


Message # 1

Message Key: 0003144F2A5A9F5DA09F4F05E29198A9DF53AB06 

From: Christopher Taylor <C.Taylor@gov.je>
To: [REDACTED]
Addressed To: r.huelin4@gov.je [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Plérin
Date: Monday, October 22, 2018 08:48 BST

Dea [REDACTED]

Thank you for all you are doing, most grateful.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] He has told me a number of stories about problems building on the same site, and this one is 69 acres!

Your offer to visit Plérin Hospital is extremely useful and I will definitely be taking up you generous offer. I believe Rowland has all the contacts and I am seeing later this morning.

[REDACTED]

Yours sincerely,
Chris

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 October 2018 15:01
To: Christopher Taylor <C.Taylor@gov.je>
Subject: Plérin

Dear Chris,

I am writing this to you privately in order to unravel what was, and could be, a good idea.

I am sure that you are aware that we, as a group, have been looking at the background to and construction of a new 300 bed hospital in Plérin, just west of St Brieuc. It has been in operation for 2 years now and was delivered in 36 months, from conception to the key in the door, at a cost of €49 million, or about a tenth of the projected cost of our new hospital.

[REDACTED] to get in touch with Rowland to offer to take you and one or two others on a day visit to the Plérin Hospital, flying in and out of St Brieuc in [REDACTED]. We have written to a friend of [REDACTED] in St Brieuc giving him the necessary background questions to answer and the plan would be to discuss the project planning with the architect and then go on to visit the hospital.

The problem is that Rowland has come back to [REDACTED] today to say that a visit is being organised through the French government for the whole of your Board. Of course that is fine, but the time this will take to organise is, in my view, unhelpful to you, as your report is due in on 31st October and then to go to the CM on or about 17th November. I also doubt that it would occur to the French authorities to involve the architect, which would mean that you would miss half the story.

The reason why I am not suggesting taking the whole Board is that [REDACTED] plane can only seat 5 people and it is essential for liaison reasons that one of them is [REDACTED], as it was his discovery in the first place and he has the local contacts. Therefore, if you are happy to take up my suggestion, please would you consider just yourself and Ms Alves going? (My reasoning is that she is clearly supportive of you and is a member of Sam Mezec's 'party', thus potentially getting their support on board in the forthcoming, PST report, States debate - whenever that happens.)

Yours,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] You may wish to comment on the arbitrary changes to the original plan, like no hydro pool in the new Westaway House physio Department, or nurses accommodation, as well as this LINAC machine, as examples of gratuitous and damaging decisions taken apparently without regard to patient care, let alone reducing out year costs, as yet more evidence of compromises made due to the size of the Gloucester Street site.

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad<<https://overview.mail.yahoo.com/?src=iOS>>

----- End Of Message -----

Message # 2

Message Key: 00031453CD79477A720CCEB3E694E7B9495C0FD9



From: Christopher Taylor <C.Taylor@gov.je>

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Addressed To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: The Hospital

Date: Friday, November 02, 2018 19:31 GMT

Evening [REDACTED]

Please note I have excluded Rowland from this reply.

[REDACTED] has most kindly arranged a visit to France to look at the Hospital in St Breuc with some of my Panel. (which is why Rowland is omitted from this reply)

The current design is for 100% single occupancy wards but we have concerns about their design.

Sorry I can't say much more at this stage.

My first Draft of the report is finished and has gone to the Chief Minister. I hope to have the final draft by Wednesday next week once it has had factual checking, and will go to the Council on Ministers on Wednesday 14th and be published soon after.

Yours sincerely,

Chris

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 02 November 2018 13:11

To: [REDACTED] Christopher Taylor <C.Taylor@gov.je>

Cc: Rowland Huelin <rowland@[REDACTED]> [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: The Hospital

Dear Chris,

I refer to [REDACTED] note to you and your colleagues.

In the particular, I would query whether Warwick Farm has been let to a farmer. My understanding is that it is let to three ex firemen or their company for the production of hemp and manufacture of hemp products, hence the current planning application for change of use of the agricultural sheds to industrial use.

This, like the reason it was removed as a site for the Future Hospital would if correct appear to be contrary to the provisions of the Island Development Plan by reason of being situated in the green zone.

