

STATES OF JERSEY



MONT ORGUEIL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY: APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT EXPERT (P.19/2003) – COMMENTS

**Presented to the States on 1st April 2003
by the Policy and Resources Committee**

STATES GREFFE

COMMENTS

The Committee believes that the proposition and the amendment to that proposition lodged au Greffe by Deputies Le Hérisser and Baudains respectively are flawed and, should either of them be adopted by the States, will simply add confusion rather than bring clarity to the challenges that need to be properly addressed in relation to the Mont Orgueil Development Strategy.

The proposition and amendment are further flawed because, although they seek the appointment of an independent expert or body to prepare a report for the States on the differences between the two bodies in respect of the Trust's Development Strategy for Mont Orgueil Castle, they require that (a) the expert or body be "acceptable to both the Jersey Heritage Trust and the Friends of Mont Orgueil Castle"; something which may not prove possible to achieve; further it is not made clear what will happen if such agreement is not reached; and (b) even though a report may be presented to the States, this does not alter the fact that statutory responsibility for determining what may or may not be included in the future development of the castle still remains with the Environment and Public Services Committee.

The Committee acknowledges that the States has a duty to ensure that the Jersey Heritage Trust complies with its obligations and preserves the historical and archaeological integrity of the site of the Castles. However, it strongly believes that the proper way to do that is for the Trust to follow the lawful planning and development applications procedures and for the body charged by the States to adjudicate on such matters; the Environment and Public Services Committee, to ensure that it secures the most appropriate independent and professional advice in order to inform its decisions.

The Committee does not believe that there is anything to be gained by the approach proposed in this proposition nor the amendment and, therefore, urges the States to reject both the proposition and the amendment.