

# STATES OF JERSEY

## Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel Fort Regent

**WEDNESDAY, 27th MAY 2009**

**Panel:**

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier of St. Saviour (Chairman)

Deputy T.M. Pitman of St. Helier (Vice-Chairman)

Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade

Connétable G.F. Butcher of St. John

Mr. I. Barclay (Panel Adviser)

**Witnesses:**

Mr. J. Carter (Jersey Heritage Trust)

Mr. R. Hills (Head of Historic Buildings, Jersey Heritage Trust)

**Present:**

Mrs. E. Liddiard (Scrutiny Officer)

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier of St. Saviour (Chairman):**

Jonathan, Roger, I would like to welcome you and, again, I must apologise for the slight delay. Thank you very much for coming. As I mentioned to you outside, Heritage has been spoken about many times in this inquiry and it is the first time, so to speak, we can get the viewpoint of the specialists. We will start the tape rolling and first of all we will introduce ourselves. I am Roy Le Hérissier, chair of Education and Home Affairs, St. Saviour Deputy.

**Deputy T.M. Pitman of St. Helier:**

Deputy Trevor Pitman of St. Helier, Vice-Chair.

**Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade.**

Montfort Tadier, Deputy from St. Brelade.

**Mr. I. Barclay (Panel Adviser):**

Ian Barclay from Torkildsen Barclay who are advisers for the sports, leisure and heritage.

**Mrs. E. Liddiard (Scrutiny Officer):**

Elizabeth Liddiard, Scrutiny Officer.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

And Rebecca is recording. We will follow the normal procedure in Scrutiny and as you know we now dispense with the oath although it is understood to apply. We will go through the formal questions but no doubt there will be digressions, diversions and wanderings down highways and byways, as we progress. We will aim to finish at around, if not before, 2.30 p.m. The first question: what is the working relationship between the Jersey Heritage Trust and the Department of Education, Sport and Culture with regard to Fort Regent? Is there any ongoing consultation when it comes to day-to-day management and care of the historical features of the Fort?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

We have no formal role in relation to any States department with regard to the management of Fort Regent. There have been occasions in the past where we have been consulted on specific interpretation projects, although not recently. We do of course manage the Signall Station under an agreement with Property Holdings. We also have a formal role in making recommendations to the Planning Minister about designation, so in terms of the protection of the building, in that respect. But that was a job done. But in an ongoing sense we have no sort of formal role about the management for the site. Indeed, and this is probably not an issue for now, but it does raise a broader question about the management of the States' entire collection of historic buildings: who is actually championing them and producing the conservation policies?

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Indeed. So, if you wanted to rectify that situation what structure would you like to see in place?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

That is a good question. The Forts and Towers project has been quite interesting in general in that respect because we are working with a number of other States departments, Property Holdings, Tourism Development Fund, Transport and Technical. We have produced a conservation policy in consultation with the heritage organisations (with the Société, the National Trust, the Occupation Society), and we have consulted on those publicly and worked with States departments to approve those policies, but we have also then entered a management arrangement where we can ensure that those policies are adhered to, updated, and that the management of the buildings is held in that framework. So that has been quite a good model but with those buildings we have taken them into management, that is probably not practical across the board, but I think that ... I mean this word “championing” is used a lot, is it not? I think there is an issue there, and E.S.C. (Education, Sport and Culture), I think, did the right thing and commissioned a conservation plan. So there are conservation policies. I do not know whether those policies are being adhered to or if there has been an audit of them. I am not sure who in the department might champion that but, I mean, I guess that ... I mean that Heritage could have a role in auditing that and updating policies, keeping them current. But we have no such role at the moment with any properties other than the ones we have directly managed.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Thank you, Jonathan. My apologies, I forgot to get you to do your introductions in the excitement of eating our sandwiches I sort of lost my sense of protocol. Our 2 visitors this afternoon, for the tape, are Jonathan Carter, the Director of the Jersey Heritage Trust and Roger Hills, the Head of Historic Buildings at Jersey Heritage. We will move to Deputy Pitman for question number 2.

**Deputy T.M. Pitman:**

It follows on really; what is the actual relationship between the Jersey Heritage Trust and Property Holdings with regard to the future development of Fort Regent?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

I think that is really wrapped up in that first answer. We do not have any formal relationships with any States department in respect of Fort Regent other than with Property Holdings for the management of the Signal Station, but in a more general sense we do not have any role.

**Deputy T.M. Pitman:**

Does consultation take place when plans are being developed?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

No, we have not been involved in any plans for the Fort.