As to the general, the Future Hospital project seems to have been bogged down by having been approached from the narrow perspective of English hospitals and N.H.S. practices, which from the media reports are far from aspirational. The very reference to continuing the practice of wards rather than single occupancy rooms for patients which is recognised by the French/American approach to hospitals as aiding recovery and healing is symptomatic of this out dated approach to hospital design and construction; as is the location of the hospital in a congested location rather than in a natural landscape and environment providing light and space for the recuperation of patients and well being of staff.

Unfortunately to achieve a hospital fit for the future rather than one based on outdated designs and concepts it requires a completely fresh approach which can only be provided by one of the architectural/engineering construction teams experienced in wider European hospital projects with their broader concepts and who also seem to have a quicker and more cost effective approach to hospital construction. It also requires to focus on the prime consideration of the well being of patients and staff rather than on the mundane matters of services and distance from town which can be easily overcome.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

----- Original Message -----

From: [REDACTED]

To: "Christopher Taylor" <c.taylor@gov.je>

Cc: "Rowland Huelin" <[REDACTED]>

[REDACTED]

Sent: 02/11/2018 11:26:06

Subject: The Hospital

>Dear Chris,

>

>I was reviewing another document when i came across the attached
>document, which might help you when it comes to the debate in the
>States following the publication of your report. The title of the
>document could easily be changed into 'Briefing Notes on the Hospital
>Development Saga'.

>

>Yours,

>

[REDACTED]

>

----- End Of Message -----

Message # 3

Message Key: 0003145359A36A4D823ECACAC647D29E97160AF0



From: Christopher Taylor <C.Taylor@gov.je>

To: [REDACTED]

Addressed To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: SENT TO THE PEOPLE WE MET IN FRANCE

Date: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 07:55 GMT

Dear [REDACTED],

A very nice note and thank you for sending it. This was without doubt a most worthwhile visit.

My report is finished and I will be reporting to the Council of Ministers tomorrow, and the report will be made public on Thursday.

All the very best,
Chris

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 12 November 2018 09:53

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: Christopher Taylor <C.Taylor@gov.je>; DEPUTY ALVES (c.alves@[REDACTED]) <c.alves@[REDACTED]>; DEPUTY POINTON

[REDACTED]

Subject: SENT TO THE PEOPLE WE MET IN FRANCE

Dear Sirs


I write on behalf of the delegation from Jersey who visited you last Thursday in Plerin, to say thank you very much. The purpose of our visit was to see, to hear, and to understand. Because of your professionalism, we were able to achieve each of those objectives. Some English, some French, and much français was spoken, but we did understand everything we were told verbally and also with the help of the excellent presentation and the superb file you put together for us. We were very impressed with the Hospital Prive at Plerin. We will be sharing the information we obtained with several people, including States members in order to convince them that they need make contact with your company in relation to the building of our new General Hospital. I hope and trust that before long, that will happen.

Personally, if there is anything I can do to help any of you at any time, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

End Of Message

Message # 4

Message Key: 0003145323C28FFE709F91F44AD6F03A044BFB66 

From: Christopher Taylor <C.Taylor@gov.je>

To: [Redacted]

Cc: John Le_Fondre [Redacted], [Redacted]

Addressed To: r.huelin4@gov.je, [Redacted]

Subject: RE: Jersey's Future Hospital Article 25

Date: Wednesday, November 21, 2018 15:06 GMT

Dear [Redacted] et al,

I am most grateful to all of you for your support and valuable help. It really is most appreciated. However the most important issue is that one site is agreed and then everyone supports that site in a united way.

[Redacted]

Briefly, and these are my personal views;

People's Park	Non-starter for the following reasons;	The site is only just big enough for current needs and so would not be future proofed
Warwick Farm	Not advisable	The site again is only just big enough for current needs, future proofing would be difficult
St Saviour	Not Advisable	Access for the public and particularly staff would be difficult
Waterfront	Possible	Access is poor for Blue light, public and staff Most of the current facilities and housing needs replacing Restrictions due to listed building and surrounding area Top performing site according to both Atkins and Gleed Would need flood prevention High value site Future needs would need to expand either on to Jardin
de la Mare or Cine/pool site		
Overdale	Good	Largest site 60,000sqm plus

[Redacted]

Article 35

Already an active Health site.

I stress these are my personal views and I am happy to meet you all and to have a round the table discussion.

