

**4.7 Deputy R. Labey of St. Helier of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding whether South Hill and St. Saviour's Hospital had been subsumed into the portfolio of the States of Jersey Development Company: [1(320)]**

Further to the presentation of R.48/2017, will the Minister as shareholder representative advise whether South Hill and St. Saviour's Hospital have been subsumed into the States of Jersey Development Company's portfolio and, if so, for what purpose?

**The Connétable of St. Peter (Assistant Minister for Treasury and Resources - rapporteur):**

I would confirm that neither South Hill nor St. Saviour's Hospital are as yet included in the S.o.J.D.C.'s portfolio.

**4.7.1 Deputy R. Labey:**

Is it the Minister for Treasury and Resources' intention for that to happen?

**The Connétable of St. Peter:**

The short answer is no because it is not in the gift of the Minister for Treasury and Resources to instruct the company in that regard. However, I will say that S.o.J.D.C. has made it clear that should they be available they would purchase them at market value and do whatever development is required, but that in itself is controlled by the body set up by this Assembly. The Regeneration Steering Group would have to have its opinion and approve or disapprove those acquisitions.

**4.7.2 Connétable J.E. Le Maistre of Grouville:**

Is the Assistant Minister as embarrassed as I am at the way the States underutilise their properties such as St. Saviour's Hospital, Piquet House, Fort Regent Swimming Pool and the La Folie site and, if so, what can he do about it?

**The Connétable of St. Peter:**

A very difficult question and in answer to the first part of his question, yes, I am embarrassed about the way that for many years now the properties are being held in unused and dilapidated conditions, particularly the Le Seilleur workshops and things like that. However, I do not put that fully at the door of the political branch of the States but also the States Members themselves, who have constantly rejected particularly items like Piquet House, which was withdrawn on a vote in this Chamber, as was the Le Seilleur workshops on 2 occasions withdrawn by a vote in this House, which is why they are still ... sorry, the Le Seilleur buildings have just gone through at the end of last year, earlier this year. Piquet House is still in the ownership of the States of Jersey because of decisions of this Chamber.

**4.7.3 Senator S.C. Ferguson:**

Will the Minister remember the clear strictures when these properties are eventually transferred? Will the Minister remember the clear strictures of appendix 7 of P.73/2010 in that the valuation of the property to be transferred should be uplifted by the planning gain? Any planning gain should be included in a valuation. It is not just the value of the land.

**The Connétable of St. Peter:**

Yes, the S.o.J.D.C. will conform with the requirements as set out in P.73/2010.

**4.7.4 Deputy M. Tadier:**

The Constable of Grouville is right to raise the issue about unutilised property within the States portfolio, and rather than use it as an excuse to dispose of it as for one-off capital gains, should

we not be thinking innovatively? Let us think of the La Folie site. Have people been asked? Have the public been approached for innovative ideas about how that could be used? Perhaps on a medium to long-term lease, perhaps at a peppercorn rent for social use, for recreational use, for art galleries, for bars, for jazz, for music venues, *et cetera*. Has the offer been put to the public to say: “We want your ideas. We want you to make us offers for short or medium-term events and leases”?

**The Connétable of St. Peter:**

The Deputy raises a sensitive question right at the moment, particularly with regard to the La Folie site. That has had several iterations of plans put forward which have one by one been demolished by public opinion. I am just waiting for the Constable of St. John to stand and comment on the position with regard to his interests with the sea cadets, who still await accommodation down there on that site. It is a matter again for this Chamber to make decisions and try and deliver those in a broader sense without further interference, which is stopping these essential works, as Deputy Tadier says, going ahead.

**The Connétable of St. John:**

Could I make a point of correction, Sir?

**The Deputy Bailiff:**

No, not during question time. Deputy Brée.

**4.7.5 Deputy S.M. Brée of St. Clement:**

Can the Assistant Minister just clarify one point that he has made when he referred to the La Folie site? Is it not the case that that site is now contained within the assets of the Ports of Jersey Incorporated and, therefore, will not come in front of this Assembly for discussion, nor will any decisions be made by him or his Minister in that respect?

**The Connétable of St. Peter:**

The Deputy raises a good question and unfortunately he has caught me blindsided because I have not reviewed the M.O.U. (memorandum of understanding) for Ports of Jersey with regard to those particular properties. La Folie does fall directly inside the red line for the Ports of Jersey. I would say that I would hope that it is in the M.O.U. that when they are disposed of they come through this Chamber under this 15-day rule for comments from this Chamber, but I cannot confirm that at the moment.

**4.7.6 Deputy R. Labey:**

I think I am right in saying that in 22 years the States have never received a dividend from this company. Do you think that bonuses for staff should be based on dividends paid to the States?

**The Connétable of St. Peter:**

The Deputy is asking me for an opinion and I do not think it is appropriate to give an opinion. All I will say is that bonuses will be paid to the States as required under, again, P.73/2010 where it sets out that dividends will be returned to the States on the completion of the developments that are going forward.