

STATES OF JERSEY

Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel Fort Regent Review

FRIDAY, 22nd MAY 2009

Panel:

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier of St. Saviour (Chairman)
Connétable G.F. Butcher of St. John
Deputy T.A. Vallois of St. Saviour
Mr. I. Barclay (Panel Adviser)
Mrs. E. Liddiard (Scrutiny Officer)

Witnesses:

Mr. J. Richardson (Deputy Chief Executive, Chief Minister's Department)
Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré of St. Lawrence (Assistant Minister, Chief Minister's Department)
Mr. D. Flowers (Director, Property Holdings)

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

I would like to welcome you. I will introduce the Panel. My name is Roy Le Hérissier, I am the Chairman of this Panel on the Fort Regent Scrutiny.

Connétable G.F. Butcher of St. John:

Connétable Graeme Butcher from St. John.

Deputy T.A. Vallois of St. Saviour:

Deputy Tracey Vallois.

Mr. I. Barclay (Panel Adviser):

I am Ian Barclay, a panel adviser and Sports, Leisure and Heritage consultant. For the past 13 years I have been the Director of Sport, Leisure, Heritage and Arts. Prior to that for a number of local authorities, advising on everything from the London Olympic bid to small parish schemes.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré of St. Lawrence (Assistant Minister, Treasury and Resources):

I am John Le Fondré, Deputy of St. Lawrence; Assistant Minister, Chief Minister's Department; Assistant Minister, Treasury, and my responsibility and why I have been hauled in front of the Panel today is for Property Holdings.

Mr. J. Richardson (Deputy Chief Executive, Chief Minister's Department):

John Richardson, Deputy Chief Executive and Chief Officer Resources with responsibility for property.

Mr. D. Flowers (Director, Jersey Property Holdings):

David Flowers, Director, Jersey Property Holdings.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Thank you very much indeed. There is an understanding that you are au fait with the procedures but basically, as you know, you are essentially giving evidence under an oath. You are protected in the sense that you will not be liable for your evidence, assuming it is truthful evidence, as it obviously is. We are very pleased to have you here. You are our first major witnesses. What I will do is I will direct my questions to the Assistant Minister and then if he wishes to share them, to improve on the answer or give us more facts or whatever, we will go that way. My colleagues will jump in. I should, by the way, give apologies, one of my colleagues, Deputy Pitman is unwell this morning, so I am sorry that he is not here. We start with the first question, could the Minister outline the current relationship between Property Holdings and Fort Regent?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Effectively it is very similar to a lot of property that we own, in other words, the public own it and we act as landlord, if you like, and a variety of departments, principally Education, Sport and Culture, are the tenants on the site. We have a whole range of areas. Obviously you know the areas involved. Do you want us to expand on the break down of those? What we call Fort Regent is also the areas that immediately border on to the Fort, for example, Snow Hill car park, which is obviously under the administration of T.T.S. (Transport and Technical Services). How far do you want to go?

Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier:

If you could outline that, John, in a sense that it may illustrate to us what are some of the complexities and some of the issues of having to sort of take the Fort forward?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

The easiest one might be if I pass that to David, who has got a map which will just outline the areas, but just as an example, there are areas that are under the direct administration of Property Holdings, for example, where the signal station is because the mobile phone mast and things are up there, anyway, I will pass on to David.

Mr. D. Flowers:

I am quite happy for you to take this plan. Let me just go through. Basically as John has said virtually the whole of the Fort Regent site and the immediate surrounding areas are owned by the public. Clos de Fort Housing Estate and Cedars is administered by Housing.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Chairman, I think it would be better if we held the plan up and David pointed to the areas so that you get an understanding of each area and its respective position in terms of occupational use.

Mr. D. Flowers:

If you hold it up I can see it from there. The whole of the pink area, the sort of pinkish area is administered by Education, Sport and Culture. The red areas immediately surrounding the Fort, which is the signal station and there is a section of road and the area to the top of Snow Hill car park, those are directly administered by Property Holdings. The bluish areas, Pier Road car park and Snow Hill car park are administered by Transport and Technical Services. The yellowy-green areas are administered by Housing. So you can see that the bulk of the land is administered by Education, Sport and Culture with Property Holdings acting as the landlord.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier:

Okay.

Mr. D. Flowers:

That fine?

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Yes. Just a question arising from that. If, for example, there were to be an overall plan for the Fort, who would compile that plan and who would deal with all the obvious jurisdictional and liaison problems were it to be a very comprehensive approach to Fort redevelopment?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I will do an initial comment and I will pass that that way. Basically my view would be is that we, as the landlord, would co-ordinate and be the ultimate producers of the plan, but obviously in consultation with the various departments. Then if there is any serious discussion going on from conflicting ideas anything along those lines, ultimately that would have to go up to the Council of Ministers for a final political decision and then almost certainly to the States, I would have thought.

Mr. D. Flowers:

I think, just looking at the plan, it is obvious that there are a number of States bodies who will have interest in that area and depends where you draw the line or the circle around a boundary. Effectively, that says that is the Fort Regent development and another bit could be, the East of Albert project. There are a number of inter-related projects going on or potentially going on here. It seems important to me that whatever happens or whatever views surround redevelopment of Fort Regent, they need to be linked to other work that is going on at the moment for the east of Albert redevelopment regeneration. It does appear, just looking at that with the complexity of it and the clear needs for Fort Regent, that this should be part of a much bigger master planning exercise. This can be a subset of it in terms of the use for the site, but in terms of regeneration of that whole area, Fort Regent is basically a key part. So think there is potentially a danger that we could be looking at Fort Regent as a project but we should be looking at a much bigger picture and a much bigger master planning exercise for that whole area.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

It depends what you are defining as the Fort. Is it what is basically inside the granite ramparts or is it the other various shaded areas that we have on that whole map?

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

That is a very good question. In a way the answer, which I am not going to give because obviously it is not us coming up with a plan. But the answer will depend partly, I suppose, what vision you have of the Fort and the integration you wish to occur. Because hypothetically ... we are going to look at heritage later on to get your views on it. But say a view developed from the Heritage Trust that there was a total under-promotion of the Fort as a heritage site, but in order to promote it various changes needed to be made and so forth, that would obviously involve a lot of delicate negotiation between the various parties? Who would handle that process? If Heritage Trust came forward, for example, and said: "We really believe that an opportunity is being denied the Island here, and we really want to push it"?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I think my first response would be, where is the money coming from? I am sorry, because the reason I phrase it that way is because we know what we have in front of us for the next few years. It is all very well, there may well be some fantastic ideas around there, but if they either are not revenue generating or even if they are, are not in any way liable to generate the money and it may not be sufficient, then my view would be you would have to seriously look at that as a starting point.

