
STATES OF JERSEY



FUTURE HOSPITAL – ACCESS ROUTE TO OVERDALE (S.R.2/2021): RESPONSE OF THE CHIEF MINISTER

**Presented to the States on 6th May 2021
by the Chief Minister**

STATES GREFFE

**FUTURE HOSPITAL – ACCESS ROUTE TO OVERDALE(S.R.2/2021): RESPONSE
OF THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Ministerial Response to:	S.R.2/2021
Review title:	Future Hospital – Access Route to Overdale
Scrutiny Panel:	Future Hospital Review Panel

INTRODUCTION

I welcome the Panel’s review of the access route to Overdale and thank members for the opportunity to comment on their findings and recommendations.

FINDINGS

	Findings	Comments
1	The Panel is concerned that option 6, “do nothing” option scored only marginally lower than option 7 “preferred access route” when meeting the set criteria.	Option 6 scored six red (negative) rated criteria whereas Option 7 had just two. This can be seen in the table on page no.100 of Appendix A to Appendix 1 of the report accompanying P.167/2020. Therefore, Option 7 performs considerably better than Option 6. Option 6 in isolation does not work. However, at every step of developing a design for a new road layout, we will consider whether the ‘do nothing’ option could be appropriate, as some sections of the road may not need to be altered.
2	The Panel is concerned the road may be widened unnecessarily for construction access primarily rather than emergency services.	This is not correct. The road will be widened to ensure that there is sustainable and safe access for patients, visitors, staff and blue light services, as well as to accommodate an active travel corridor required in accordance with the Assembly approval of P.167/2020.
3	There is no detailed design to show how the proposed roadworks will look, the impact on the surrounding area and any loss of green space.	It would have been inappropriate to prepare a detailed design for a single option, such as Option 7, and present greater detail than other options prior to approval of a route by the States Assembly. Undertaking detailed design for all 71 options would have provided neither value for money nor

	Findings	Comments
		<p>be cost effective for the Government of Jersey and the taxpayer.</p> <p>Now that the States Assembly has approved Option 7, design work is underway. A full impact assessment will be undertaken to consider how best to minimise the impact on green space, trees, children's play areas, existing car parking, heritage and historical sites and this forms part of the Planning Application process.</p>
4	<p>There is no indication where loss of leisure facilities and green space will be relocated.</p>	<p>The report appended to P.167/2020 was an options appraisal to assess the relative viability and suitability of each option.</p> <p>A full impact assessment will be undertaken to consider how best to minimise the impact on green space, trees, children's play areas, existing legitimate car parking, heritage and historical sites and this will form part of the Planning Application process.</p>
5	<p>States Members will not have the opportunity to approve the outline design prior to planning approval.</p>	<p>This is not correct. A full schedule of engagements covered to date was provided to the Panel in December 2020. The updated draft communications and engagement strategy documentation was provided to the Panel was provide from POG on 23 February 2021 and a further updated draft on 16 March 2021.</p> <p>The Public Engagement & Communications Strategy was published on the ourhospital.je website together with a Consultation Feedback Form for members of the public to complete and submit.</p> <p>There was considerable engagement with key stakeholders during the options appraisal process, including but not limited to the Ambulance Service, Fire and Rescue, Planning, the Infrastructure, Housing and Environment department, and that engagement with these key stakeholders is ongoing.</p> <p>Full public consultation is a requirement for the Planning Application process and will be undertaken as part of that process, as is standard for major construction projects.</p>

	Findings	Comments
6	There has been no public/key stakeholder engagement undertaken by Government of Jersey at this stage of the project.	<p>All key information that is necessary and available at this stage of the project has been provided. There appears to be an expectation of detail in the information in respect of the development of the preferred access option which would be neither appropriate nor available at the stage of the project when a wide range of options was being appraised.</p> <p>Therefore, I have instructed Officers to append a timeline to this response which will clarify when information will be available.</p>
7	The Panel has been criticised for delaying the project unnecessarily due to requesting additional key information which appears to be missing.	<p>All key information that is necessary and available at this stage of the project has been provided. There appears to be an expectation of detail in the information in respect of the development of the preferred access option which would be neither appropriate nor available at the stage of the project when a wide range of options was being appraised.</p> <p>Therefore, I have instructed Officers to append a timeline to this response which will clarify when information will be available.</p>
8	The Panel understands there is a budget of £15.5 million within the overall costs of £550 million to undertake the work on the highways. The Panel is concerned that if the design has not yet been finalised, cost could spiral as they are not fixed to a specific plan or proposal.	<p>The budget for the highways works was £15.3m (excluding contingency) based on a 10metre corridor for the road and allowances for active travel corridors and verges. This has been reviewed by the Design & Delivery Partners Cost Advisor and our own Cost Advisor to check that it is reasonable and aligned with the scope of works.</p> <p>A Target Value Design process is being operated by the Design and Delivery Partner, its Designers and the Project Team, which is based on designing to the budget and identifying savings to offset any essential design changes and associated cost increases that arise for the highways work during the design development phase.</p> <p>A procurement route is being developed to most cost effectively buy the works, with the intention to use the existing on island supply chain as much as possible.</p>

	Findings	Comments
		These measures will ensure the right price is paid for the road once it is designed but that doesn't mean it may not end up costing more than the original estimate. It does mean that costs won't spiral out of control.
9	There do not appear to be any plans in place for any potential road closures during construction.	A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be prepared to accompany the planning application, as is standard for major construction projects. This will set the traffic management proposals for the construction period. Detailed information including dates regarding road closures and how existing traffic movements will be rerouted will be finalised during the construction process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