**Deputy T.M. Pitman:**

Nothing, whatsoever?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

No. Our only involvement on an ongoing basis is our management of the Signal Station, which is under an agreement with Property Holdings. As I said, in the past, although I am going back quite a long way to the days of another committee, we were asked to be involved, for example, when [the UK exhibition company] Event Communications, I am talking about 10 years ago, did an interpretation project. We were involved as a museum service but really that is more than 10 years ago.

**Deputy T.M. Pitman:**

So it is a situation, I guess, you would ideally like to change?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

I think there is a case for looking at not just specifically the Fort. I think there is a case for looking at the management arrangements and the policy arrangements for the States whole collection of historic

buildings. Some of those we have taken into management, but I think that there is an issue for a lot of these sort of stray forts, towers, historic buildings, about management protocols and the conservation policies for them. It is something that at the moment we are not resourced to do, but I think that as an Island it is maybe something that going forward it is worth looking at.

**Deputy T.M. Pitman:**

The next question is really related to the multipurpose aspect of Fort Regent and, of course, depending on who you ask we get a different response as to whether it is a blessing or a curse that Fort Regent is at the same time a heritage site and also effectively a leisure centre. Does the Trust have any experience or is it aware of any other heritage sites that struggle with the same multi-usage issue?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

We were thinking maybe the best way to answer that question is to say that all historic sites do struggle with their potential conflicts and different sorts of use. I mean, I think in our view it is not really possible and not desirable for historic buildings to live outside of the real world. I mean, in order to be properly conserved, buildings do need to be used and sometimes those uses have an inherent compromise or conflict with their conservation. If you think about an example like Stonehenge, for example. I mean, that has a leisure use. I mean they do not normally use that word "leisure use" but it has a visitor use, and it is so popular it is under pressure from that use. English Heritage spend a great deal of time and a huge amount of money working out how best to handle the leisure use, the tourist use, with its building conservation. Locally, I am sure you will be familiar with the long debates we had about Mont Orgueil and the best way to handle those compromising uses. It is a fact that the money available for the conservation on an ongoing basis of the castles is derived from visitor admissions, and money that we gain on site through weddings and events. Now clearly, as you will recall from the debate, people have different views about how best to manage on balance those different uses, but managed and balanced they must certainly be. So in a sense, Fort Regent is not unusual at all in having those kind of compromises up for debate. I think that one thing to bear in mind about that is that the whole site is quite large. If you talk about Fort Regent in terms of they have a sports centre within the

walls of the Fort but actually the whole site, the whole landscape, and this is the point that is quite clear in Antony's conservation report, is quite substantial (ie can absorb diverse uses). So I think there are a couple of points arising out of that. One of which is that buildings do need a viable use in order to help conserve the heritage elements and that that use is not necessarily a problem or a conflict, it just depends on how it is really managed.

**Deputy T.M. Pitman:**

Thanks for that. I think we take on board the comments but I would probably say that the difference between Fort Regent as opposed to other heritage sites, and you gave the example of Stonehenge, is that if you ask the general public in Jersey they would view Fort Regent as primarily being a sports centre which happens to be an old fort, and I do not mean that in any disparaging way. Whereas the others, perhaps Mont Orgueil or Stonehenge, may be used for the occasional cost but primarily they are heritage sites.

**Mr. J. Carter:**

I absolutely agree with that, and I think that the heritage is obscured by the use but I think the point I was trying to make is that it need not be. There is nothing sort of inherently problematic about having a leisure centre or sports facility in an historic fort, but it very much matters how you have it in, and I think at the moment the heritage is rather, sort of, overridden. It is rather hard to discern. But it is perfectly possible to imagine a viable and well-used sports centre in the confines of an historic building where its historic structures and significance is very apparent.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Okay, we will move on, and a lot of the questions are, as you have obviously determined, are overlapping. As we know, several recommendations were made in the Antony Gibb report *A Conservation Statement on Fort Regent*. For example: "Remove intrusive features or try to minimise their impact. Any future development should respect the existing skyline and protect existing views. Maintain existing uses and promote the Fort as a heritage attraction." To what extent do your own

visions for the Fort coincide with those put forward by Mr. Gibbs?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