Mr. D. Flowers:

I think a reasonable starting point in terms of Fort Regent clearly has got to be the huge heritage issues. That is very clear from what is there now. Whatever happens to Fort Regent in terms of redevelopment and regeneration, it cannot be what happens if Heritage had views. Heritage have to be part of the team

who look at the redevelopment of that site. It will be totally wrong, in my opinion, to look at them as an organisation with views. They have to be an integral part and that does lead me right back to my earlier comment about master planning. If you do not master plan this project you will end up with opposing views all the way through, you will never get a consensus and you will never get a project off the ground. The only way, certainly in my view and experience that I have seen of other big projects in Jersey, is you have to involve everyone at the beginning. You may have different views, and you have to work through those views, but you have to aim to come up with a solution and the only way you are going to come up with that is to have a strategy and master plan that can be approved at the highest level, which obviously in this case is probably via the States. That then sets in stone where we are going, the direction, after that it is a delivery programme. I think that certainly from where I am sitting with Property, one of the things we have to do with all of the States departments is understand that relationship. That while we (Property Holdings) may be the landlord of all of the States property, there are a number of States buildings and States developments that need master planning and everyone has to be involved in this in order to get by and an acceptance that we are going in the right direction. Fort Regent appears to be the classic, it has been on the cards for redevelopment for 15 years, I think, at least. We do not seem to have a strategy and a master plan that sets a direction everyone can buy into that then - subject to funding and development opportunity - can be developed.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

That is good. That will affect obviously a lot of your subsequent answers of the 3 of you. Just one technical one and then I will come to ... I thought the Parish of St. Helier was also a ... I know it is not a States body but quite clearly ...

Mr. D. Flowers:

The Parish of St. Helier owns the children's play area, which is adjacent to South Hill offices.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Any other adjacent roads or anything in which they have not addressed?

Mr. D. Flowers:

I do not believe there are. I have not included those on that plan. You can look at South Hill as part of the Fort Regent complex or you can look at it as separate, it depends how the master plan is. Can I just add that the other interested parties are of course all of the clubs, societies and statutory bodies that have leases and licences of different natures within the Fort, which are quite extensive.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

We will be seeing representatives of that group, thank you. I will ask Ian if ...

Mr. I. Barclay:

It is more a clarification question, if you do not mind. It may sound a bit naive you started to answer some of that. As the landlord is there a formal relationship with tenants if they are State organisations and what are the responsibilities? Are you just literally ... you own the land but every repair maintenance responsibility is the responsibility of the tenant?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I will pass that on to David, definitely.

Mr. D. Flowers:

The Education, Sport and Culture Department is responsible for maintaining the interior of the Fort and facilities management. They transferred a small budget to Property Holdings about 2 years ago for the whole of the maintenance of the exterior. Education, Sport and Culture also do all of the grounds

maintenance around the surrounding areas.

Mr. J. Richardson:

But from a slightly higher level, just to put it in context, the States as we moved to ministerial government passed or approved formally the responsibility and relationship of landlord and tenant. So all property that was previously under the formal administration of departments, be it Sports, Fort Regent, Transport and Technical Services, my old department, all property was formally transferred into the collective ownership of Property Holdings. So they are the formal landlord for all States property and all departments occupy those buildings under, as David described, varying forms of agreement or lease.

Mr. I. Barclay:

Are they formal agreements or informal?

Mr. D. Flowers:

I do not think we could have a formal lease between States departments. We have service level agreements.

Mr. I. Barclay:

Just to understand the relationship, the clubs and the bodies who do have leases, is that a lease directly with Property or the Education, Sport and Culture?

Mr. D. Flowers:

They are with Education, Sport and Culture but we advise and as the landlord we have to give approval.

The Connétable of St. John:

Can I just ask before we move on to another subject. Are they leases per se or licences?

Mr. D. Flowers:

Some of them are leases and some of them are licences. The leases are generally with the statutory bodies, such as J.E.C. (Jersey Electric Company) who have got a long term lease on the substations, booster station, et cetera. But the others are licences.

Deputy T.A. Vallois:

With regard to the master planning, you were saying strategy having to build it up, is there any plans in the near future to have that master plan put in place?

Mr. J. Richardson:

That, I think, is what we are here to talk about today. But what I am just interested from the Panel's perspective is what you are looking at? Are you looking at Fort Regent or are you looking at it from a master planning perspective? Because clearly there are 2 very, very different pieces of work going on here. I think certainly from sitting here with Property, we need to have a view from the Panel as to what you are looking at, because we could talk for hours about uses within the ramparts and re-use and future use, but we could also be talking for quite some time about the overall picture. There is obviously a gap at the moment and I think if we are working with you and with other panels we need to understand that because we need to then work on how we go forward. But as the Assistant Minister already said, we are going to come to a particular point which says, to take this project forward, be it redevelopment of the interior or master planning for the whole of the area, is a substantial piece of work requiring substantial funding which does not exist. So we can talk about the vision, we can talk about ideas, but the next step is significant work and there is no funding and certainly looking at it with David, I think we are talking about a very significant sum of money.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

You have raised a very good point, John, but I think that is an issue we are going to have to discuss as a panel. Quite clearly if you take the master planning approach, obviously it seems the most reasonable and most rational approach to take, the big question then becomes is that going to basically freeze all development in what is already perceived by some people as a declining institution or one where there desperately needs to be an infusion of new ideas and new thinking while the master planning process goes on and on and on?

Deputy T.A. Vallois:

I personally believe that it is not worth looking at things in piecemeal, if you are going to do something properly you have to look at the overall picture. Our terms of reference are we want to clarify the current situation with regards to the Fort Regent facility, consider the plans for and implications of future development of the facility, to assess the current and future financial and staffing arrangements of the facility and to consider the current access, which is something that everyone is concerned with, the public and politicians alike. That is our remit at the moment but if it means taking in the overall strategy we are not necessarily at the moment talking about: "Okay, it is going to cost a lot of money." We understand it is going to cost a lot of money but we need to know where we are going. If there is going to be a master plan when it is going to happen? How are we going to look at funding in the future for that?