Yours sincerely,
Chris

From: [Redacted]

Sent: 20 November 2018 09:49

To: [Redacted]

Cc: Christopher Taylor <C.Taylor@gov.je>; John Le_Fondre [Redacted]

Subject: Re: Jersey's Future Hospital

Dea [Redacted]

[REDACTED]

I wholly support the view that the aim should be to provide a new hospital for much less than the estimated 466 million for the Gloucester St. development I think we need an expert appraisal of the different sites by an established hospital construction group such as AIA before dismissing any from consideration. All the sites will have some expense attached to provide access or services which will be reflected in the total development cost. We know that it is unlikely that one will be able to replicate the figure for building the hospital at Plerin but it should be possible to build one for a figure of much less than 466million which will avoid the Island having to borrow 275million.

That and having a hospital with all facilities on one site in a location conducive to recuperation and healing with parking for patients, staff and visitors in an open environment should be the aim. I believe Overdale would provide the opportunity to achieve that and hope that an appraisal will confirm it.

Regards,

[REDACTED]
Sent from my iPad

On 19 Nov 2018, at 20:31, [REDACTED]

Dear Chris,

[REDACTED]. We just wanted to make sure that you were alerted about a JEP article about Plerin before it actually came out.,

Thank you for producing a really good report pointing out other, better sites than Gloucester Street, namely that the Waterfront and Overdale and I hope that it is taken seriously by States Members, as a lot of time and money has been spent in the last 6 years to get where we are today with no real understanding of where the optimum site is to be able to deliver Jersey's Future Hospital. That said, our group feels strongly that St Saviour's Hospital and Warwick Farm also need to be considered in the same way and at the same time so that a fair comparison of price and construction time can be made. Every site has advantages and disadvantages, but weighing these up in a fair way is the only way to make the best decision for Jersey.

I understand that a delegation consisting of yourself, the Chief Minister, the Health Minister, Charlie Parker, and [REDACTED], the Deputy of St Lawrence, Gregory Guida, might be paying a visit to the Hospital Prive in Plerin in the near future. That is very good news. We believe that you may also be considering asking A.I.A. the company who built the Hospital in Plerin to carry out a feasibility study on several alternative sites in Jersey. By including the four sites mentioned, you will have four different prices together with four different build times.

We acknowledge that Overdale is large enough for a complete Hospital, but so are St Saviours Hospital and Warwick Farm. We also acknowledge that the Waterfront, although mentioned in your report, is unlikely to be chosen as not only is the site very valuable, but also getting on site to build a hospital is entirely dependent on the promised 550 space underground car park being built in order to vacate the temporary car park at present supporting Jersey's new finance centre and, as you point out in your report, Jersey needs a new hospital now, not in 10 to 15 years.

To an extent, in our view, the same applies to Overdale, as there are facilities there, specifically the rehabilitation centre, which would require re-locating in order to build the new hospital. In addition clearing the site and getting planning permission to do so and then build a hospital is going to take a lot of time, as the key to the Overdale site is a new approach road through the King George V housing estate. It is very good news that it is owned by Andium Homes and again there will be a delay in demolishing the existing buildings, re-housing the occupants and getting planning permission to build the new access road. In addition, as pointed out in the Atkins report, there are likely to be protests over the removal of trees on the west of the site that are apparently very special and whose removal will inevitably speak protests from environmentalists. Nothing is simple!

I know that you were pleased to visit the Plerin hospital and to talk to the build consortium, AIA. The cost of this project, from start to finish was 101 million and the time to complete the project from first thought to completion was 48 months. The key to this was the experience of AIA and the fact that they were developing a green field site. If you take that as a model, then building on Warwick Farm or St Saviour's could take a similar time, could start very quickly by comparison with the Waterfront and Overdale and cost about 200 million, at worst. Furthermore, at that sort of price, Jersey would not have to borrow the huge amount of money that is currently planned. The calculation of the cost of the proposed bond over 47 years when added to the estimated cost of Gloucester Street brings the project total to 1.2 billion over that period, meaning that our great, great grandchildren will still be paying for it.

Politically there is a reluctance to build 'outside town' that we simply cannot understand. Guernsey's Queen Elizabeth hospital is outside St Peter Port and works perfectly well. We live on a small island and any money we can save on this project has to be to the benefit of all. If 35% of people are concerned to have the hospital in town, then 65% are happy not to. Therefore, please include them within your shortlist.

