

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE MINISTER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE  
BY DEPUTY M. TADIER OF ST. BRELADE  
ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON TUESDAY 15TH NOVEMBER 2016**

**Question**

What plans, if any, are there for the demolition and / or development of the former swimming pool building at Fort Regent and, if none, will the Minister advise whether the current structure is the best use of the site?

**Answer**

The Department for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture is developing proposals for the regeneration of Fort Regent through development of the site. These proposals will define the potential for the site to be regenerated without recourse to public funds, consistent with capital funding allocation within the Medium Term Financial Plan.

There are no current proposals to demolish the swimming pool in its entirety, however the Department for Infrastructure is obtaining costings for the demolition of the bridge link to remove access to the swimming pool to prevent unauthorised entrance and vandalism.

A derelict swimming pool is clearly not the best use for the site, however in the absence of a planning approval for alternative development, maintaining the existing structure protects the development potential and underlying land value of the site. A successful proposal to secure demolition of the building as part of an outline consent would also provide that protection and would be a preferable step forward to determining a future use for the site. The attached correspondence from the previous Minister for the Environment sets out the planning position in 2012.

**Minister for Planning and Environment**

South Hill  
St Helier, Jersey, JE2 4US  
Tel: +44 (0)1534 445508  
Fax: +44 (0)1534 445528

Deputy Noel  
Malgre Tout  
La Rue de Haut  
St Lawrence  
JE3 1JQ

4 July 2012

10 JUL 2012  
let to art ensemble

Dear Deputy Noel

I am writing in response to your letter dated 26th June 2012, in which you raise the issue of the demolition of the swimming pool at Fort Regent.

Any such demolition would require planning permission, as demolition constitutes development under the Planning and Building Law 2002. It is not appropriate for me to comment about a possible planning application, but of course all of the relevant material considerations will be taken into account in determining any such planning application. Such matters will include the visual impact on St Helier and you rightly point out Policy GD5: Skylines, views and vistas of the Island Plan 2011 as one such consideration. It is also relevant to note that, from a heritage perspective, the Swimming Pool on the Glacis and the covered passageway across the Counterguard, have introduced buildings where there were none and they undermine the historical relationship and understanding of the Glacis and Counterguard as part of the defensive structure of Fort Regent, and any redevelopment of this site would need to address this issue.

You specifically request a mechanism whereby the site's future development potential can be protected, despite any demolition of the structure.

In this regard I cannot do more than state what the planning status of the site would be once the site has been cleared. It will of course have an existing planning history, which more recently has included the swimming pool building. Its planning status extends beyond that and also includes all previous uses on the site. At the current time, the site is within the built up area boundary for St Helier and is within the green backdrop zone. It is adjacent to protected open space, and is set within a site of significant heritage value. I would imagine that some built form and hard standing would remain, and therefore the site would be classed as a previously developed site, in any future decision.

Any future planning application will need to take into account the site characteristics, its history and be judged and determined against the policies in force at the time. As such I cannot predetermine what those policies will be and therefore it is impossible to provide an open assurance as to what the future status would be and what future decision would ensue.

I would have thought that a key issue for you to consider, which is outside of the planning system, but nonetheless could manifest itself in any comments about a future proposal, is the public perception of a cleared site, and the time lag between any demolition and any new proposal.

I hope these comments are of use.



Deputy R C Duhamel