Mr. J. Richardson:

I think to answer the Chairman's question first, I do not think there is going to be any redevelopment within Fort Regent at the moment because there is no funding. There is no funding in the capital programme and I am sure David can expand more if you want to, but there is appetite in the private sector at the moment for redevelopment in that sort of sphere. I do not think anything is going to happen in the short term. To answer Deputy Vallois, I think that that is absolutely where we should be. A master plan should be informing the future use development access, et cetera. Until we do that then I would not say we are at a standstill, because David has done a lot of work and there is a lot opportunity to go further, but the real piece of work is not going to happen until a substantial sum of money is voted and appropriate people appointed to undertake that exercise. Classic example I think I can give you is the other end of town, north of town, that is another project or number of projects there that have been staggering on for a number of years, and it is only now the Planning Minister has identified a need for a master plan and following out of that will be a number of big projects, which have got funding, that we can then develop. I can see Fort Regent and that area of town following in exactly the same line but it does need that injection of capital in order to move forward.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

You have asked where our priorities lie, I think. I think it would be fair to say that for this year, certainly, as far as I am concerned, and I think as David is concerned, our priority has been office strategy, integrated property management system, charging mechanisms, backlog of maintenance, which is all very unsexy stuff but it is all very necessary stuff. So as we have said a number of times we have an £80 million backlog of property maintenance that has to be addressed. We have done various pieces of work on the Fort. I say it is moving forward but it is moving very slowly forward. To an extent we are almost slightly ahead of ourselves in terms of today because as I said our priorities have to be the other items I have mentioned first, because if we do not get those sorted out we will not have the funding to do any of the other of the nice to haves.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

We will move on to number 2.

The Connétable of St. John:

Could the Assistant Minister inform the Panel of the department's plans for the facility and we will take this in 3 slices. What plans are in place for the old swimming pool site, whether they are affordable or not?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

We have done some informal, I say, sounding out of views, you could say consultations. We approached DTZ as well, and David can elaborate a lot more on that. But certainly one suggestion for the Fort, and I think from what I have understood at what you have spoken to people about, you may have touched on it, is potentially some form of hotel/restaurant idea up there. That was in our thoughts, as I say, before it came into the public domain, so, I think there may be a meeting of minds on that one, I do not know. It is, from my view, personal view if you like, one of the most fantastic view locations on the Island. You should be able to do something of merit up there. I shall pass that across to David who might want elaborate.

Mr. D. Flowers:

Yes. I think, just headlining. If you are looking for definitive plans we do not have them. What we have, what we have been looking at, is all of the reports which have been produced over the many years to see what are the best parts of those reports, what would be supported, and then try and come up with a concept. We have done some, as John has said, informal discussions with leisure consultants mainly to see what sort of approach we should take. The view was that it should be an evolutionary approach rather than a revolutionary approach. Some of the things which are in the reports, such as the EDAW report, are really quite significant changes and I do not think that we can recommend going down that route. But before you can really go anywhere with the Fort it requires an extensive master planning and feasibility exercise which in itself would be quite expensive. I think it would be wrong to assume that the ideas which we might have can then move into an implementation phase without being properly evaluated. simply because ... I think one of your later questions is, what do you believe the appetite is for public/private partnership? We would certainly say that it was not very good at the moment. We cannot assume that we can find a partner that would be able to fund this.

The Connétable of St. John:

Through the Chair; certainly through the meetings that we have had with public and public responses at the moment there is a strong feeling out there that the pool should never have been removed. I know we are talking of history. One of the other things that came up at a recent meeting at Fort Regent was something like the potential of a budget hotel to accommodate sports people in the facility, rather than generally it is looked at 4 and 5 star hotels to do certain things. What are your thoughts on that idea?

Mr. J. Richardson:

I think that is something you need to talk to Economic Development about. They have a much better view on the requirement for the tourism industry and the type of hotel. I do not think that is something we could answer on that.

The Connétable of St. John:

Obviously we would be looking very long term on these things anyway and hopefully as the economy starts on the up it might be the time to grow different ideas. Do you have any questions on the first one, no? Have you got anything on the pool?

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

No.

The Connétable of St. John:

Okay, we will move on. B and C are really linked together. What plans are in place for the cable cars? We know they are defunct at the moment. The evidence we have seen so far it certainly seems the minute that transportation was dropped there was a 20 per cent drop in usage of the Fort.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

The cable cars themselves, I think the idea of putting those back into service, in my view, is a non-starter. I think the costs just do not work let alone the actual whole issues around running them, whether it is health and safety, the whole lot. I think there is a recognition that that again has to become part of the overall plan. You definitely need to get some form of access that end of town to get back into the Fort. But that has to be part of the planning exercise.

The Connétable of St. John:

Generally with the drop in usage of the Fort, as you know with many businesses, it is always the last few per cent is where the profit is. It is very much at the core of the viability for the Fort and transport links to get up there in some form or other would certainly improve the facility up there, in my view, anyway.

Mr. J. Richardson:

I am going to keep coming back to this master plan issue because for many years it has been recognised that the cable cars were very old, had to be decommissioned from a safety point of view, but they were no longer viable and serviceable and there has been a recognition that there does need to be an improved linkage, without question. I think the question that does come out is, how do you make best use of the location, because it is not an easy place to get to? Do you do it as part of redevelopment of the area surrounding it where some development there could provide a much better mechanism to form an easier link? With a fairly high promontory which you have to get up to it is almost a vertical rise, so you are very restricted on the type of elevator type mechanism you can use, but if that could be incorporated into some further development in that surrounding area it could make for a much better access route with facilities around it. But that comes back to the much bigger picture.

The Connétable of St. John:

Obviously from our point of view as a panel Education, Sport and Culture is the site but we certainly appreciate that it is all part and parcel of a much bigger picture.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

John, given your rightful enthusiasm and attachment to master plans, some people have suggested that the North of Town master plan could contribute in a sense that, for example, the Ann Court car park be basically reinstated as the Snow Hill car park and then there would be roof style access from Snow Hill to the Fort.

