

Review of the Future Hospital Preferred Access Route to Overdale

I have responded using the enumeration of the States of Jersey Press release dated 4th January 2021

1. I am not and shall not be directly affected by the preferred access route to Overdale, however the very fact of the proposed access route is a severe diminution of the natural amenities of this beautiful sylvan lane is a compelling argument.

The current road is relatively little used and possesses fabulous views over St Helier and the Port. The loss of the bowling green and particularly the adjacent tree cover would be an irreplaceable catastrophe in what is currently a quiet attractive rural aspect in one of the entrances to the larger urban area comprising St Helier.

2. As I indicate in response to number 1. The loss of the Bowling Green shall be an irreplaceable loss to the amenity irrespective of, if and where it shall be removed and relocated. The loss of any, if not all of the adjacent wooded area, an expanse of natural and mature beauty would not be allowed if the proposed development were to be a commercial venture, the fact that the proposals are for a community development should not be an excuse for a differential in treating this proposal from any other.

I entreat the Scrutiny Panel to consider if the development were a commercial proposition, would they support the destruction of such beautiful and irreplaceable habitat to be enjoyed both by the general public and indeed the inevitable loss of the wildlife of the area?

If the answer to the above is in the negative, why then are we prepared to allow the despoliation of this remaining area of the environment so close to the conurbation of St Helier?

3. It is my considered belief that there are other sites available on the Island which allow greater sustainability for transportation and indeed for the environment generally and which shall possess a minimalist impact upon the long-term natural beauty of the Island and indeed shall have a significantly less impact upon the future enjoyment of the Island and which in turn, shall move traffic away from the current congested area concerned.

These alternative areas are, in no particular order, Warwick Farm and St Saviours Hospital, neither site has been adequately considered using substantial addressable criteria and non-self-fulfilling conditions. The assessments used in support of developing Overdale and indeed eliminating other contenders were not equalised and adequately and properly independently third party evaluated.

Response to Scrutiny Panel Evidence request

4. It is my considered belief that notwithstanding the time allowed for the public to properly consider the all the information provided by the States (Government of Jersey), on the contrary, the information provided by the States is poorly and inadequately presented and fails to effectively and properly address the methodology used for the final selection. Such methodology is obscure and lacks detailed analysis.

The final decision is based upon a series of unsubstantiated and unsupported documents which have the overall effect of not only concealing the process of the decision but also the volume of documentation provided by the States is both Contradictory and inconclusive other than virtually indicating that Overdale, in the absence of other consideration, is the only location suitable for this development.

Thus, it is not just the decision for Overdale but for whatever reasons it is about the avoidance of proper and in-depth consideration of the two sites mentioned in response number 3 above, those of Warwick Farm and St Saviours Hospital.

The number and extent of the acronyms used in the documentation is detrimental to the comprehension of the reasoning in the reports which, for proper consideration, could and should have been composed in a more literate language. I concede that the very nature of the reports is complex and address multifaceted issues however in order for proper consideration to be given such reporting could be distilled into a more coherent manner.

Thus, my response to this issue is the matter is not about time, it is about the paucity of the information thus far provided e.g., detailed and validated costings rather than in many cases, (particularly the infrastructure costs) which appear to be little more than ill-informed guesses, but in addition the entire reporting appears to be more akin to reporting upon a secret defence installation rather than the production of what is in effect a general hospital.

Indeed, from my study of the proposals there is a lack of drawn information in the proposals thus, how can a work up of detailed costing have taken place indeed how therefore can a preferred Contractor have been nominated let alone appointed? This is apparently putting the cart before the horse and flies in the face of the financial scrutiny required on any development such as the construction of the hospital.

In the light of this, my primary question is, how was the bidding process managed and adjudicated? What attempts were made to ensure that the various alternative Contractors costing the process were furnished with adequate and comprehensive equalised information in order to allow the bids (tender) process to be factored upon a level playing field, equalised basis? This is a serious question when expending public funds and more so when the sums being assessed are of the magnitude of the hospital.

5. My personal perspective is that the Council of Ministers were, and are determined upon a course that they have dictated for themselves, to some extent not only

Response to Scrutiny Panel Evidence request

regarding the Assembly but most definitely in disregarding the opinion of the public's viewpoint (whether majority or minority) and have embarked upon a course that is both short term and disregarding suitable viable and less destructive and indeed potentially less costly alternatives.

6. I do not believe that my voice has been heard until this point and I hope that Scrutiny, in the situation of the loyal opposition, takes the opportunity of investigating that which is not only a miscarriage of the process, but indeed a decision that shall not only leave future generations poorer both financially and ecologically, not to mention environmentally.

I am unaware if anyone has sat back and analysed the potential costs of the inordinate delays incurred to the hospital project and the time that shall inevitably lost with the compulsory purchase process attached to the Public obtaining the revisions to property that shall be needed in order to obtain not only the fields that are required for this development but also the thus far unstated number of dwellings that require to be obtained, for the development and of course the matter of the bowling green.

All of these shall potentially be subject to a Court process with the inevitability of appeals within not just this jurisdiction but indeed even as far as the UK Courts.

As a case in point, I have taken the opportunity of preparing a very rapid assessment of the increased costs of the development based on simple and potential cost of living increases over the foreseeable future. All based upon a nominal 1-year delay.

	Effects of Inflation upon Hospital Costs of a 1 Year Delay			
	Possible Build and development costs			
Assumed cost of project	£ 500,000,000.00	£ 600,000,000.00	£ 700,000,000.00	£ 800,000,000.00
Assumed Inflation	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
1-year Delay	£ 5,000,000.00	£ 6,000,000.00	£ 7,000,000.00	£ 8,000,000.00
Daily cost per Day	£ 13,698.63	£ 16,438.36	£ 19,178.08	£ 21,917.81
Assumed cost of project	£ 500,000,000.00	£ 600,000,000.00	£ 700,000,000.00	£ 800,000,000.00

Response to Scrutiny Panel Evidence request

Assumed Inflation	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%
1-year Delay	£ 7,500,000.00	£ 9,000,000.00	£ 10,500,000.00	£ 12,000,000.00
Daily cost per Day	£ 20,547.95	£ 24,657.53	£ 28,767.12	£ 32,876.71
Assumed cost of project	£ 500,000,000.00	£ 600,000,000.00	£ 700,000,000.00	£ 800,000,000.00
Assumed Inflation	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
1-year Delay	£ 10,000,000.00	£ 12,000,000.00	£ 14,000,000.00	£ 16,000,000.00
Daily cost per Day	£ 27,397.26	£ 32,876.71	£ 38,356.16	£ 43,835.62

As one can see from the simple table attached, depending upon cost and any resulting inflationary pressure the annual/weekly/daily cost escalations are extremely significant and the resultant impact upon the development caused by delays in the Compulsory Purchase system are very substantial. These range from a £500,000,000 build cost delayed for 1 year at 1% inflation to a **daily** increased cost of **£13,698.63** to a seriously concerning daily increase based upon a cost of £800,000,000 **daily** increase of **£43,835.62** based upon only 2% inflation.

I have spent over fifty years employed in the local construction industry and retired in 2019. I have no current connections with any local construction organisations having disposed of my equity when I retired. However, I have significant experience in the planning, costing and funding of large construction projects at very senior level. Notwithstanding this, the manner in which this particular project is being proposed is significantly outside any deliberations that I have previously witnessed.

I shall be happy to provide evidence to the Panel in person should it be felt that my observations have suitable merit.

Sincerely

Stephen J. Regal

“Armon”

Rue de La Croix

St Ouen

JE3 2HA

Tel 482429 Mob 07797 719 808