



PARISH OF ST HELIER



Minutes of the Shadow Conseil Municipal	
Wednesday 15 January 2020 at 6.00 p.m.	
Old Magistrate's Court, Town Hall	
	Item 1: Welcome, Apologies, Scene Setting and Overview –
	<p>The Constable welcomed everyone to this historic event, the first meeting of the Shadow Conseil Municipal.</p> <p>Present: Constable Simon Crowcroft (SC) Procureur Peter Pearce (PP) Procureur Geraint Jennings (GJ) The Very Revd Mike Keirle (MK) Mr Julian Rogers (JR) Mr John Baker (JB) Mr Barry Le Feuvre (BLF) Mr Bernie Manning (BM) Mrs Lyndsay Feltham (LF) Mrs Babara Corbett (BC) Mr Mario Pirozzolo (MP) Mr Malcolm L'Amy (ML)</p> <p>In Attendance: Mr Jason Turner, CEO (JT) Mrs Alison Sweeney, Parish Secretary (AS)</p> <p>Apologies: Robert Le Brocq</p> <p>The Constable outlined from his recent letter, that Projet 6 approved by the Parish Assembly on 6th November agreed establishment of a Shadow Conseil. Members have less than a year to show both the Assembly and the Government that there is merit in establishing a St Helier Conseil Municipal. The focus this year must be to engage the Council of Ministers and its Officials in a constructive way and see what responsibilities or delegated powers could be discharged to the Parish without adding to the financial burden. The secondary aim is to create a small numbers of portfolio committees complimenting the work already done on behalf of parishioners. The CEO and his team have done considerable work in preparation for tonight's meeting, which is based on UK standards and is put before you for approval this evening.</p>
	Item 2: Declaration of Interests
	There were no interests declared by members
20/001	Item 3: Induction Programme
	<p>Members were asked to note the proposed Induction Programme for all members to attend at a date to be arranged outside of Conseil Meetings:</p> <p>The Induction would provide an: Overview of the Conseil and 2020 objectives Overview of Parish Strategic Plan Overview of Parish Finances Overview of key services: customer services, care services, public services, infrastructure and administration Tour of key sites</p> <p>Members noted this motion unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)</p>
20/002	Item 4: Code of Conduct
	<p>Members were asked to adopt the Code of Conduct in respect of all members.</p> <p>The Code of Conduct is based on best practice from UK Councils. The document was discussed by members and there were a number of amendments suggested.</p>

	<p>No.7 It was asked in relation to gifts, whether the Parish required a register. It was suggested that a register should include gifts that were offered even if they were not accepted. Members asked for clarification as to what counts as a gift, is a coffee a gift, is a meal a gift etc. Members felt that the sum of £1000 was too high and that everything over £5 must be declared. It should be acknowledged there were times when to refuse hospitality could offend. It was explained that the £1000 referred to the register of interests document. It was agreed that the JT would come back to the next meeting with draft procedures.</p> <p>The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)</p> <p>It was stated that in numerous places the code of conduct referred to elected members, when in fact the Roads Committee had not been elected on to the Conseil and that this should be changed to read member.</p> <p>The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)</p> <p>No.6 It was suggested that if members had a complaint in relation to a Parish employee they should be able to direct this to the Chief Executive and not the employees Line Manager.</p> <p>The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)</p> <p>No.6 Complaints should not just relate to Parish employees but also to members of the Shadow Conseil. There was discussion around that if political parties were in operation, you could state that others were incompetent but that the code of conduct prevents this. It was agreed by all to leave the code as stated, it was hoped this wouldn't happen</p> <p>The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)</p>
20/003	<p>Item: 5 Register of Interests</p>
	<p>Members were asked to adopt the Register of Interests template to record member's interests.</p> <p>In relation to gifts and hospitality there was only one sum of in excess of £1000 mentioned, this would not stop people receiving £100 per month and it should be changed to reflect multiple payments.</p> <p>The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)</p> <p>There were concerns around GDPR and naming other individuals on the form. The Parish will comply with GDPR and would not want to breach any legal requirement the documents will be reviewed to ensure there is no breach.</p> <p>There was concern that the forms state they will be kept on a permanent basis by the Parish. Under GDPR it should be stipulated they will be kept or a fixed period. The Parish will check to ensure it complies with GDPR.</p> <p>Subject to GDPR the amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)</p>
20/004	<p>Item 6: Standing Orders</p>
	<p>Members were asked to adopt the draft Standing Orders as their Standing Orders for 2020, subject to any variation appropriately agreed during the year</p> <p>It was explained the Standing Orders were Standing Orders used for Parish and Town Councils. JT identified three amendments that had been noted since the orders were issues:</p> <p>No.27F need to add additional point that you can speak again to request clarification</p> <p>No.47 delete that they have to stand, they should raise hand to indicate</p> <p>No.52 to read by the majority of members present and voting, remove the word Councillor from the document. Proposed: BC Seconded: GJ.</p> <p>The amendments were adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)</p>