Mr. J. Richardson:

If I can wear my old hat of Transport and Technical Services, car parking was a key issue clearly. Building an additional level in Snow Hill has a number of problems just because of the pure nature of the site. It is not to say it cannot be done, but it is a very, very expensive option for a pure car park, it just will not work financially. If it can be worked as part of another development then clearly one could cross-subsidise the other. In terms of pure building a bigger car park that could provide a lift from the top, it does not work financially. So it does come back to how you look at that whole area and provide a better form of access.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Back to the question ... obviously, it is about issues, what did knocking out the swimming pool do to the Fort, which I suppose is partly an E.S.C. (Education, Sport and Culture) question and we will obviously revert to them. The issue of the cable cars, of course, raises, as you have said, the whole issue of

access. You have outlined some of the cost implications of access, John, I suppose it may sound a bit like desperation, but is there some kind of silver bullet? For example, some facilities are accessed simply by mini buses, so you do not need all this massive capital expenditure. Is that a possibility, for example?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Are you suggesting a mini bus link from the bottom of Snow Hill to ...

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Yes, Snow Hill to the Fort, for example.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I suppose my reaction is nothing is impossible but it then comes down to the funding side, does it not?

Mr. J. Richardson:

Certainly the simple answer is, yes, it is feasible; it is quite an easy route, it is a serviceable route which could be accomplished quite easily. If I recall we ran a park and ride many years ago from La Collette to the town centre, very successful scheme, very popular but very expensive to run. Of course, the times you want it because of the nature of the centre that is there with the sports facilities tends to be either side of the work day. So you are into very early morning shifts and late evening shifts, so contracting that with a private sector contractor you will be paying premium rates. Someone will be paying premium rates and if it is the operator then they have to bill that into their operating costs.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

We will move on to our third question. Tracey.

Deputy T.A. Vallois:

It appears that no action has been taken with regards to numerous reports and feasibility studies on Fort Regent that have been produced over the last 10 years. Is this so, and if so, why? If not, what has been developed?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I think I will ask David to deal with that one, because I know he has gone through a lot of the reports.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

That is a career in its own right.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

It is an historic question as well, to an extent.

Mr. D. Flowers:

The conclusions I have reached are that progress on the implementation of any of the recommendations of the various reports has been halted due to lack of funds. I think that the States approved, for example, the Jersey Sports Village concept in 2000 but did not subsequently approve the funds to progress the initiative. So lots of ideas, a lot of them very good, and together could be put together and could form a good package but you need to invest in the feasibility to drive it forward.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Do you think ...

Mr. D. Flowers:

I think that is why they have stopped.

Deputy T.A. Vallois:

Yes, I think the whole concern with regards to Fort Regent is that because all these studies and these reports have been going on for years and years and no one has seen anything come out of it ... the money being spent on these reports and consultants et cetera, I mean that is money just going down the drain to a certain extent because nothing is being brought out of it. Now we are saying we are going to do a master plan, we are going to do more feasibility studies, are we going to be in the same place 20, 25 years down the road?

Mr. J. Richardson:

I think from what I have seen of most of the reports it has been looking at the internal, not the externals of it.

Deputy T.A. Vallois:

But this consultation report by R.Q.A. (Roger Quinton Associates) took in the master plan of the La Mont de la Ville Park and took in surrounding areas as well.

Mr. J. Richardson:

Yes, I am not sure report ... it may not have been given the credence it should have been given at the time but certainly all of those areas did not come up with an overall solution. It was always looking at the internal, what do you do with the internal space? That probably is one of the big questions in debate for the future. Is, what are we going to reuse that internal space for? There are clearly a number of intentions or number of different ideas as to do you turn it purely to heritage? Do you use it for an occupational space? Do you keep it as it is but modernise it? Loads of ideas. No one has come up with saying: "This is what we want out of it." The reports have so far come up with different options but no one has, through collectively working together with all of the various bodies, said: "The right solution is X."

Deputy T.A. Vallois:

So the internal though, Education, Sport and Culture are being the tenant of the building, would they have the say so in what happened on the inside or would that be a whole collective, as you said all the tenants, Property Holdings and Education, Sports and Culture and Housing and everyone all around there? So would it involve all of them or would it be just Education, Sport and Culture that would have the say so?

Mr. J. Richardson:

It has to be everyone. Clearly Education, Sport and Culture have a huge input in to the number of people who use it, the facilities that are there, what is needed for the community in the future.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I would say I agree, I think my view would be that given the current use ... Education, Sport and Culture are the majority user, at least they are to me, therefore to an extent in terms of waiting for their input they have, I would have thought, a very significant impact on what the future use is. For the sake of argument, I caveat this, I do not want to send a hare running because we are only talking about ideas here, but for the sake of argument if the idea of Heritage taking it all off, strip it back to a fort, say, you have to replace the sports facilities. That is the biggest sports facility we have on the Island. So, you therefore have to put significant weighting on what the E.S.C. I think want to do and if the view is we want to put it back to Heritage, which might be a fantastic idea but it has a significant cost attached to it in itself, where do you put the alternative facilities? That goes back to David's comment about evolutionary or revolutionary because I am afraid it does go back to money as well.

Deputy T.A. Vallois:

Going back to the money side of things. Over the years we have got rid of certain facilities like the cable cars because it was costing too much money. Like the swimming pool because it was costing too much money. Then we went and built a swimming pool around the front which is costing us a lot of money. It seems to me we have not really used our heads over the years and now we are turning around saying: "We did a feasibility study in 2000, we have not done anything with it, so 9 years later we are saying we want another master plan, we want another feasibility study." Are we going to do anything with it? Will we get that master plan and then looking at stages ... I know it is going to cost a lot of money and I know it means having to come to the States and asking for money but it is a case of we cannot let it keep on going downhill, we need to see something progressing. Do you see where I am coming from? We have heard all this before, feasibility studies, reports, we have spent all this money on that. Then we have put our money somewhere else which turns out we spent more money on it. What I am asking is, okay, we need a master plan, we need a feasibility study, once we get that where are we going from there? Is it just going to be put back in to the folder and ...?

