that the New President of the Police Association was not in a position to give the same commitment as the Former President. I am embarrassed to say that it would appear that my Scrutiny Panel has been misled. Sadly, I was ill yesterday and was unable to attend the presentation nevertheless I did manage to contact the New President and clarify some matters. I am informed that at the Police Association

AGM the former President did not seek re-election. Thus the then Vice-Chair was appointed as the New President. Following the AGM various Police officers mentioned their concerns about the proposed Police HQ and the New President decided to contact the membership of the association to seek any concerns. I would point out that by implication it could be argued that the former President had not done this. My Panel have not had the time to look into this matter.

This action has created approximately 21 written submissions from the Association Members – this figure of course does not include any verbal concerns that the Membership may have expressed. Further to this we have been provided last night with the anonymised comments from Police Officers. My Panel has not had the time to analyse the comments. These comments have also been sent to Members and at a initial consideration Members will note that despite Deputy Noels e-mail the concerns expressed are not all minor issues, the concerns are at all levels. Some of the concerns expressed by officers are in sync with the overall concerns of the Panel.

Who best to know whether this proposed site will be fit for purpose than those Officers who will have to work there?

I see that the Assembly has 3 options going forward:-

1. Members may consider that they have enough information and decide to carry on with Deputy Martins Proposition.

2. Members may wish to defer the debate to another sitting and wait for the Police Association to form and present their views.

3. Members may choose to refer Deputy Martins to Scrutiny to carry out further analysis of the Police Association views should they deem this key information when coming to a decision.

Whilst I note that an extraordinary meeting of the Police has been called at 5pm this evening to agree its position on the project. I am unsure if the is just the Committee or of all members, thus I would be surprised that the association would be free from political pressure to respond by the end of today. The response does not guarantee at all issues raised will be resolved within this time frame not tested.

Should a Member of the States wish to refer the proposition to my Panel we can give the Assembly the undertaking that we will carry out the work requested though we will take the time we deem necessary and in line with the procedure under standing orders. I insist that it must be a States decision for this action to take place, as Scrutiny is sometime maligned by some quarters for delaying debates for daring to do their job to the best of their ability. The wider issue of consultation was pointed out in the report is a concern for the Panel and we would highlight that the Honorary Police have not been consulted at the design stage and are expected to be consulted at a further stage – the Panel question the question this approach and do not believe it to be satisfactory.

The Panel wishes to express its desire for the Police to have new fit for purpose facilities that will last into the longer term and we are aware of the damage to moral of the Police that the current sites is having though we as States Members must provide good value of taxpayers' money.
My Panel has worked very hard on our report, we have delivered on time and I would like to thank Panel members and our Scrutiny officer for their contribution. We commend our report to the Assembly and encourage Members who have not yet had the chance to take the opportunity to read our report.

Scrutiny Review: Police HQ – Timeline

1 Correspondence, dated 8th October:
The Panel wrote to the Minister requesting a meeting with the Police to discuss concerns relating to internal design and the question whether the proposed building will adequately meet the requirements of the States of Jersey Police Force over the next twenty to thirty years. The Panel also requested the opportunity to hear the views of the Police Association

2 Minister's first letter, dated 15th October

3 First Meeting dated 16th October:
The President of the Police Association attended the Panel's meeting with the Minister, Deputy Chief Officer and Property Holdings

> **Extract from agreed notes: Consultation with police officers**: The Deputy Chief Officer explained that detailed consultation with police staff had been conducted on a department by department basis and had looked at issues including the adjacencies of offices and the space requirements. Staff feedback had provided many useful suggestions which had been incorporated into design changes (for example, the design storage space and processes for dealing with stolen property).
> The President, Police Association, confirmed that extensive consultation with staff had been effective. Early designs had been changed and improved in response to staff comments. Plans had been made available in open spaces in the Police station for officers to comment. He was confident that all significant issues raised by officers had been addressed and had not received any negative feedback about the latest designs.

4 Second meeting and second letter from the Minister, dated 26th October.
The Police Association was not represented this time

5 Further questions, email dated 2nd November.
The following questions were raised regarding the 2009 review:

- Were there any significant reservations expressed [by stakeholders] at this workshop relating to aspects of the reduction in specifications?
- What was the response of the Police Association to the removal of staff parking?
- Did the Association, or any officers, raise any concerns about safety issues faced by staff during shift or evening working patterns or difficulties in finding suitable parking nearby in periods of congestion?

The President was copied in to this correspondence.

6 Third letter from the Minister dated 6th November.
The Minister responded to the questions - see letter for details). No direct response was received from the President of the Police Association.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Members have 10 minutes to put questions to the Chairman of the Scrutiny Panel.

Deputy J.A. Martin:

Mine was just a clarification. It is not a question. It literally is a point of clarification. On point 2 the way I am reading it: "Members may wish to defer the debate to another sitting and wait for the Police Association to form and present their views." Would the Deputy clarify that the new association is formed and have already balloted the members. I am not clear about that. If you could clarify.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Forming their views, as I understand it.

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

Yes.

The Deputy Bailiff:

It is forming their views, Deputy.

Deputy J.A. Martin:

Forming the views, thank you.

8.1.1 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

Mine is also a point of clarification but the question I put to the Chairman is, is this statement his statement or his panel's statement because he refers to "we", "I" and "my panel" and it is not clear to me whether these are the Chairman's opinions alone or whether they are opinions that have been sought and agreed with his panel.

