

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE MINISTER FOR TREASURY AND RESOURCES BY THE
DEPUTY OF ST. MARY
ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON MONDAY 21st SEPTEMBER 2009**

Question

“Would the Minister advise how the conclusion contained within paragraph 8.2.7 of the Annual Business Plan regarding the former Jersey College for Girls building’s unsuitability for use as States offices was reached and outline who carried out this assessment, the timeline for any meetings, provide minutes of any meetings or reports prepared to substantiate this proposal?”

Answer

Following the provision of a new Jersey College for Girls at Mont Millais the former school site has been identified for re-development as a residential site. For a number of reasons this development project has not progressed.

In the latter part of 2008, as the initial phase of a comprehensive review of all States property assets and their future use, Jersey Property Holdings prepared a concept Office Strategy which identified current office usage and explored various options for delivering greater efficiency of space and property utilisation. One set of proposals were to consolidate a significant proportion of office activities into a single building. In order to illustrate the costs and benefits which might be achieved from this approach, the former JCG site, amongst others, was used as an example of how a single site could be used to provide sufficient space for a large numbers of employees.

Whilst the concept of a large single development locating a single States of Jersey office centre of approximately 150,000 sq ft and housing 1,500 employees has many benefits, the location of a building of this size would place a significant burden on the road infrastructure of the area.

The proposal was discussed by the Corporate Management Board for an initial view. I was then briefed on the proposals and following consultation with Ministerial colleagues and the Planning Minister I ruled out the progression to move the States office centre to JCG.

The main reason for this decision was that the Island Plan clearly sets out a policy to locate office development in the town centre. In addition not only would it be unwise to make an exception for the States but the public who interact with the States.

Property Holdings were requested to identify and evaluate other potential sites for development including some smaller locations with less concentration of States office users in one place, but in the town centre to comply with the Island Plan.

I have asked the Assistant Minister with responsibility for property to meet with the Deputy to brief him, and if he wishes to show him the conceptual plans which were rejected for the reasons above.