Mr. J. Richardson:

A lot depends on what the output is in terms of use. Because if the output is a use which has an attraction to a private party in terms of a development opportunity and the economic climate is such that you can attract a developer in and work in partnership, and their funding through a public/private or some form of partnership arrangement can work and provide the funding for it, then the opportunity exists and could well be developed and move forward. If, on the other hand, it remains as purely a States operated organisation and facility then if that relies on the capital programme then we know where the capital programme is at the moment and funding will be very tight. David mentioned earlier at the moment the market testing or the market sounding he has taken is saying that there is not much appetite from private sector developers to come in for that sort of facility. Until we get to a stage where perhaps there is an appetite there and there is a feeling that there is a regeneration programme which will deliver a return for a developer it looks difficult to see how we are going to move that forward.

Deputy T.A. Vallois:

Fort Regent, as I remember from speaking with Derek de la Haye, has never really been a profit making area, it has always cost, basically balancing the books or going in to minuses. I can see why there is not very much appetite at the moment with regards to the private partnerships. But going forward Derek de la Haye is very much of the thought that with Fort Regent as it is at the moment, with the sports, et cetera, is for the benefit of the people and that it should not be for making money. Do you believe that or do you think there is potential to diversify?

Mr. J. Richardson:

Sorry, that is a political question, not for an officer to answer.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I suppose my view would be that ... I do not have experience in the area, of sports centres, but my understanding is that it is very unusual ... I will caveat it, next to impossible for these things to make money in terms of they are regarded as a community facility rather than as a profit-making centre. If somebody can demonstrate something different then please come and tell the Panel. From that point of view if you go to carry on with some form of sports orientated facility up there I think we have an acceptance that there will be a cost attached to it. If you can minimise that cost to the public, fine, but you need to know what those ideas are. So I probably do not disagree with you, I think.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

What intrigues me in hearing all of you talk and having heard your summation; have any of you ever

asked yourself the 64,000 dollar question, which is perhaps, should we consider closing the Fort down and putting it under a minimal maintenance basis? Because all these numerous reports which Tracey referred to have gone on and on. They have been in a sense a search for the silver bullet and other than perhaps pumping money into access, which would open up further possibilities, no one has yet come up with anything. Have you ever come to the conclusion, well, really we are involved in a fairly decreasing set of circles and why do we not just pull the plug?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Yes, I do not know if it helps, say my background to the Fort, depending how far back in your records you go, you will find my father was number 2 or 3 up there for a year. Then he went into politics. From that point of view I used to know my way around there a little bit, I mean we are going back into 1970s, early 1980s here, I think, and so I am marginally familiar with the place, but also some of the nooks and crannies that the public do not get into. In fact I went up there 2 or 3 years ago, Eric Le Ruez - before David - took me around a number of the sites and we did half a day up at the Fort just to remind myself what it was like. Yes, you can question and say, right, what would happen, I go to Les Quennevais quite often for swimming and things like that, and what is the cost per head? I have never quite got to the bottom of the running costs of Les Quennevais versus the Fort because you are not completely comparing like with like because you have all the playing fields and things like that up there. So could you build a more modern efficient sports centre somewhere else to service and then effectively take it out of the Fort? You do then leave yourself firstly with the question, what do you do with the Fort? Brings us back full circle. Which maybe brings you back to the heritage idea, but that is not a cost free option. What is the differential of a new facility and, particularly, where would you put it? Because the Fort does serve St. Helier, to an extent it serves the east of the Island as well, but it is predominantly ... I do not know the breakdown of where people come from to use it but I would imagine the fact that its location is near St. Helier is fairly fundamental. I suppose, yes, I have asked the question and the conclusion I got to at the end of the day is that it is a very useful facility, it is not just sports, it is used by Jersey Symphony Orchestra 3 times a year, it is used by various pop concerts and things like that. I do not know what they do conference-wise but they used to have facilities there for it. It serves a purpose and I think you would have to be very careful before you take those purposes away. You would have to replace them somewhere. So at the moment although, yes, it is costing us money, I think we have a long way to go before we have to consider running it on an effectively lights out basis. Because even then that is not a cost free option.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

What about you, David, having reviewed all the reports and everything, when do you say to yourself: "Are we chasing after something that we can really move forward" or do we really have to stand back and say: "Where is this getting us?"

Mr. D. Flowers:

I would have to say that the Fort is administered by E.S.C. and they are the ones that carry the budget. We have the liability for the external maintenance which would be there whether or not the Fort was being occupied. So it makes no difference from a property perspective. I think the issue really is until you have investigated what value can be obtained from property development which might support a master plan for the changes to the Fort itself, and it is that exercise which is the next step from the feasibility studies, then you do not know. It is that exercise that needs to be done and it is that which if you were able to attract a private partner, that is what you would be expecting them to do, but in the current climate where you cannot attract a private partner it then requires the States to make that investment.

The Connétable of St. John:

Can I just ... obviously in the past the way things used to go with the old lottery that used to be run on

the Island, an enormous amount of funds from the lottery used to go into Fort Regent. Obviously that is demised now to virtually non-existent. Is there any way of moving forward with a U.K. (United Kingdom) lottery and getting some funding from that direction?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

That is really a matter for E.D., I guess ...

The Connétable of St. John:

I was not sure where the lines were on these things. It certainly would seem, we have lost the lottery but not replaced it with anything. Obviously the other perennial question comes up periodically is the thought of a casino somewhere. Something that is going to generate significant amounts of money. Not in your remit?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

No, I do not think so. I bounce anything to do with gambling and lottery money certainly to Economic Development, because I know that is their remit. I think they have been looking at things but I might be putting words into their mouth.

Mr. I. Barclay:

Just ask a question. Listening to the discussion it seems to me that, from your perspective, it is the funding that is driving the end? I have to start the opposite way around. I say what is the need? Therefore how can we fund it? Sometimes it is a long term plan. Sometimes you have to take it from a funding route. You see where you are going but you might have to take a different path to get there. Irrespective, as long as you know where you are going that is the key thing. I am not clear yet whether there is any overall vision for this site yet. If there is it would be more funding driven, i.e. means rather than the end. Have I got the wrong end of the stick there?

Mr. J. Richardson:

No, I think you have the right end of the stick but to get to that point a significant amount of money is required to get to a consensus of what it is to be used for, in context with the surrounding area, which is all subject to redevelopment to make sure you end up with the right use that meets all of the needs, be it sports and heritage and others, then I agree with your view. Then you look at how you go about delivering it. But the first piece of work is a significant piece of money which does not exist at the moment.

