

# STATES OF JERSEY



## **FUTURE HOSPITAL: RESCINDMENT OF GLOUCESTER STREET AS PREFERRED SITE (P.5/2019) – SECOND AMENDMENT**

---

**Lodged au Greffe on 5th February 2019  
by Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence**

---

**STATES GREFFE**

FUTURE HOSPITAL: RESCINDMENT OF GLOUCESTER STREET AS  
PREFERRED SITE (P.5/2019) – SECOND AMENDMENT

---

**PAGE 2 –**

After the words “Westaway Court” insert the words “; to agree that the results of any site selection process undertaken to date should be set aside and to request the Council of Ministers to implement a new, open and transparent process of site selection for the new Jersey General Hospital in order that the most suitable site location may be identified”.

DEPUTY K.F. MOREL OF ST. LAWRENCE.

**Note:** After this amendment, the proposition would read as follows –

**THE STATES are asked to decide whether they are of opinion –**

to refer to their Act dated 1st December 2016, which approved in principle the site location for the new Jersey General Hospital, and their Act of 13th December 2017, in which the preferred scheme and funding was approved, and to agree to rescind its decision that the site location should be the current Jersey General Hospital site with an extension along the east side of Kensington Place and other nearby sites, including Westaway Court; to agree that the results of any site selection process undertaken to date should be set aside and to request the Council of Ministers to implement a new, open and transparent process of site selection for the new Jersey General Hospital in order that the most suitable site location may be identified; and to authorise the Minister for Treasury and Resources to make the necessary changes to the terms of the Hospital Construction Fund to facilitate the payment of costs incurred as a consequence of this rescindment and the winding-up and decommissioning of the works associated with the previous scheme and the continuation of other elements necessary to the overall project, irrespective of the eventual site location.

## **REPORT**

The aim of amending [P.5/2019](#) in the suggested way, is to ensure that a rescindment of the Gloucester Street site decision is a worthwhile endeavour, should the States Assembly choose this route.

The need to start a site selection process afresh is predicated on the reality that there are no potential sites that stand head and shoulders above any others, a fact that the Independent Planning Inspector clearly makes in his report:

“Based on the evidence before me, I assess that there is no stand out alternative site option that would be clearly superior in Planning terms.”

Given the complexity inherent in any decision regarding the choice of hospital site, it is crucial that once taken, a rescindment decision should trigger a new decision-making process that will ensure the ultimate choice of site for the hospital is one that the Island’s public can have confidence in and support.

### **The need for transparency**

For this to be the case, the decision-making process that follows any rescindment and which will lead to a final choice of site for a new General Hospital, must be open, transparent and fair. Among the many complaints islanders have made with regard to the choice of Gloucester Street, many have rightly criticised the opaque nature of the decision-making process that led to that decision.

If the States Assembly is to embark upon a new process, then it must ensure that Islanders’ criticisms are listen to and learned from. This amendment is designed to do precisely that by requiring a new site selection process be started following a rescindment decision and for that process to be “open and transparent”.

The importance of this amendment to [P.5/2019](#) should not be underestimated. Any decision to rescind the choice of Gloucester St will require a new decision-making process but, as [P.5/2019](#) is currently worded, the choice of where to begin that process will sit entirely with the Council of Ministers and should it choose to take short cuts or hide elements of that process from this Assembly and the public, then the Island will quickly find itself back in the same position it is in today.

### **Ensuring public support**

To ensure we learn from past mistakes, it is important that we go back to the beginning and start afresh, so we can choose a hospital site in a way that Islanders understand and which enables them to see the pros and cons of all potential locations. To do otherwise will mean that no lessons have been learned and that the ultimate choice of hospital site will be mired in controversy, once more.

By supporting this amendment, this Assembly will be showing Islanders that it has nothing to hide and has learned from the mistakes of its predecessor. Adopting this amendment will show that this Assembly is committed to getting decisions right and to working openly and in conjunction with the public, for everyone’s best interest.

### **Financial and manpower implications**

If adopted, this amendment will require that a site selection process for the new General Hospital will start afresh and as such, it will bring associated costs. The original Future Hospital Project spent £1.38 million on consultancy and site selection work undertaken by Gleeds. A full, open and transparent site selection process will likely incur similar costs, although it is the case that some efficiencies may be found because some work will be reusable without prejudicing the outcome of the process.

The manpower implications of the decision to rescind the Gloucester Street site decision will be significant, with or without the adoption of this amendment.