I will bring Roger in on this, if I may, and it might be worth saying as well that Antony is retained by Jersey Heritage as an historic building adviser for a number of our sites, just for the record. I mean, those simple phrases you have listed there sort of pick up a number of specific points which do overlap with some of the other questions. I think that we share a general view that on the face of it the existing use as a sports centre seems to be a perfectly reasonable one, and not necessarily, as a point of principle, at odds with the historic significance. But, the historic significance, as I was just saying, has been rather overlooked and there is a great opportunity to enhance and improve that. However, it should be clear really that when we say that we support it is a valuable heritage attraction it does not necessarily mean that we would support running it on the same basis as the castles, as a paying to enter visitor site. We think that probably in promoting the heritage aspects of it we think that more could be made in terms of its public amenity. You do not need to charge people to come to a historic attraction in order to bring money to heritage. There is a lot of heritage interest that could be brought out simply by encouraging people to go there, interpreting the Fort better, and bringing the heritage more to the fore. I think the problem with thinking of it in terms as a heritage attraction is it would be something which would necessarily, in those terms, compete with the War Tunnels, the castles, and I am not sure that the visitor economy has enough slack in it to support that. I think if we were to spend £4-5 million on developing Fort Regent as a heritage attraction I think the visitors would come out of Elizabeth Castle and the War Tunnels, and the overall economic impact would be probably not positive for the private and heritage sector generally. But there are more specific points about intrusive features that Roger ...

**Mr. R. Hills:**

Yes, I mean, just from what Jon said and obviously we believe there are ways in which we could improve the heritage value of Fort Regent, running it parallel with its use as a leisure centre or sports centre, or whatever. I mean in terms of the sort of specific points you list here, I mean, removal of intrusive features or try to minimise their impact; throughout the whole site there are large intrusive

features such as a swimming pool and the former cable car station. But there are also lots of other smaller intrusive features that could be removed. In a collective it would have a sort of positive impact on the site. I mean, if you walked around there is obviously lots of bits and pieces which have been abandoned years back, abandoned mini golf courses, cafés, little bits of parks and gardens. There is inside the parade grounds a rather strange kind of rockery waterfall that comes down one of the original staircases. I mean things like that which ... and they are just left there to fall apart which make the place look worse, people do not understand what they are doing there. Removal of those smaller items and reinterpretation of the fabric and what those original elements are would greatly help, we believe. The skyline is quite an interesting question. There are 2 points really. The swimming pool building in our view is a blot on the landscape, to put it bluntly. It does not fit in with the architectural vision and the rest of the Fort, including the 20th century elements of it. Really, it is detrimental to the views you get at St. Helier. Our view of that is that the swimming pool should be removed and that the Glacis Field, the sloping field up to the Fort, should be retained as the Glacis Field As far as the actual roof within the Parade Ground is concerned, although that was not included within the S.S.I. (Site of Special Interest) listing last year our view and recommendation last year was that it should be part of the S.S.I. listing. I think it has become a fairly iconic sort of view of St. Helier now. Some people probably love it, some people probably hate it but I think it is certainly ... it certainly does a pretty good job with the interior as well and does not really interfere too much with the actual outer walls of the parade ground, it is fairly sort of self-supporting. Interestingly, we brought over a guy called Peter Smith who is one of the senior architectural historians and investigators they call them now at English Heritage, a few years back to look at 20th century structures and Peter's view was that to quote, he thought the roof at Fort Regent was an "extraordinary structure" of national importance and would definitely qualify for listing on the mainland. Our view really is that the roof is of interest and significance in itself and you do not need to remove the roof to improve the heritage value of the site.

**Deputy T.M. Pitman:**

The obvious question, sorry to interrupt, but would you be in favour of that being listed?

**Mr. R. Hills:**

Yes, we would be. That was our recommendation last year.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Roger, it is interesting that you see the different uses as part being reconcilable. But would you divide the Fort up? In other words, would you say: “Well, sports are here, they have taken the inner core and we will let them get on with it. We cannot really strip it out. It is there and it has to be developed for economic and other reasons.” Could you see the rest of the Fort being restored to what I know in conservation circles is a very questionable term, its original state, and then almost being run as another section of the Fort?

**Mr. R. Hills:**

Yes, I think that is exactly our line of thinking. Under the roof, so to speak, is a good spot for a sports centre or leisure centre. I mean it could be done perhaps better. The interpretation, the care of the historic fabric within the walls, it could definitely be better. There is no interpretation, there is no effort to do real sort of conservation and restore the fabrics to conservation standards. But outside the Fort there is definitely opportunities to, I think Jon used the term “heritage park” before. Definitely opportunities to do more heritage interpretation. For instance, a bit of living history, militia characters, whatever, and there are lots of parts of the Fort which could also be properly repaired, maintained, reopened to the public, parts of the north part of the site which is pretty much closed off to public access. One of the benefits of that is you get an opportunity, I mean, people will see it as a heritage site as well as being the other attraction. Hopefully it will also attract people up there to have a look. People can have a look, walk around the site, understand the building and then maybe see what else is going on inside, you know, concerts, sports events, whatever, and be encouraged to go into that as well. So it could have ... improving the heritage to the exterior could have a positive knock-on effect on the economic benefit of the Fort itself I think.