Mr. I. Barclay:

So the work that has been done to date on the needs analysis for various options, sport, conference, entertainment is not considered to be valid or it needs looking at again?

Mr. J. Richardson:

With respect, we would not be sitting here today if it was, we would have a plan. So that is all I can say on that. Clearly there has not been consensus so we are sitting here today 10 years on from some of those reports that are there, that has not delivered the master plan.

Mr. I. Barclay:

Who would be responsible for driving that forward then? I mean there has been all these reports, I am just trying to understand what happens when they are delivered?

Mr. J. Richardson:

There needs to be a view which has to be brought together by all the respective parties representing sports, heritage, planning, everyone as to what is going to happen. Bring it back right to the first

comment I made about that master plan for the area. I think there is a danger that they were talking about Fort Regent. It was the Planning Minister who was very clear that anything that he is looking at from here on is about degeneration of areas and that whole area we are talking about, we call East of Albert, I think some Members have been to the presentation already on opportunities for East of Albert, should include or should certainly have cognisance with the future use of Fort Regent.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Bearing in mind that all fits in to things like residential development and things like that.

Mr. D. Flowers:

If you read all the feasibility studies and reports that have been produced on the Fort, some elements are common but there is a lot of conflict. It is getting a single view that is important, and doing the proper financial appraisal in the context of the surrounding areas before you can move forward.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Times have changed. I came across a report, well, either mid-1970s or mid-1980s, I cannot remember, which was another concept idea of what to do with the Fort, but that was very much tourism and leisure orientated rather than sports, if that makes sense. Where we are now in terms of lifestyle, funding, economy, state of tourism industry, that type of thing, that report itself would, I would say, definitely not be valid. That is one of the problems.

Deputy T.A. Vallois:

With regards to the actual talking of the conflict of putting things up there. In the 1970s when they built the swimming pool, there was quite a lot of conflict about the height of the building and the fact that it was on the Glacis Field, et cetera, but it was still built. Everyone has taken much joy in that area and they have had a lot of use out of that area until it was closed down. Over the last 10 years we have not come to a general consensus with all of these reports, how are we going to come to a general consensus over the next 10 years? The Fort Regent is such a big remake, can we use it for so many things, when do we stamp our foot and say: "That is it, we are going to do something? I do not think we are ever going to come to one general consensus." Your views? Do you really see us coming to that conclusion?

Mr. J. Richardson:

I do not think that is something we can answer. With respect, we are here to talk about the property element of it, Property Holdings. You are asking an issue which is a political issue which involves a number of politicians who represent all of the bodies and the public of the Island. The Assistant Minister might want to comment but I think we are here today to talk about the property issues surrounding Fort Regent, not the much larger public issues.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I would say, as I said, once you have brought the various strands together and if you get to the point there are 3 competing ideas for the Fort, say, then I think at that point that goes up to the various political levels and ultimately to the Council of Ministers to try and pull together and then bring it to the States. That is ultimately how it has to come through.

The Connétable of St. John:

Obviously, you have been mentioning, John, a lot about the cost of getting to a master plan. Can you put a number on that?

Mr. J. Richardson:

I would not want to put a number on it in terms of a hard number but I think if you are looking at the overall area you would certainly be well over £1 million.

The Connétable of St. John:

But that divided among various ... you would be talking Housing, presumably, Harbours?

Mr. J. Richardson:

No, it is the cost of developing a full master plan ...

The Connétable of St. John:

Yes, but the master plan would include the various different parties that you are talking about? Not just E.S.C. so as in it would be divided among the various ...

Mr. J. Richardson:

You need to look at land use planning around there to see whether there is some leverage you can apply on one piece of land, which if you can get the right development on that piece of land, which can fund or cross-fund another piece of development. At the moment we seem to be looking at everything in individual chunks. A master plan if it was done properly with tending to the right level of financial appraisal would allow the opportunity of saying: "If you look at this in totality of an area and there is an opportunity to develop this piece of land for this purpose, attracting the right funding route and the right development, then that could cross-subsidise or cross-fund another development." That is a very good piece of work.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier:

That leads me on to the public/private partnerships again. We have obviously had comments from David already on this issue. But I suppose we have to make the assumption that normality may return to the economic situation and if it were to return or when it returns, let us be optimistic, what are the possibilities of developing public/private partnerships to enable suggested developments?

Mr. D. Flowers:

Certainly if or when things settle down elements of any proposals could attract private partnership. The question we come back to, to get to that point more work is required.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier:

What do you think a private partner, David, would be looking for, for example, if they pursued the idea or wanted to pursue the idea of a hotel on the Glacis Field or something, the swimming pool site?

Mr. D. Flowers:

Again, subject to more work done on it and taking advice from E.D.D. (Economic Development Department) et cetera, I think they would be looking to ensure that they can get a satisfactory income stream, as any operator. The nature of the hotel is quite important. Certainly it does give you the opportunity to provide what you have mentioned before, which was the restaurant.

The Connétable of St. John:

Just a quick question. You may know the answer, you may not. In terms of the Glacis Field as a whole, is there a covenant on that that further down the field could not be used? I know there was lots of public objection when things were done up there initially, but I am just wondering if there is a legal covenant on the rest of the Glacis Field?

Mr. D. Flowers:

There is not a covenant, but the whole of the site has been designated as an S.S.I. (Site of Special Interest) and in my view it would be extremely unlikely that any development would be permitted on the Glacis Fields except on the current site of the swimming pool. Extremely unlikely.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Again assuming a situation of normality, are there any other public/private partnerships that could be considered other than the ones in the frame at the moment, hotel and restaurant?

Mr. D. Flowers:

Only insomuch as potential residential development in the grounds. As far as I can see.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Thank you. We will move to the next question. Graeme.

The Connétable of St. John:

Will Fort Regent come in to the department's priorities for redevelopment especially in the current climate, obviously? Is there a possibility of any funding from the stimulus package?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I think I have part answered that question. I suppose our phrase is not so much where does it come in our priorities, but what priorities lie ahead of it? The priorities that lie ahead of it as far as I am concerned are of the strategy, backlog maintenance, integrated property systems that has been happening since the charging mechanism. That I would say were my priorities for at least the next year.