	Recommendations	To	Accept/Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
1	The Council of Ministers should ensure that full consideration be provided to pursuing option 6, "do nothing option" as this would reduce construction time, loss of green space, trees, children's play areas, existing parking spaces Jerseys heritage and historical sites and disruption to existing modes of access.	DCM	Accepted	This work forms part of the Planning Application process.	By Planning Application Submission at E on the timeline
2	The Council of Ministers should provide the States Assembly with an overview of why the 'do nothing' option, option 6 was disregarded when it scored only marginally lower than the preferred	DCM	Accepted	This information was included in the Report accompanying P.167/2020.	Completed

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
	option. This should be done without delay.				
3	The Council of Ministers should provide the States Assembly with any additional costs for access and enabling works the contractor would have to undertake if the ‘do nothing’ option was considered. This should be done within 6 weeks of presentation of this report.	DCM	Rejected	Option 6 doesn’t work. The final design for the access route will be costed including any sections of the route which are left untouched.	By Planning Application Submission at E on the timeline
4	The Council of Ministers should ensure any loss of leisure facilities and green space will be relocated. This to be provided to the States Assembly within 3 months of presentation of this report.	DCM	Accepted	This work forms part of the Planning Application process.	By Planning Application Submission at E on the timeline
5	The Council of Ministers should provide a copy of the public/key stakeholder engagement the GoJ plans to undertake. This should be provided without delay and publicised on the States Website/social media. This should be done without delay.	DCM	Accepted	This had already been completed prior to receiving S.R.2/2021	Completed
6	The Council of Ministers should provide the States Assembly with details of how the cost of £15.5	DCM	Accepted	Outline information is provided in response to Finding 8 above. Details of the investment in the access	At lodging of the Finance Proposition and OBC at

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
	million was arrived at for the proposed roadworks without any detailed design. This should be done without delay.			route will be provided in the OBC.	B on the timeline
7	The Council of Ministers should provide the States Assembly with proposed plans to cope with any disruptive road closures during the construction phase. This should be provided within 3 months of presentation of this report.	DCM	Accepted	This will be included in the Traffic Management Plan and specific road closure details will be available nearer to the start of works.	By Planning Application Submission at E and detail at G on the timeline

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM ADVISERS

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
1	A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Travel Plan are produced.	DCM	Accepted	This forms part of the Planning Application process.	By Planning Application Submission at E on the timeline
2	Detailed discussions are quickly initiated with the Highway Authority and a scoping exercise carried out which informs the work required to submit a planning application. A three-stage approach to approval might be considered, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Approval in principle to Option 7 as the 	DCM	Accepted	Discussions with the Highway Authority were already ongoing and will continue to inform the Planning Application.	By Planning Application Submission at E on the timeline

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
	<p>primary route for vehicular access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Development and agreement of a multi-modal access strategy to the new hospital site. •Production of a preliminary design and impact assessment based on the chosen route and access strategy. 				
	<p>Initiate an IPA process (independent Project Assurance) for the project moving forward as recommended by HM Treasury.</p>	DCM	Accepted	<p>Assurance currently in place includes:</p> <p>NEC Supervisor – Mott MacDonald Project Management Office – Mace Cost Consultant – Turner & Townsend</p> <p>This is in addition Government departmental duties and Political Scrutiny</p> <p>Appointment of an independent project advisor will be considered by POG.</p>	Completed

CONCLUSION

I am extremely pleased that the Panel's advisors agreed that Option 7 is the best access option for Overdale. I thank the Panel and their advisors for their work in conducting their review of the access to Overdale.

I note that in considering P.167/2020, the State Assembly was asked to approve the preferred access route in principle, rather than a detailed design scheme. The design information will be available as part of the detailed Planning Application submission in Q4 2021. The design process is iterative and develops in response to comprehensive

consultation with stakeholders. It is imperative that work is produced robustly and in sequence, with full public engagement at the appropriate time, to ensure that the best access scheme is designed and developed, which minimises impact on residencies, amenities and the environment. The following timeline is included to demonstrate the timing of the availability of information to be provided:

A		B		C	D	E								F	G
May-21	Jun-21	Jul-21	Aug-21	Sep-21	Oct-21	Nov-21	Dec-21	Jan-21	Feb-21	Mar-21	Apr-21	May-21	Jun-21	Jul-21	

Activity		Date
Pre-construction Stage Activites		
A	Hospital RIBA2 design completes	May-21
	Highways RIBA2 completes	May-21
B	Highways RIBA3 completes	Jul-21
	Overdale Reprovision Planning Application submission	Jul-21
	Demolition Planning Application submission	Jul-21
	Lodging of Finance Proposition & OBC	Jul-21
C	Agreement of OBC	Sep-21
D	Main Planning Application Documents Complete	Oct-21
	Overdale Reprovision Planning Application decision	Oct-21
E	Hospital RIBA3a (planning) design completes	Nov-21
	Highways RIBA4 completes	Nov-21
	Main Planning Application submission	Nov-21
	Demolition Planning Application decision	Nov-21
F	Hospital RIBA3b design completes	Jun-22
	Main Planning decision	Jun-22
	Main works contract award	Jun-22
G	Agreement of FBC	Jul-22

I thank the Panel and their advisors once more for their work in completing this Report.