I think we can all agree that in ten years' time St Saviours Hospital will not look like it does today. If it is used for a village, as Andrew Green intimated it could be, then the only people to benefit from it will be the families who live there. On the other hand, if it was used for our new Hospital, the whole population would benefit from it. The priority has to be to produce a new hospital in the shortest time and at the best price. Handing over Warwick Farm and St Saviour's for public housing may seem to be a good idea, but surely not if it is going to cost Jersey many millions more to put the new hospital at Overdale and take a lot more time than building on either St Saviour or Warwick Farm..

I hope that your proposed visit to Plerin, together with John Le Fondre and a mollified Richard Renouf goes well. If you follow the Plerin model there is a very good chance that Jersey's new hospital will be well under way by the next election, which would be a huge achievement by you and


your fellow States members. As for the offer by AIA to produce site appraisals at cost on the shortlisted sites, at a total cost, including reports, models and their travel and subsistence costs while here of under 490K is a bargain and, if publicised, would show the people of our island that you are actually making more progress in 6 weeks that has been made in the last 6 years.

Yours,

[REDACTED]

----- End Of Message -----

Message # 5

Message Key:	0003145461C0B2DF7A18B4E3D36F3A863BC709CE	
From:	Christopher Taylor <C.Taylor@gov.je>	
To:	[REDACTED]	
Cc:	[REDACTED]	
Addressed To:	[REDACTED]	
Subject:	RE: Overdale	
Date:	Monday, February 11, 2019 08:21 GMT	
Attachments:	image001.png (532.5 KB), image002.png (702.4 KB), image003.png (480.5 KB), image004.png (127.1 KB), image005.png (997.9 KB), image006.jpg (475 B)	

Dear [REDACTED],

Thank you for your input below, a well proven course I believe.

This is why I am supporting Deputy Morel's Amendment to be open, transparent and to fully consult all interested parties. I shall also be opposing the Constable of St Helier's Amendment to remove people's Park and all of Westmount because it is nimbyism, but we need to remove any site from the list by using evidence, not a political process.

I would like to add, I really am most grateful to the very many members of the public, but especially to your group, who have supported me and spent so much time on research.

Many thanks,
Chris

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 February 2019 17:58
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Christopher Taylor <C.Taylor@gov.je>; [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Overdale

Dear [REDACTED],

No problem at all. If i can add one point which could assist Constable Taylor. An extraordinary situation has developed. The States politicians and both review boards are reliant in fact on lay people in providing this information rather than professional people. This simply due to the (political) divide over the development of the GS site. This is of course very wrong and obstructive to the process. When they should be firmly advised by our appointed professional design Team, the Hospital design team.

And this information could easily be missed if not raised. So there's a disconnect and a slower process, review boards opposing each other, politicians opposing each other and the Assembly, which leads as we have seen to a more extended process and conflicting information. Perhaps one element of the Design team (perhaps 1-2 persons) should be appointed to be impartial and to assist the 2 panels in processing information. This would seem more democratic.

We now appear, hopefully, to be going back to the drawing board so to speak on site selection, the process should be as follows if we can 'win the Assembly' over this week:

- States Assembly conclude to review further sites (with GS included or not, probably not would be my thoughts as it has been exhausted)

- A public workshop for the general public to be guided by the Design Council Cabe in consideration of the remaining available 4 or so sites*
- The French Developer to carry out their feasibility study
- Conclusion by the 2 review Panels to then instruct the HP team
- A public workshop for the general public to be guided by the Design Council Cabe in consideration of the chosen site and how the building will be designed*
- Forwarding of this information to the HP team
- Preparation of a full design for the Hospital
- Final Workshop 3 for the general public to input to full design of the Hospital*
- Submission of a planning application

*the 3 workshops are standard practice for Public workshop for such a size of Project. Design Council Cabe in fact carried out the same 3 workshops for concluding and developing the design for the Hugely successful Liverpool children's hospital at Alderhey, this was confirmed by Charles Campion one of the Cabe's main workshop facilitators for the recent Waterfront Masterplan workshops.

I include Charles Campion's contact details below if Constable Taylor wishes to speak direct about the Public workshops

<https://twitter.com/charliecampion>

Hope of use.