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

I can inform the Constable that I did meet with my panel early this morning to discuss the matters that had arisen, which explains why this particular statement is so time sensitive. As the Connétable will be aware given the mechanisms that have happened today I have not been able to pass this statement exactly under the noses of my panel for approval word for word though I believe that the sentiments within that were communicated accurately from the meeting from my panel. Therefore, I am happy to say that these are an accurate reflection of the members' views when taken in consideration with the report that members of course had input on. I hope that clarifies the situation for the Constable.

8.1.2 Senator B.I. Le Marquand:

To ask a question in relation to the fourth paragraph of the statement, which is dealing with future proofing, and the question was this, I wondered whether Deputy Maçon and his panel in making the statement contained there had considered the fact that there is going to be, at some stage in the future, there are estimates between 7 years and 20 years, a rebuild, a reconstruction of the Green Street car park and whether you have in fact considered the fact that that might give an opportunity for them to review the situation and indeed to build an extension if they are right and numbers are increasing.

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

I can be honest and inform the Minister that no my panel has not been able to consider that opportunity. Of course, that is in the distant future and will be subject to States available budgets at the time for which I am afraid I do not believe any party can say there is a guarantee of anything at the moment.

8.1.3 Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

I do realise the Chairman is in a difficult position. However, in his statement he made a remark about not being convinced of value for money. Value for money can only be assessed against other options. I did hear him on the radio this morning and he said that he had not assessed any other options. How can he say that it does not represent value for money when other options have not been considered?

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

While I would like to make it very clear again that my panel restricted its terms of reference to the operational policing matters and therefore, the wider planning matters such as different sites fell, we felt, outside of our terms of reference and therefore we did not include them. We are aware, however, that there has been a long history of different sites that have been considered but the remark over good value for money is reflected in the longer term and growth aspects which we are unable to sign up to. Therefore, the term value for money we believe is wider than the assertion of the Minister for Treasury and Resources as he sees it.

8.1.4 Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Is the Chairman saying that in his judgment because he was inadvertently or his panel were inadvertently misled his panel is now missing a vital piece of evidence in coming to its conclusions? Is that what he is saying?

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

What I can say is certainly one of the key bits of information that the panel requested immediately when we started this process was to seek the views of the Police Association because we very much do feel that any decision taken their views clearly are going to be key as they are the workers who will have to provide the service within these facilities. Yes, we would suggest that that is a key and vital bit of information which needs to be properly considered and analysed which we would hope other Members would sympathise with that view.

8.1.5 Senator P.F. Routier:

The Chairman expressed his opinion that "I am embarrassed to say that it would appear that my Scrutiny Panel has been misled", it is comparing what was said by the previous leadership of the Police Association and saying that perhaps because the new leadership of the Association is saying something different that the panel was misled. Does he appreciate that it is quite possible for different people to have different views and hold those views validly and not to be misleading? Also, the views that were being expressed yesterday at the briefing were views I believe from 10 per cent of the force and not the other 90 per cent of the force.

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

To answer his first question, yes and no, and I would like to explain. When an individual is responsible for the representation of a body of people, it strikes myself and I believe my panel that to have such a different position to say: "We are fully behind these proposals" to: "We are unable to state a position at this current time", we feel that because in that role of being representative to hold different positions, I express the concern that I do feel that the panel has been misled. That is my reasoning. If the Senator could just remind me of the second section of his question please.

Senator P.F. Routier:

It has been expressed that people who do have concerns, 10 per cent of the force currently have expressed an opinion, but there are 90 per cent who have not expressed any concerns.

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

That is not necessarily true, as I point out in my statement, because we know that if only 10 per cent have submitted written concerns that does not mean to say that other officers might have been involved in compiling those written responses, it does not mean to say that there have not been other verbal responses which have been compiled. This is the problem which I am trying to explain that we do not know how representative these concerns are at this current time and we do not know whether now that this avenue seems to have opened up whether there may be more which at the moment have not been viewed. The point is, what we are trying to say is, we do not know the extent to these concerns and therefore we do not know how representative or not representative they may be at this stage. We have not had the opportunity to be able to assess that.

8.1.6 Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Would the Chairman like to confirm that in fact the most valuable part of the police force, the actual members of the force, the frontline staff, have not been consulted on the new station?

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

Which is the most important cog in a machine? I would not want to place one member above another and that is because I am a very diplomatic person, but I can say that obviously those working at the coalface, those who do deal with the frontline issues, of course their issues and their concerns and their views are incredibly important when it comes to the delivering of facilities and when it comes to whether they have been consulted. In our report we do point out that a high level of consultation did appear to have been conducted with higher ranking officers than necessarily frontline staff. We have raised concerns about the consultation process and we do think it is something which, if had we the time, we would have considered further and given a better response to but we were constrained by the time factors.

8.1.7 Deputy T.A. Vallois of St. Saviour:

Has the Chairman been provided with the final response from the Police Association which was sent to the Assistant Minister for Treasury and Resources last night which he has chosen not to provide in the email to all States Members today?

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

While it is not my role to defend the Assistant Minister for Treasury and Resources, as I have read that particular email I understand the situation to be that at the moment the Police Association have yet to form a final view and therefore have been unable obviously to provide that. I have expressed the concern in my statement that given the hurried nature I do have concerns whether they are being pressured into producing a response. I am sorry for going on but thank you.