Mr. J. Richardson:

I think from the financial stimulus the 3Ts come in to play here. The 2 that are most critical is timely and targeted. Timely we would not achieve any significant output that you could use the investment that the financial stimulus package has been aimed at to be of benefit; and certainly targeted, until we have got the target, we know where to aim and fix, it would be probably too early to use funding from that route in Fort Regent.

The Connétable of St. John:

Could not some of the funding from the stimulus package be looked at as a longer term view? I know it is timely, targeted, but looking at the big picture as to what the people of the Island ...

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

The timely issues is the fact it should be useable in the next 2 years. Realistically, because of the master planning exercises and things like that, it is probably not going to happen. It would not have any desired affect.

Mr. J. Richardson:

It is unlikely that the money that would be required to undertake that level of master planning, a significant amount would go into the local economy.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Obviously you have talked about the stimulus package there but is there a likelihood of any funding from elsewhere?

Mr. J. Richardson:

No.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

It is getting fairly negative this meeting. [Laughter]

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

You have to put everything back into the context, if you looked at the financial projections for the next 4 years and the comments that have been made about potential and structural deficits and things like that, from that perspective, it is not going to look overly positive until we start seeing ... because obviously we were at the beginning of what could be a difficult time. Until you get a little bit further down the line, you have a bit more certainty as to what the actual impact of the economic situation is, you have to prepare for harder times and you have to be very careful on what you spend your money on.

Deputy T.A. Vallois:

Just thinking of the stimulus package with regards to the 3Ts, I have heard it so many times now. Being timely, temporary and targeted, something like demolishing the swimming pool area because it is so far gone and they are having to keep maintaining it just so it does not fall down by itself, I mean surely that meets the 3Ts criteria?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

What I would say is (a) is it a priority; and I think I will let David discuss the various conflicts we have on that. If, for the sake of argument, one turns around and says ... I do not know what the demolition costs would be but say it was £500,000 or £1 million, would it be better spent knocking that building down or would it be better spent from our perspective on employing 4 local firms to do various maintenance which we know we have to do on certain buildings to catch up. The other issue, if you remember, the Fiscal Policy Panel specifically said that if it was larger capital projects they have to be ready to go. There is no point saying, yes, we are going to spend it on X and it takes 3 years to start having an impact. I will let David comment about the demolition idea.

Mr. D. Flowers:

John has given you a summary of where we are with our backlog maintenance. Some of that backlog maintenance is of high priority and where we have put in bids in the fiscal stimulus package it is to focus on those areas. The way in which we prioritise our capital spend is very much spend to save. So any expenditure which can save the States money in the short and medium term. So it is very difficult at this time to put a feasibility study, effectively, and work on the Fort at a higher priority than those elements.

Deputy T.A. Vallois:

Surely something like just demolishing the swimming pool area, would at least start to save you money because you are having to pay to maintain that? It is not exactly fit for purpose at the moment, it is falling apart. So, that was only something I just put in. I mean thinking long term, if you are having to maintain this building when it is not being used, it is effectively costing the States. So by putting money in just to demolish it, I am not talking about rebuilding or anything like that, just to get rid of the building, what are the implications there?

Mr. D. Flowers:

John mentioned a range of demolition costs between £500,000 and £1 million, we are not absolutely certain what it may be. We simply do not have that money. We simply do not have that money.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Did anybody when they were looking at Heritage ... and I suspect because of the historical reputation of the Fort the very issues we have discussed, how everybody struggles to get it in to focus and a vision and everything, it may not have been approached, but there was talk ... for example, I think John mentioned, re Heritage, there is an implicit assumption that it can only move forward if all the current so-called internal structure is stripped out and it returns to its essentials. You can rebut that perhaps, John. But did anybody look at the possibility that there was some form of heritage makeover available

at a more minimalist level? Where you could have stripped out the more obvious things, you would have had to co-exist with Sports and Leisure, which by the way is very vibrant, I must say. I must introduce a more positive note, we have been impressed at the vibrancy of what is going on there, we have been impressed by that, and the sports village almost seems to be growing almost by stealth, which is quite interesting. You know the development offices are there now and there are all sorts of issues there, and we have truly been impressed by that. But could somebody have come in and said: "Look, we cannot strip this Fort back to its essentials, we cannot make it into an iconic heritage site but we can definitely with the input of a bit of labour, a little bit of imagination we can get it up to speed a lot more and maybe a few little cafes around the ramparts and so forth, we can get it up to speed to be a fairly reasonable site and we can run a mini bus from Snow Hill. All that can be done in fairly short order, we do not have to go to world heritage site standards." Anybody look at that?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I will just clarify, when I talked about do you strip the whole sport out and take it back, that was me and that was hypothetical as well. [Laughter] Secondly, as to whether anybody has looked at your suggestions, I do not know because we are going on so long, it was before my time, but I will pass it to ... in terms of matter of fact, either John or David.

Mr. J. Richardson:

David's comments on it, it is evolution not revolution. It does seem to be while we are in a position of having very limited funding in an economic position then if there is any investment to be made, and while, as you have already described, there is a vibrant scene operating up there and it is something to be encouraged and further developed, until you know what the long-term view is and how you are going to get there, then some form of evolution in terms of modernisation programme, redevelopment, enhancement absolutely splendid idea, but to come back to the evil question, there is an investment required and someone has to meet that investment.

The Connétable of St. John:

Can I ask you, does Fort Regent sit within your backlog of maintenance? I am not sure what your structure is with Education in terms of do you have to keep the building wind and water tight?

Mr. D. Flowers:

Yes, we do.

The Connétable of St. John:

Is there sort of funding available? Is that falling behind up there?

Mr. D. Flowers:

There is an element of backlog maintenance in Fort Regent and currently we do not have the funds to close that gap.

The Connétable of St. John:

Could you not get any of those funds from the stimulus package as part of your backlog of maintenance?

Mr. D. Flowers:

We have the maximum funds we think we can get in a different priority because there are other buildings that require expenditure from a statutory compliance level which must go ahead before.

The Connétable of St. John:

Certainly there are many members of the public that wander around the Fort and have the perception that there is a big hidden agenda up there, that the place is just deteriorating. It is fine under the roof, it

is quite good there, but if you walk around the surroundings, it is poor.