■

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 February 2019 12:58
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Christopher Taylor; [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Overdale

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for this input. Great work and much appreciated.

Yours,

■

On 10 Feb 2019, at 11:50, [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Chris,

There are a number of recent UK examples of new build hospitals on clear sites that have taken 2 - 3 years. One example is the Northumberland project which took 2 years (scroll down the first link). It is for 210 beds at a 95M build. I'm forgetting Jersey's bed Number requirement but does this equate?

<https://www.northumbria.nhs.uk/contractor-appointed-new-specialist-emergency-care-hospital/>

<https://www.chroniclive.co.uk/news/health/look-cramlington-new-95million-hospital-9311848>

The French Hospital developer confirms similarly. Allow an additional 18 months preparations getting permits at the outside 5 years. Just thought I'd mention.

[REDACTED]

From: Christopher Taylor [mailto:C.Taylor@gov.je]

Sent: 10 February 2019 09:04

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Overdale

Morning [REDACTED]

Pamplin's report was ambiguous, it will take 10 years from NOW to build a Hospital, not as the JEP reported 10 years from 2028!

Because the current site will need significant redesign before it will pass Planning, the unsubstantiated evidence I have seen suggests regardless whether we build on the present site or somewhere else it will take the same time. However there are so many variables in this, it can only be taken as indicative.

All the best,

Chris

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 09 February 2019 13:38

To: Christopher Taylor <C.Taylor@gov.je<mailto:C.Taylor@gov.je>>

Cc: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Overdale

Dear Chris,

An email to reconfirm re the below. No offence meant to your Board's excellent work! I'm just thinking we should be considering what will happen with the vacated GS site in proposing Overdale, or it may become a second long winded Exercise/Planning enquiry/ as to new use. And supports the Overdale site.

There seems to be confusion with Deputy Pamplin's Report media issue ie a question over disembarking the GS site due to extended length of time to complete on a second site. This is ill informed but not sure Deputy Pamplin means this? (it could just be a media error). It also overlooks, as previous, the extensive amount of work carried out on the Overdale site which serves to shorten duration of preparing revised design? I'll cc to the group.

Good luck with next week's debate.

Kind regards>

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 30 January 2019 17:16

To: 'Christopher Taylor'

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Overdale

Second email

Dear Chris,

I think we need to be intelligent at this stage in proposing Overdale. There is a second important ingredient in making this proposal. What to do with

the existing Gloucester street site.

It is surely an opportunity to create relating industry for future Jersey, and perhaps accommodation for Nurses/medical staff which is currently under provided, and what's provided is very poor quality ie it's Putting off medical staff moving to the island.

Some ideas for future industries on the GS site – medical training facility; medical tourism; accommodation as above; there has been some discussion as to the production of medical components needed For the new Hospital eg. Equipment, medical and operating implements

The historic hospital element could potentially be an community facility eg Arts facility. Or hotel to support the above. These are in some ways random thoughts however it confirms a '2 prong' approach to proposing Overdale ie this frees up the GS site for vital future industry/in part supporting the new Hospital which gives further much needed industry/facility for the Island's future. So something to consider now for the debate on 12th February.

Again hope of use.

With regards>

■

■

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 January 2019 17:05
To: 'Christopher Taylor'
Subject: FW: Overdale

Dear Chris,

Re costs for preparing the Overdale design.

Please see the below information of designs that have been prepared for the Overdale site in fact by Hassell architects, the current Architects. This appears to be quite a developed design, It would be useful for Hassells to provide all the drawings prepared so it can be gauged what extent of drawn information has been prepared in consideration of a planning application submission.

The whole mood at the moment is one of 'how can we waste 38m on the GS site works carried out'. The above could give you a good argument in proposing the Overdale site at the forthcoming 12th Feb States sitting.

Hope of use.

■

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 January 2019 17:01
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Overdale

■

Yes the below link i've given for the design at Overdale is stated as '100% single site Option' for the design provided by Hassells. So a lot of work has been done. I'll copy this to Chris Taylor too.

■

[cid:image001.png@01D4C1E1.BB59BD90]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 30 January 2019 16:59

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Overdale

**i've copied the others in as useful info and in relation to your aforementioned States debate on 12th February

■

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 30 January 2019 16:58

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Overdale

Curious,

you will have seen in my last email to Chris Taylor reference to the previous drawings and extensive survey work that would have been carried out in 2013 under Rob Duhamel's Planning minister-ship.

