

# STATES OF JERSEY



## FUTURE HOSPITAL: PREFERRED SITE (P.110/2016) – AMENDMENT

---

Lodged au Greffe on 16th November 2016  
by the Connétable of St. John

---

STATES GREFFE

**PAGE 2 –**

- (1) After the words “new General Hospital” insert the words –
  - “either –
  - (a) ”.
- (2) For the words “this Proposition,” substitute the words –
  - “this Proposition; or
  - (b) the south side of the Waterfront site, not including any part of Les Jardins de la Mer, in accordance with the Map in the Appendix to the Report accompanying this Amendment,”.
- (3) For the words “proposals to be brought back to the Assembly as set out in Section 6.3 of the accompanying Report” substitute the words –
  - “business cases for both options to be brought back to the Assembly by the summer recess in 2017; and”.
- (4) After paragraph (b), insert the following paragraph –
  - “to request the Minister for the Environment to amend the Esplanade Quarter Masterplan to make provision for the potential siting of a new hospital on the south side of the Waterfront.”.

CONNÉTABLE OF ST. JOHN

## REPORT

This amendment is being made at this stage as a precautionary measure, in order to enable Members to have a full and proper debate on the Hospital, and if necessary to give Members a choice when arriving at their decision.

At the time of lodging, the Scrutiny Sub-Panel looking into the siting of the new Hospital were about to have a final Hearing with the Minister for Health and Social Services, and will then finish drafting their report. Also at the time of writing, the Minister for Treasury and Resources has yet to present the funding arrangements for the Hospital to Members.

This is probably the biggest capital project facing the Island for generations, amounting to (per [P.110/2016](#)) £466,000,000 in capital spending.

It has become clear during the scrutiny process that there are actually 2 sites left in the running as a potential allocation for a new Hospital –

- (1) The site proposed in P.110/2016, namely part of the General Hospital site, combined with Westaway Court (a 2-site option).
- (2) A site on the Waterfront (south of the dual carriageway) as roughly identified in the map in the attached **Appendix**.

As matters of fact –

- (1) The Waterfront site will be cheaper than the General Hospital site.
- (2) It can be completed more quickly (by 2 years).
- (3) It performs better than the General Hospital site in terms of ‘weighted benefits ranking’ and ‘weighted risks’ ranking.

What also appears to be the case is that the initial evaluations performed between the General Hospital site and that of the Waterfront were not performed on a like-for-like basis.

It is certainly the case that the footprint of the proposed new building has decreased, (and it seems to have got taller) in recent months. However, these changes do not appear to have been re-applied to earlier site options, and the relevant cost base does not appear to have been updated as a result.

On that basis it seems probable that the likely cost savings which would result from building on the Waterfront site would be even greater than the £20,000,000 presently held out as the cost differential between these 2 sites.

One of the disadvantages of building on the Waterfront site was the loss of Les Jardins de la Mer. With the reduced footprint of the new proposals, it is clear that a taller building would fit onto a site which EXCLUDES Les Jardins de la Mer.

Equally, the disadvantages of the General Hospital site include – the need to (potentially) compulsorily purchase a number of properties; the need to decant a number of departments before demolition can commence; and the noise, dust and general

disruption to patients in the operational part of the Hospital from having a significant construction project take place immediately adjacent to where they are receiving medical treatment.

Let me be clear, the health practitioners have been waiting for a long time for new facilities, and the debacle of the People's Park did not improve public confidence in the project.

Therefore, the intention of this amendment is not to seek to introduce new sites into the equation: that would lead to unacceptable delay.

It is a simple choice – to request good information as to the 2 remaining choices of sites, and to enable the Assembly to properly determine whether the choice of the Council of Ministers is one which this Assembly would choose to endorse.

In my view, for the Assembly to do that properly and responsibly, on a capital project which represents approximately 60% of our tax revenue in any one year, it needs to know, on the basis of current and even-handed calculations, which site offers the best value for money. It is clear that the site rejected by the Council of Ministers represented the better of the 2 choices with regard to most categories of risk.

Once the Scrutiny proceedings have been concluded, I shall consider whether it is appropriate to lodge a further addendum to this amendment, providing additional information.

#### **Financial and manpower implications**

There are no manpower implications arising from this amendment.

In my view the potential cost savings that should arise from the Waterfront site would far outweigh any cost implications arising from this amendment.

WATERFRONT SITE