No.51 amend to if the chair is absent from a meeting the Senior Procurer then the Junior Procurer then members can chair the meeting. **Proposed:** PP **Seconded:** MK

The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)

No.59 amended 2.5 hours unless agreed to extend it, to if two thirds of those present wish to continue the meeting, it is understood those who have to leave can do so. **Proposed:** BM **Seconded:** SC

The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)

No.18 amendment notified to Parish Secretary in writing should be changed to three working days. **Proposed:** JB **Seconded:** MK

The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)

No.25 delete from standing orders. **Proposed:** JB **Seconded:** MK

The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)

No.30C it was decided this should stay

No.44 timings on speeches as it limits the number of people who can speak. Discussion around it should be the same for the public and members. It was agreed to change to 5 minutes for both public and members. It should be added that people giving presentations should be excluded from this and chair to give their consent for additional time. **Proposer:** MK **Seconded:** PP

This was adopted by the majority (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML), but not adopted by (JB)

No.68 portfolios numbers within the information documents is not consistent, it was advised there was errors in the report and the numbers should be up to five.

No.73 it states that the Shadow Conseil should satisfy itself with the Constable and Roads Committee policies plans and strategies. It should be noted that when the Conseil assumes more power, it should be the ultimate body and the other Committees the subordinate committees. The document needs to be changed to express this **Proposed:** JB **Seconded:** SC

The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)

No 83 Confirmation was requested

This is the procedure in all UK Councils. It was agreed that any item for discussion should be on the agenda, with nothing being discussed without advance notice. It was agreed that members could bring items forward though amendments this is the same with AOB. It doesn't stop you doing these things they just need to be done in the correct manner **Proposer** JB **Seconder** PP

The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)

No.53 Chairman has casting vote that means they get two votes, which should not be allowed. It was agreed to remove the casting as it was a more modern arrangement **Proposed** GJ **Seconded** SC

The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)

It was agreed portfolio committees should follow suit, the chairman shouldn't get two votes **Proposer:** GJ **Seconder:** MK

The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)

No.55d if someone does not declare an interest and the chair discovers it in the course of the meeting then the chair can ask them to leave the meeting. **Proposer:** BLF **Seconder:** JR

The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)

No.56 says you should check if unsure of interests, surely you should not be in the meeting. There are different levels of interest, it was agreed this is covered in the code of conduct.