If you google new hospital at Overdale and click 'Images' in your top bar you'll see some of the work carried out. It is a full design including landscaping for a low lying building. This as mentioned was a '2-site' design with Gloucester street. However as now a 1-site option the design could be adapted.

I am uncertain if it's the same Project architect/design team as current, frankly it's such a well thought through design (visually in appearance) i doubt it very much! It would give opportunity to ditch the current team in favour of the previous. I'll see if i can find a name.

I know [REDACTED] has the full set of plans to hand so perhaps opportunity to invite [REDACTED] to one of our meetings? It would be even better if the JEP would publish some.

Regarding the development of a design & planning permits, the above would ensure a quicker way thought with a lot of work previously carried out. And build time as before estimated at 2 - 3 years. Again a no brainer.

■

EG

[cid:image002.png@01D4C1E1.BB59BD90][cid:image003.png@01D4C1E1.BB59BD90][cid:image004.png@01D4C1E1.BB59BD90]Try and read the titles to each area of the Hospital

**have a flick through the 4 site options given in this link, Hassell architects drew up a design for Overdale (option 4 & 5 i think) It looks like this is a full design as well ie not a 2 site design. I'm not sure the above images relate to this design

<https://jerseyeveningpost.com/news/2016/02/03/gallery-the-four-options-for-jerseys-new-hospital/>

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 30 January 2019 15:25

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Overdale

Dear [REDACTED]

We met there at 0900 hours. There were about 8 people there, some of whom I knew, others were part of [REDACTED] group, plus Rowland. We walked around the site for an hour, ending up looking at the Rondel field where Chris Taylor thinks that a shared equity scheme for nurses and doctors could be built.

The Overdale site is big, but not that much bigger than GS due to its topography. The ground slopes away to the SW and is dominated by the re-entrant above the KG V estate about which there has been a bot of controversy this week. Without a new road coming up onto the high ground I would say that the site is a non-starter. However, Chris Taylor's idea is for a 2 carriageway road, rather than a four, which, if passed, will make the management of the site more difficult than necessary.

Chris Taylor confirmed to me at the end of the meeting that John Rogers and the project team are preparing a third planning application for GS, which makes the debate on 12th February critical and the only way GS will be squashed once and for all. He also confirmed that there is no design brief for the new hospital, something I find to be more than bizarre and should have been drafted in 2011. He is clearly ambivalent over the CM's assurance that all three asigtes would be reviewed again.

In summary, Overdale is fine, but it will be expensive to prepare and take a long time to build a new hospital on; I would guess about 10 years.

Yours,

[REDACTED]

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad<<https://overview.mail.yahoo.com/?src=iOS>>

On Wednesday, January 30, 2019, 3:02 pm, [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Chris,

Apologies for not making it yesterday i was unable to make it ultimately. I'd be interested with the group's feedback to the visit as poss.

KR>

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 January 2019 18:40
To: 'Christopher Taylor'
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Overdale

Dear Chris,

A great CTV media piece this evening, certainly sews the seed for the Overdale site and the Infrastructure Minister was in many ways quite positive too to the site. I am assuming you have access to the substantial area of work carried out with the former Planning minister Rob Duhamel in 2013. I have seen some of the plans, albeit a design for a '2 site' hospital with Gloucester street there was a significant amount of work carried out to the overall design which was a low level design so not challenging on the skyline which has been the concerns. The following you could use perhaps as argument for the amount of work carried out to date to the COM (council of ministers) to persuade it is worth pursuing:

- Site survey completed; including access, roadways
- Landscaping to site
- Registering extent of existing landscaping, trees, tree formation (in terms of current state of the art Hospital design being surrounded by landscaping and woodland is a substantial

Benefit to overall health and wellbeing termed biophilic architecture i am sure you may have read about it or read some of Engineer [REDACTED] emails)

- Design completed for the 2-site hospital some of which could be reused
- New JEC substation at bottom of hill

Overall it is one of several favoured sites. Having myself visited a friend at Overdale 18 months ago what is striking when getting out of your car is the air, you breathe in a lung full of sea air though is protected by the tree belt to the perimeter to most of the site. This has strong appeal for a health building, as above. It is an interesting point raised during the debate that St Saviour's Hospital would have been built in the heart of the

countryside for similar therapeutic reason.

