

STATES OF JERSEY



FUTURE HOSPITAL: RESCINDMENT OF GLOUCESTER STREET AS PREFERRED SITE (P.5/2019) – THIRD AMENDMENT (P.5/2019 Amd.(3)) – SECOND AMENDMENT

**Lodged au Greffe on 7th February 2019
by Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence**

STATES GREFFE

FUTURE HOSPITAL: RESCINDMENT OF GLOUCESTER STREET AS
PREFERRED SITE (P.5/2019) – THIRD AMENDMENT (P.5/2019 Amd.(3)) –
SECOND AMENDMENT

PAGE 2 –

In the inserted paragraph (b), after the words “Preferred Scheme” insert the following –

“;

- (bb) 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 third amendment would read as follows –

PAGE 2 –

Before the words “to refer” insert the paragraph designator “(a)”; replace the words “refer to” with the word “rescind”; replace the words “the site location for” and insert the words “the use of the present Jersey General Hospital and certain extensions thereto as the site of”; and delete all the words from the first occurrence of the words “General Hospital” until the end and insert the following words –

“;

- (b) subject to paragraph (c) below, to rescind paragraphs (a), (c), (d)(i), (d)(ii), (f), (g) and (h) of their Act of 13th December 2017 (P.107/2017) on the financing of the Preferred Scheme;
- (bb) 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
- (c) to note, for the avoidance of doubt, that there may still be incurred pursuant to P.107/2017 such expense as is necessary or expedient for the purposes of winding up work undertaken to date under the Preferred Scheme.”.

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 that 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 Street 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 shortcuts 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 that 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 interests.

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.

Note:

This amendment has been lodged in the same terms as [my amendment to the main proposition](#), because I am advised that if the [Minister for Treasury and Resources' amendment](#) is adopted, my original amendment would fall.