

DELIBERATIONS OF 21-12-2011

Date: 22nd December, 2011

**STATES OF ALDERNEY
DELIBERATIONS FOR THE MEETING OF
WEDNESDAY 21ST DECEMBER 2011 AT 17:30**

Present:

Mr Stuart Trought, President
Mr Bill Walden
Mr Ian Tugby
Mr Tony Llewellyn
Mr Boyd Kelly
Mr Geoff Sargent
Mr John Beaman
Mr Matt Birmingham
Mr Paul Arditti
Mr Ray Berry

Colonel Colin Mason represented His Excellency The Lieutenant-Governor of the Bailiwick of Guernsey.

Item I The Customs & Excise (General Provisions) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2011

The States resolved to approve The Customs & Excise (General Provisions) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2011.

Proposed by Mr Kelly and seconded by Mr Sargent
Approved unanimously

Item II Sanctions

The States resolved to approve:-

1. The Syria (Restrictive Measures) (Alderney) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2011; and
2. The Belarus (Freezing of Funds) (Alderney) (Amendment) (No.2) Ordinance, 2011.

Proposed by Mr Beaman and seconded by Mr Kelly
Approved unanimously

Item III Policy & Finance Committee Annual Report for 2011

The States resolved to approve the Annual Report for 2011 of the Policy and Finance Committee.

Proposed by Mr Beaman and seconded by Mr Llewellyn
Approved unanimously

Item IV General Services Committee Annual Report for 2011

The States resolved to approve the Annual Report for 2011 of the General Services Committee.

Proposed by Mr Walden and seconded by Mr Kelly
Approved unanimously

Item V Building and Development Control Committee Annual Report for 2011

The States resolved to approve the Annual Report for 2011 of the Building and Development Control Committee.

Proposed by Mr Sargent and seconded by Mr Llewellyn
Approved unanimously

Item VI 2012 Census - Requête

The States failed to approve the proposition that the States directs the Chief Officer to make the necessary enquiries in other jurisdictions in the British Isles and to report to the Policy & Finance Committee with costed options for a Census in Alderney in 2012 to replace the 2011 Census which was not conducted.

Proposed by Mr Arditti and seconded by Mr Berry
Requête failed:-
Approved: Messrs Tugby, Llewellyn, Arditti and Berry
Disapproved: Messrs Walden, Kelly, Sargent, Beaman, Birmingham

Item VII Proposed Increase in Mooring Charges for 2012

The States resolved to approve the Statutory Instrument of 2011 in relation to increase in Mooring Charges

Proposed by Mr Walden and seconded by Mr Tugby
Approved unanimously

Item VIII Occupiers Rates 2012

The States resolved to approve The Occupiers Rate (Level for 2012) Ordinance, 2011.

Proposed by Mr Beaman and seconded by Mr Sargent
Approved unanimously

Item IX Questions and Reports

The following questions were submitted by Mr Arditti to Mr Beaman, Chairman of the Policy and Finance Committee, and Mr Beamans answers are included:-

The Bailiff wrote on the 4 October 2011, expressly for the information of all members of the Policy and Finance Committee. His letter bears a received stamp of the 5 October but was not circulated to members of P&F until the 1 November 2011.

Q1 What part did you play in the letter to Jurat Partridge of the 27 September to which the Bailiffs letter of the 4 October is in response?

A: I took part in the P&F decision which was relayed to Jurat Partridge.

Q2 When did you first see the Bailiffs letter of the 4 October?

A: I do not recall the exact date I was shown the letter

Q3: When was the decision to circulate the letter on the 1 November made and who participated in making that decision?

A: I do not recall when the decision was made. The CEO and myself participated in making that decision.

Q4: In the intervening period between 2 and 3 above did you discuss the letter with any member(s) of P&F or anyone else; if so with whom and on what dates?

A: No formal discussions with anyone else took place

Q5: During any of the discussions in 4 above did you discuss copying the letter to all members of P&F or otherwise bringing the letter to their attention without further delay; if so on which dates and with whom?

A: Not applicable. See 4 above

Q6: In respect of each of the discussions in 5 above;

a. What were the competing arguments for and against?

A: There were no competing arguments

b. How were the competing arguments in 6a rationalised in order to arrive at the decision made?

A: Not applicable. There were no arguments to rationalise

Q7: In respect of the decision in 3 above;

a. What were the competing arguments for and against?

A: There were no competing arguments.

b. How were the competing arguments in 7a rationalised in order to arrive at the decision made?

A: There were no competing arguments to rationalise

Meeting Closed: 1855hrs

Issued: 22nd December 2011

Uncontrolled Copy - 2012-04-03 13:00:04