A footnote – i don't know if you've seen the Alderhey hospital in Liverpool. Link as below Design council Cabe (for the Waterfront workshops) who facilitate public workshops for building projects) confirmed they were instrumental with the project in developing over 3 main workshops with the public. In fact the concept of a hospital in the park was instigated by the public and local community at the workshops as what they wanted. Perhaps we should now have Cabe carry out a public workshop on the Overdale site for the hospital which could go some way to reinstilling some faith in the project and the political system.

The contact at Design Council Cabe [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] confirmed the above detail and that they could certainly assist with a public workshop

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alder_Hey_Children%27s_Hospital

[cid:image005.png@01D4C1E1.BB59BD90]

Hope assists.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[Redacted]

From: Christopher Taylor [mailto:C.Taylor@gov.je]

Sent: 24 January 2019 12:59

To: [Redacted]

Cc: [Redacted]

[Redacted]

Subject: RE: Overdale

Morning [Redacted]

I looked this morning and you are right. I think the earlier the better. Can I therefore suggest we all meet at 9am Saturday in the car park at Overdale.

All the best,

Chris

From: [Redacted]

Sent: 24 January 2019 11:27

To: Christopher Taylor <C.Taylor@gov.je<mailto:C.Taylor@gov.je>>

Cc: [Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Subject: Re: Overdale

Hi Chris

I've just checked the forecast and it looks like the odds are better for the morning this Saturday as the strong winds and rain are forecast for later in the day.

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/weather/3042091>

Let's get this show on the road!

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

This email and any attached file are confidential and are solely for the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. If you have received this email in error, you must inform the person who sent it immediately and discard it from your system; it is absolutely prohibited to make use of the information in it or to inform others thereof.

On Tue, 22 Jan 2019 at 13:48, Christopher Taylor <C.Taylor@gov.je<mailto:C.Taylor@gov.je>> wrote:

Dear All,

Forgive me for not responding recently but I have been taking a much needed break.

It is indeed excellent news that the current Hospital site has been rejected again. I am very grateful for all you have done. However the Future Hospital team believe they are 95% there and are naturally pushing very hard to put in a third Planning Application. However it is clear the Hospital Staff, States Members and the Public are all not in favour of the Gloucester Street site.

For any site to be successful it must have a substantial majority of support or we will go round in circles. Just to quote John Rogers "I was talking to a group of 5 or 6 who were all anti the current site when one said "it should be St Saviour" then another said "No Warwick Farm" and another said in the end I walked away leaving them squabbling amongst themselves!"

I hope you will agree that it is most important to get united support for one site. To this end I would like to invite you to join me on a tour of the Overdale site and would suggest this Saturday if the weather is fine.

Yours sincerely,

Chris

Care : If you have received this email and it was not intended for you, please reply to the sender, and then delete it. Please treat our information in confidence. This communication may contain legal advice which is confidential and/or privileged. It should not be forwarded or copied to anyone else without the prior permission of the sender.

Contract : This email does not form any binding agreement unless it is supported by an official States of Jersey purchase order form.

Content : All States information systems may be monitored to ensure that they are operating correctly. Furthermore, the content of emails and other data on these systems may be examined, in exceptional circumstances, for the purpose of investigating or detecting any unauthorised use. This email has been scanned for viruses by the States of Jersey email gateway.

Confidentiality and Privacy : The confidentiality of this e-mail and your reply cannot be guaranteed. As a public authority, the States of Jersey is subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011. Under this Law we may be required to disclose information we hold, including the contents of this email and any response to it, unless the information is protected from disclosure by an exemption under the Law or any other enactment, including the Data Protection (Jersey) Law 2018. We collect and process personal information about you under the Data Protection (Jersey) Law 2018. For more information on how we use your data please go to our privacy statement pages on www.gov.je<<http://www.gov.je>>.

[Image removed by sender.]<http://www.avg.com/email-signature?utm_medium=email&utm_source=link&utm_campaign=sig-email&utm_content=emailclient>

Virus-free. www.avg.com<http://www.avg.com/email-signature?utm_medium=email&utm_source=link&utm_campaign=sig-email&utm_content=emailclient>

----- End Of Message -----