**Deputy T.M. Pitman:**

To take on from that; on the other panel I am on, one of the members always asks the question, if you had a magic wand - now you have already given some suggestions which way you would go - but if you did have a magic wand, from your perspective what would be the move for the Fort to make it what you ...?

**Mr. R. Hills:**

I think a magic wand would get rid of the swimming pool, the cable car and clear up all of the derelict bits and pieces that are around.

**Mr. J. Carter:**

One of the examples, I think, you may not think it relevant, but some of the very modest public ground improvements that have been achieved in town like Broad Street. It seems to me that very little effort and limited resource have massive impact on the quality of the public realm and encourage people to use it. I think probably where we are with the Fort is that the Fort tends to encourage sort of grandiose thinking about huge solutions to huge problems. There does not seem to really necessarily be so much of a huge problem there. I think that maybe some attempts to improve the public realm aspects around the outside of the Fort just to make it a more pleasant place to be, would encourage people to go there. Because at the minute you walk around and no one is there. People go for a use, to play squash or Jungle Jim's or whatever but the days when people went up there just to walk around because it is a nice place to be with a great view seem to have gone. Because it looks a bit kind of tatty really.

**Mr. R. Hills:**

It is also not clear that you can walk around the other bits. There is not much signage or interpretation, like you see tourists look a little bit confused and ...

**Deputy T.M. Pitman:**

Many people have talked about the access from Snow Hill. Would restoring that be detrimental to your vision of a heritage site?

**Mr. R. Hills:**

Restoring access ...?

**Deputy T.M. Pitman:**

From Snow Hill, where the cable cars were.

**Mr. R. Hills:**

It depends how the access is provided, I guess. I mean our view of the access is that it has quite good access. I mean, it has already got one multi-storey car park on one side of the Fort with parking level with the Fort. There is a slow sloping road up to the Fort, there are escalators, there are lifts, there are staircases and to a certain degree it is a defensive position, so the actual element of walking up to a defensive position like Edinburgh Castle or something like that, I mean it is all part of the ...

**Deputy M. Tadier:**

From a heritage point of view, but probably from a leisure point of view I think that is where the access issue is more ...

**Mr. J. Carter:**

I think in all honesty we probably do not know enough about the numbers of people using the Fort or what impact the removal of the cable cars actually had. But, I mean, clearly an enormous number of people do get up there for concerts and sometimes I wonder if the access problems are overblown. I think in terms of the Snow Hill issue, it is probably worth making the point that we would not necessarily be very enthusiastic about filling in the ditch. There have been various sort of proposals around that and the use of car parks in the ditch. I mean, I think our view from a heritage perspective would be that the ditch is part of the defences of the castle and filling in the moat is not the best way to conserve the historic interest. There may be other reasons to do it but ...

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Is this the Snow Hill cutting you are talking about?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

Yes. That is a very significant part of the Fort's defences.

**Deputy M. Tadier:**

Jonathan, you mentioned earlier about the fact that there are quick wins effectively that can be done in the Fort, and I think one of the issues that we are coming against is the fact that we are always asked for a master plan, that everything has to be seen holistically, which normally is a positive thing but that seems to be used as a kind of stalling tactic potentially. First of all, do you think there are any problems either from a heritage perspective or from a leisure point of view why things cannot be done piecemeal and would you favour that?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

A master plan is obviously a good idea, is it not, because piecemeal things have to add up to something. But the master plan need not be a multi-million pound effort in its own right but I think it is important to address things in the overall vision, is it not? I do support that. I think that within that there probably are some relatively small steps that could be taken to improve the general public amenity up there. But I do not think they will be in a position to sort of outline in any detail those now but it is a bit of work that could be done. I think some of the interpretation. I mean there is not a guidebook, for example, about the history. Some of the things that would help promote people's understanding of it as a heritage site could be relatively minor but it seems like signage and interpretation, relatively low thousands would get you quite a long way.

**Deputy T.M. Pitman:**

Have either of you come forward with plans to say: "Look, we would like to get rid of this, tidy this bit up."