	<p>No.54 Roads Committee votes are taken automatically don't need to request that votes are recorded, this should be the same Proposed JR Seconded SC The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)</p> <p>No.54 a member asked to call for an appel, by recording next to the votes the initials of people for and against. He stated he would like it in Standing Orders. Another member described this as a reading out the votes at the time, there is no need for this currently, but could be if the Conseil were to use an electronic voting or recording system as votes would not be visible at meeting. This was two separate things, one was to record names in the minutes the other was to read the names out and need to be inserted after No.54 Proposer GJ Seconded SC The amendment to record names in the minutes was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)</p> <p>No.73 should the Procurers not appear in this list? Proposed: PP Seconded: GJ The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)</p> <p>No.73a should state in line with existing published polices, plans and strategies Proposed: JR Seconded: BLF The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)</p> <p>No.73 should state Procureurs need to comply with their oath of office Proposed: PP Seconded: SC The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)</p> <p>No.30b typing error No.69 typing error and publicly needs correcting in several places</p> <p>No.104 rights and obligations of other roles to inspect if the Constable is not present, might say Senior Procureur and Junior Procureur. Proposed: PP Seconded: GJ The amendment was adopted unanimously (SC,PP,GJ,MK,JR,JB,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML)</p>
20/005	Item 7: Portfolios
	<p>Members were asked to adopt portfolio areas for 2020.</p> <p>The Constable stated that portfolio committees would be formed from all members, as it was important that the Conseil operated within its capacity and to try to make the workload manageable, for the members and team at Town Hall. Three portfolios were being proposed, Environment, Public Engagement and Community Services. Members asked for clarification on the current roles of existing Parish Committees. The CEO stated the Roads Committee currently has statutory obligations and the Accounts Committee had been set up by Parish the Parish Assembly to look at the finances. The Conseil didn't want to end tradition or step on other Committees toes, but it was evident from the reduced Agenda of the Roads Committee that morning, that they had been undertaking many areas outside their remit, which would now be led by the Conseil.</p> <p>There was discussion around the number of Committees required. It was agreed that there was no reason to restrict the number to three committees and that others may be added as matters arise and as the Conseil saw fit. The Constable stated it had been considered to create 12 portfolios; one for each member, but that would have been too ambitious and the Parish did not currently have the resources to undertake that amount of work. He stated the Conseil would not be able to convince people they were required if they spread themselves too thinly</p> <p>In general discussion, it was decided that the remit of the Environment Committee was very clear and necessary. However, when it came to cycling and transport the Conseil needed to be mindful of the Roads Committee remit. The Community Services portfolio was self-explanatory, ensuring that vulnerable people in society needs were met. There was considerable discussion around the Public Engagement Committee and what it may involve; ideas focused on turnout at Parish Assemblies, increasing voter turnout communication the Town Crier, Website, Social Media etc. With only four members of the public at the first meeting it was evident engagement was necessary.</p> <p>One member of the Group felt that portfolio was not grabbing them, it was not about getting bigger audiences, whereas others felt it was about making the Conseil relevant. It was suggested the Conseil should be looking at early wins and encouraging people to turnout to meetings would need to be worked at and take some time.</p> <p>This was adopted by the majority (SC,PP,JB,MK,JR,BLF,BM,LF, BC, MP, ML), but not adopted by (GJ)</p>

	<p>It was decided that Public Engagement should also cover businesses, events in parks and town, tourism and would need to be applicable to people of all ages. Examples were Jersey Heritage and Visit Jersey who get people to engage through publicity, marketing and activities. If this was the case GJ said he would be more inclined to support it</p> <p>The Committees were tasked with bringing back a plan to avoid overlaps.</p>		
20/006	Item 8: Portfolio Committees		
	Members were asked to adopt portfolio members for 2020.		
	<p>Improving the Environment Geraint Jennings Mario Pirozzolo Bernie Manning John Baker Bob Le Brocq</p>	<p>Community Services Barbara Corbett Julian Rogers Barry Le Feuvre Malcolm L'Amy</p>	<p>Public Engagement Reverend Mike Keirle Lyndsay Feltham Simon Crowcroft Peter Pearce</p>
	<p>The Constable asked if anyone would want to take responsibility for putting a Youth Committee together. It could involve going to Youth Centres to speak about the group. LF was happy to lead on this as part of Public Engagement Committee</p> <p>AS will contact all members to arrange their first meeting at which they would be expected to elect a chairperson. The Constable advised that secretarial services would be provided at these meetings.</p>		
	The date of the next scheduled Parish Assembly is Wednesday 12 February 2020 at 6pm		