Mr. J. Richardson:

There is no funding in place to manage that scale of land to a level which you have described and the public would expect. Whether it is Property Holdings budget or Education, Sports and Culture.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

When it was transferred to us I think we were given a budget of £65,000, which is what Education had identified as their external maintenance budget for the Fort. We are having a number of discussions with different departments as to whether all of their calculations are entirely as accurate as they could have been.

Mr. D. Flowers:

It is not a large amount of money.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

No, and that is per year. I cannot comment on that particularly but we know of quite significant funding pressures relating to the Fort which are significantly higher than that.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Thank you, we will move on to the next question. Tracey.

Deputy T.A. Vallois:

Many of the submissions sent in by the public have mentioned what an attraction it would be to have a restaurant from which to enjoy the views of Jersey. Could you advise the Panel the feasibility of developing this without a feasibility study?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Well, I think if you stand back to look at the idea we have said already the views, particularly from the pool, are some of the best I would say on the Island. So it is to me ... as David has referred to, combined possibly with the idea of an hotel it would seem to be a logical idea. But we come back to the normal story.

Mr. J. Richardson:

We believe that they would be mutually supportive but you have to do the work again to justify that.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I have one comment which I suppose also comes down to, it is purely a personal view, it is not backed up by evidence, it is a feeling. Hopefully it would not be relevant here, but one can sometimes come along and see that you see little developments and they stick a little shop or stick a little cafe and stuff, but there is a finite level of demand within the Island as to how many little cafes and restaurants you can have around to make sure they are viable. So you also have to make sure when you are doing that that, yes, probably up at that location ... yes, it is a significantly good idea, but at the end of the day it has to be a money generating venture out of that otherwise people are not going to do it.

Deputy T.A. Vallois:

Same kind of situation with hotels as well?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Yes. It is entirely about feasibility, demand, and that is when you need input from Economic Development and that type of stuff.

Deputy T.A. Vallois:

I think I raised that concern with the idea of a hotel, I mean with the Royal Yacht just redeveloping down there, you have Condor and Radisson and Grand Hotel, all pretty much in the same kind of vicinity. If they did go into public/private partnership, would there be anything from that because of ...

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

That comes down to feasibility, demand and yes, what is the position? With that you would have to know before you go further down that line.

Mr. J. Richardson:

That has got to be part of the demand study as part of the master plan.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I would say personally, again my view, again you want to make sure that any of the existing operators, who I do not necessarily want to name, but if you were going for a budget hotel, for example, there are other organisations which are ... they are not budget but they are operating somewhere in the middle. What is in Jersey's interest in respect of, do you set up another and perhaps just close down someone else or can you demonstrate by adding another operator you have started expanding the market again? That is not my speciality in any shape or form but you would have to obviously consider those factors.

The Connétable of St. John:

But if you had a vision as to something that would be ideal up there, it would be a swimming pool, hotel and a revolving restaurant on the top. That could be stunning but I doubt the site is big enough to accommodate all 3.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Okay, again we are reaching a point where we have dealt with some of these questions in other areas, but, for the record we will move to them. How does the Assistant Minister intend to balance any future development of Fort Regent with its unique military past?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

That is an interesting question, is it not? I think we have to say we are obviously very aware of the historical significance of Fort Regent. I do always stand back and look at the amount of funding over the centuries that has been spent on defending Jersey. Quite interesting if you have a look at it in those terms. We are certainly supportive of the various ideas of a visitor centre or tours and things like that supporting the history of Fort Regent and things like that. But again we go back unfortunately to the nature of making sure, is the funding available?

Mr. D. Flowers:

I just thought you might like to have this, which is a plan of the Fort area in 1790 which is before most of the ramparts were built.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Thank you. So what lessons are you asking us to draw from this plan or what conclusions?

Mr. D. Flowers:

I just thought you might like to have it.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Presumably part of the master planning process would be to what extent ... we will obviously be seeing

Jersey Heritage next week, but John has put enormous stress upon the role of the master plan. To what extent, for example, can in a heritage site co-exist, either with what is there at the moment or with what might be envisaged?

Mr. J. Richardson:

That is one of the key links that has to be made that may not have been made sufficiently in the past. Whatever you look at for the use you have to pay a lot of recognition to what that site was there for originally. There has to be a very sympathetic balance between future need, use in a modern society as we are today, and that has to be contrasted against the history of that site. You have to recognise it and its balance and certainly if master planning is going to be undertaken then Heritage are going to be one of the key players in determining how we recognise the future of that site.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

There are some interesting little pieces. I do not know if you have been, have you been down to the well on your tour of the Fort?

The Connétable of St. John:

We did not go down to it but some of us know it is there.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

There are also, they used to be offices but effectively what used to be referred to as the dungeons on the site and all that stuff.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Okay. We will come to the last formal question. Graeme.

The Connétable of St. John:

Who establishes the overall direction for the Fort and how do the 2 departments work to resolve the differences of approach, i.e. Education and Treasury?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I think we have probably answered that in terms of the role of landlord and tenant, so there is a formal relationship. In terms of future development within the site, that is for Education, Sport and Culture to determine and maximise its use inside. But looking to the future, then it comes back to this much bigger piece of work that needs to be done, with everyone involved.

The Connétable of St. John:

But to go to issues like the current internal catering arrangements, you have no say in those at the moment? That is run by Education?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

That is the tenant.

The Connétable of St. John:

With a franchisee, yes.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Yes.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

So it is literally “you” rent out the space to them and what they do with it is entirely up to them?

Mr. J. Richardson:

In conjunction, they obviously talked to Property Holdings about if there is going to be a lease with a patron franchise, whatever, they will talk to them. But they operate the internal facility.

Deputy T.A. Vallois:

So if it should, with a public/private partnership, you would have a large involvement in it, in that status?

Mr. J. Richardson:

Yes.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

We have covered a lot of issues, obviously, in a fairly broad sense. So, I do not know if any members of the Panel ... Ian, if you have any final points before we move in ... we will have a little break before we move in to the next session. Any questions you want, any wrap up questions? Are there any comments that any of you wish to make?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

No, I do not think so.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

What I suggest now, we will formally end this session. Let us have a 10 minute break so you can refresh yourself. Then we will go into a short private session. Okay, thank you very much.