**Mr. R. Hills:**

No.

**Deputy T.M. Pitman:**

Is that viable, do you think?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

It is a question of timing and resources. I mean if given time and resources that is something that we could be doing.

**Mr. R. Hills:**

It is certainly a good starting point with the conservation plan.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

We are roaming because we have duplicated some questions, I think, in the answers. But when that conservation plan was published what was the thinking? Who was going to drive that plan forward?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

I mean I suppose that if one recalls the time at which it was done, I mean there was a lot of talk about conservation plans, was there not, around Mont Orgueil, but I am not aware that the department has necessarily a system in place for ensuring that the recommendations are implemented, which is where we started. The conservation plan is a really good document. It has quite a lot of specific recommendations about how some of these improvements could be effected. I think it has got to be a good starting point. It was adopted but I guess it is a question of identifying who and how, and how much and in what time scale it can be followed through. But I think that is really the thing to stick with at this stage. From a heritage point of view it is a good document. It was widely consulted and adopted.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

I think we have done question 5. So I am going to go to Montfort and ask if he can do question 6.

**Deputy M. Tadier:**

Could you outline the heritage aspects of Fort Regent that need to be considered when planning the redevelopment of the site?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

Without wanting to repeat myself too much, I think I will just go back to what you just said really. I mean, those priorities in our view are the ones highlighted in Antony's conservation plan. I think it is worth going back to that. It is a good document, there is a lot of consultation, people have had a chance to input and it was adopted, and I think that it does highlight the general principles, and is a good thing to stick with really. It may be possible if you wanted to go on from that to commission a management and development plan where somebody could look at specifically how some of the interpreted improvements or signage schemes could be approached. I think that would need to be commissioned as a separate bit of work, and there is any number of people who could do that. We would be delighted to help.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

We have had it put to us apropos New Haven Fort actually, and the point was made to us that I think there was going to be some confusion about how that was developed, but in the end they decided to go the historical, the heritage route. So therefore if you were to look at the Fort and the way you went to the Fort, the added reception area, for example, that you first go through and then the big tunnel, which by the way the people like the Netball Association were saying impressed their visiting teams enormously. But you come into that, you then see the café on one side, you see the Jungle Jim's for the kids and all this sort of stuff; from a heritage point of view, do you really think you can co-exist in that area with things as they are currently laid out?

**Mr. R. Hills:**

I think it has to be because, I mean, the heritage is there. The wall surrounding that area is the heritage of the site so it has to co-exist.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Could you conceive of a situation where you could improve signage, you could perhaps simplify the décor or whatever and people would happily sort of ...?

**Mr. R. Hills:**

Absolutely. I think as Jon said, a guidebook would be enormously helpful, interpretative signage, the removal of unhelpful bits and pieces within the building that are not needed for anything.

**Mr. J. Carter:**

I think as a design issue it is important not to get too hung-up on these big points of principle about heritage or commercial. I mean I think that ... as I say, many of these important historic sites have aspects of compromise in them between the use they have and the management of the conservation. How effective that is is really about the quality of design and architecture in the space. At the minute it does look a bit of a cluttered mess, does it not? But that is not necessarily a point of principle about the uses that are in there. It is what the café looks like. It is not that it is a café. I think these are issues of architecture and design and you would be able to help the heritage to sing more loudly simply by getting an architect to look at what the space looked like. Interesting though the roof is, I guess it is a fact, is it not, that the original vision of the roof, which was this light touch single span enclosure was compromised very early on and the space started being shut down by ties needed to keep the roof down and all of this. Now that did rather begin to impact by chopping the space up, but I think again if you revisited some of that architecturally and looked at the materials, the flooring, I think you go a very long way simply by readjusting the architecture and design inside to allow the heritage to be seen. Roger mentioned one of the most extreme examples earlier which is one of the staircases has just been filled in with a sort of rocky grotto with plastic ferns in it. There may well be a reason for that, I do not know.

But that is gratuitous decoration that could be simplified and removed and really bring the heritage out, and I think people will begin to understand it more as a heritage site.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

We partly dealt with this but I am going to ask Trevor, sorry we are jumping around a bit, if he can ask number 7, because we talked about the master plan and the need for heavy finance.

**Deputy T.M. Pitman:**

I thought we had answered this really.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

You think so?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

There are a couple of aspects to that because you talk about promotion and preservation. I think it is worth saying that the site on the preservation side, the site is now designated. So in terms of its preservation ... when was it designated? Quite recently?

**Mr. R. Hills:**

Last year.

**Mr. J. Carter:**

But the S.S.I. does provide a framework for any sensible consideration of any changes in the preservation sense.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Is it just the actual fortress structure itself or any of the outlying lands?

**Mr. R. Hills:**

I have got a plan; it is the Fort with the East Ditch and also South Hill, the actual hill. But it does not include any post 1945 elements.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Additions, okay. Another question; if you were invited ... say for the sake of argument you were invited to sort of manage. Say improvements were made and you were invited to come in and manage the heritage part of the site. We all know you are under financial pressure at the moment with the existing portfolio you have. But would you see yourself able to do that?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

As I said before, I would not ... we would have to look at it but I do not think it would be sensible to run it as an attraction in the sense that you will take money off people at the door to look at the heritage bits, and have a sports centre over there. I think we see managing the heritage aspects of it as simply managing the public amenity in a way which brings out the heritage and there may be a commercial use with a conference centre or a leisure centre or sports facility or whatever. Now, I mean, physically managing that consists at one end of simply developing the policy and commissioning the architecture, which is sort of work that we do every day. Physically managing the landscape and the grounds is a whole lot of other area that would have to have some resources that are attached to it, which at the minute we just do not have enough people to do. In terms of the design, yes, we could handle that.

**Deputy T.M. Pitman:**

Do you see or not see development of the heritage aspect is contributing to the revenues of the Fort?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

I suppose what I am advocating is you have a realistic view of revenue. If you spent millions of pounds at Fort Regent, took out sports and developed it as a really exciting heritage attraction, you could probably increase its income, but that income would come out of, I suspect, Mont Orgueil, Elizabeth

Castle, Jersey War Tunnels, possibly the zoo, so I think we need to be aware that when we talk about revenue that there is an Island attraction economy which is already in short supply of paying visitors and declining. So I think we need to be very careful about the impact of that. I think where it is asking that consideration is given to that, and in that respect I suppose we are suggesting that we do not have another paying attraction because there are not enough people to go around, and in that sense, I suppose, the answer to your question is it would be difficult to see a direct link. However, if depending on what the commercial uses in there were, sports or cafés or whatever, if the place was a more attractive place to go to, a more interesting place to go to, and more people went up there, the secondary spend, if you want to call it like that, people up there would spend money in the cafés and would make that use more viable and that could help sustain managing the infrastructure. So I think in an indirect way the answer is yes. But I think one would need to be cautious about a direct link between the heritage related paying admissions and keeping the grass cut.

**Deputy M. Tadier:**

I think that has pretty much answered the question I wanted to ask, but presumably places like Elizabeth Castle have to solely make their money from the entrance fee that they make from the souvenirs, et cetera, the gift shop and other concessions. Is there any scope that Heritage could run something similar up at Fort Regent?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

With those other sites it is fair to say that the enormous bulk of income is admissions. Secondary spend is not insignificant. That includes revenues from cafés but we are not directly involved in catering and nor would I have ever get directly involved in catering. We have just gone back into retail and improved secondary spend there. It is true that potentially if there was another outlet up there we would be interested in looking at that certainly. But the bulk of non admissions related income is venue hire. Now, it is entirely possible that it would be possible to develop options for corporate use or weddings or holiday accommodation in the Fort. I mean, they would be quite exciting and interesting things to look at. But they need to be looked at in detail. In principle, yes, I would certainly rule in consideration of

that. There are some interesting spaces up there. But equally that is ... I mean somebody has to take the money. Whether it would be more effective for us to run that as part of our portfolio of other historic sites, I suppose there is something in that. But equally it would not need to be us that ran it, it could be run directly depending on how the Fort is operating in the future. But there is an opportunity there for sure.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

From a lot of people, contrary to Roger's optimism, access has been a continuing issue with a lot of witnesses. Do you think ... and of course the Heritage Trust knows about access issues to forts and castles; do you think there is a need for improvement. I know you said you were fairly happy, Roger, things looked good. But obviously the lift is seen as the one missing element, and one other possibility that has been put up, which apparently was tried historically, was running a mini bus, given that we may not be able to afford a proper lift, what is your view on that?

**Mr. R. Hills:**

Obviously there are ways the access could be improved. As we said before, even through things like directional signage would improve access pointing to the existing forms of access that we have. But, yes, certainly.

**Mr. J. Carter:**

I think people are going to have to want to go there though. I mean being able to get there is one thing, but why would you go there? I mean, it is the motivation. If there is a concert in there, thousands of people go because they want to go. The question seems to me to be not so much how do you get there, that is the secondary question. The first question is, why would you go there? At the minute when you walk around the outside and it is all a bit sort of 1970s concrete paving and railings. Unless you were going for a concert or to play squash or whatever, why would you go? I think what we are saying really is if you concentrate on making it a nice place to go, so it is interesting, all that heritage stuff, you could learn something, there are some decent cafés there, maybe a bit of living history, there is some stuff to

do in the general leisure sense, over Jungle Jim's and a can of coke, then maybe the access problem will begin to sort itself because clearly thousands of people can go there. Ask us at the end of the year. We are running a mini bus this year from a group of hotels to Hamptonne because transport to Hamptonne is problematic and we cannot get the buses in the area, so we are trialling mini buses ourselves this year. Our previous experience of coaching people has not been very successful but we are trying it again. But, I mean, one thing maybe if it is okay to ask you a question; I think it was mentioned in the *Evening Post* last night, the report of yesterday's session, was it the case that when the cable car stopped that admissions went down by 12 per cent?

**Deputy M. Tadier:**

Twenty, was it?

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Twenty, I think, yes.

**Deputy M. Tadier:**

There were 2 waves, there were the cable cars which stopped and then there was the pool which closed about a year or 2 later, and it was the second wave ...

**Mr. J. Carter:**

The first wave of just removing the cable cars was relative small. But that really answers your question, does it not? I mean, if it is the case that 80, 90 per cent of people were going by means other than from Snow Hill it seems to me that that puts that issue in some context.

**Mr. I. Barclay:**

I would argue that is exactly what you said, why would they want to go there in the first place, and that has not changed among the tourists. There is no reason in any literature I can find for me to want to go to the Fort.

**Mr. J. Carter:**

It is not promoted at all. I mean the quickest win ... because even having made the points about poor quality of public realm, it is still quite a nice place to go on a sunny day. There is a great view and there is a café on the rampart. But how would you know? How would you ever know? I mean, it is not promoted anywhere. No one promotes it. That is a general issue about a lot of heritage in Jersey about how well it is promoted. But it is quite hard to find out that it is a nice place just to wander up to enjoy the view and have your lunch. So maybe the very quickest win is simply that. A couple of signs.

**Deputy M. Tadier:**

You are quite right in your analysis, that it is 2-pronged but it may sound slightly abstract, but there is a sense in which if we had a really nice kind of glass lift with an atrium at the top, or whatever you want to call it, that in one sense is both an access and an attraction because people go ... it looks attractive, people go up for the ride and when they get there they are in the Fort. I think the 2 should not necessarily be ... they are not mutually exclusive.

**Mr. J. Carter:**

That was certainly the case with the cable car, was it not?

**Deputy M. Tadier:**

You need to make it attractive to go there.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

We have covered a lot of issues, do members wish to ask any questions?

**Deputy M. Tadier:**

I think I have one more, just an extension of the last question. We have to be realistic certainly as politicians that everything has to meet an economic test nowadays, so I am sure that if people bring

forward ideas to development I suspect that they would favour, in one sense, the leisure and the sports facilities more because we know they are active, it is basically self-funding almost, it is the one aspect of what goes on at Fort Regent which is the most lucrative. So, do you feel positive or optimistic about it? Have you put in any applications for funding that would be met and what kind of case can you make for the States to give you the money you needed?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

To do a job of improving heritage aspects of the Fort?

**Deputy M. Tadier:**

Yes, given the fact that it may not yield a financial return.

**Mr. J. Carter:**

That is a big question, is it not, and I think part of the answer to it is I think that one just needs to accept that, the interest in economic indicators notwithstanding, that in part cultural aspects including heritage is a market failure. It is not possible to justify all cultural investment on economic grounds and there is more to economy in the general sense than that. Sure there are ways in which it would be possible to increase measurable productivity in terms of activity compared to before, but I think one needs to be realistic about the extent to which most heritage conservation is, in part, a cultural act. I need to be honest about that.

**Deputy M. Tadier:**

Especially in Jersey.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Ian, have you got any points you would like to make?

**Mr. I. Barclay:**

I only have one question about product and the attractiveness of getting people there; to become a heritage attraction as well, people are able to go up and have a look at it. Do you think that it is possible to do that without making it a paying attraction? I know you have put in a number of times now to the fact you would not want to see it take business away from elsewhere, but do you think it is practical to be able to deliver something that would attract people to go up there unless it had the investment that got at least some return back again?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

There are 2 questions there. Is it practical to do if somebody made the investment? Yes. Would it justify the investment? Well, no, but I think that is back on the previous point. I know Freddie said you were discussing previously the investment in Mont Orgueil but that ... I mean we spent £4.5 million in Mont Orgueil. You would not make that on commercial grounds. A lot of that money went into things like repointing masonry in lime to keep the structures up. It is not a commercial proposition, so it depends on the terms in which you are seeking to justify it. It is practical in the sense that you could evolve a sensible plan which would have an impact on the number of people that went there, and that that would have an impact on what they learned and understood about Jersey and how much they enjoyed their visit. Could you justify that in raw return on investments terms, I suspect not.

**Deputy M. Tadier:**

Is there any reason not to have a nominal charge to go in, so obviously excluding people who have already paid their membership by their Active or they have paid for a concert? If you had a pound entry and you go in and you can spend the day looking around Fort Regent, is that perhaps a way of offsetting some of the costs, and that could be invested in the heritage side?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

Absolutely. I think there are any number of ways of cutting it. I think the only point I am really trying to make is that I think it would be unwise to approach it purely on the basis that you could evolve a business case where the future Fort Regent could be managed by taking money off people with an

interest in heritage to go and look at the site. I just think there needs to be some realism and caution about that. I think you can see that somebody would construct a business plan like that, but I think that if you had to look at the whole Island, the availability of visitors, but sure you could take money off people and help subsidise the cost out of that, yes.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Back to this economic test that Montfort mentioned. As you know the Fort was not applied for under a programme or an initiative was not applied for under the fiscal stimulus programme for the Fort, and there was a view perhaps that the kind of things that Roger has referred to could have been done under the fiscal stimulus programme. You know, not the highly skilled stuff you did at Mont Orgueil but stuff that would tidy it up, get rid of intrusive materials, perhaps reopen footpaths, refurbish fences or install them or whatever; do you think that such a programme could be devised and got off the ground fairly quickly and not with huge expenditure?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

I would have thought so. But, I mean, in all honesty we have not ... I mean in approaching this we have not looked in great detail at options specifically, detailed options for improving the management. These things are really a function of resource, are they not, which is a function of money. I am sure if the money was available somebody would produce a plan. It is not too late for the fiscal stimulus package, is it?

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

No, apparently not.

**Mr. J. Carter:**

It raises one of the issues, does it not, which is this whole business about prioritising investment. If you draw a box around heritage I suppose if there was a sum of money available for spending on heritage improvements, would you prioritise Elizabeth Castle, say, or Fort Regent, say, as likely to have the best

return in a heritage sense? Again, there needs to be a broader consideration of that issue if possible.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Do you think given what we have said, given the conservation statement, do you think you will be able to contribute more proactively to the preservation, the retention and the promotion of what is sort of best around the heritage at Fort Regent?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

Yes, I think we could, given the time and resources, yes.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Because we do get the impression of a lack of focus and, as we mentioned earlier, the lack of a champion, to use a current phrase. Although at the moment the official landlord is obviously Property Holdings, they are not a heritage organisation obviously and they have major priorities on their plate.

**Mr. J. Carter:**

As I said at the start, I mean, I think that it is a general issue. I mean maybe Fort Regent is a big example of that but, I mean, Jersey is very fortunate to have in public ownership a really significant collection of historic buildings for whom other commercial uses are limited. So we have made an inroad into those where we can with the Forts and Towers scheme but there is a lot of those buildings which deserve some sort of care, and it is, as you rightly point out, the question of championing it because Property Holdings, as you say, has a huge range of other concerns. So I think there is a big issue there about how management of these properties is informed. Certainly at the policy end of it, that is something that we could do.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Are there any final comments that you would like to make? Anything that you have forgotten? We are always open to future written submissions, I should add, but anything you feel that we may not have

addressed or not addressed sufficiently?

**Mr. J. Carter:**

We have a short note of all the points we have made as a written submission we can leave with you.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

That is very kind of you.

**Mr. J. Carter:**

By the same token, I mean if you need to talk again do not hesitate to ask. I mean I am very aware that in approaching this, as I said, we have not gone up there and done a plan of everything we would like to see, partly because I think the conservation plan is a significant document and a good starting point. But if there is an interest in developing it further we are prepared to put some time into putting some more specifics on some of the principles.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:**

Okay, well, I would like to thank you both very much indeed. I think it has been a very interesting session and go away and cogitate. Thank you.