Message Key:	000314540C378A4A6E0F5627EC24502CA507FE23
From:	John Rogers <J.Rogers@gov.je>
To:	Bernard Place <B.Place@gov.je>
Subject:	Fwd:
Date:	Wednesday, December 12, 2018 11:18 GMT

For information

-------- Original Message --------
From: Charlie Parker <C.Parker@gov.je>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2018, 06:17
To: John Rogers <J.Rogers@gov.je>
CC: Stephen Hardwick <S.Hardwick@gov.je>
Subject: Fwd:

FYI

Cheers

Charlie

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ian Gorst <I.Gorst@gov.je<mailto:I.Gorst@gov.je>>
Date: 12 December 2018 at 05:00:22 GMT
To: Council of Ministers <councilofministers@exchange.soj<mailto:councilofministers@exchange.soj>>

Dear Colleague,

Unfortunately I'm not able to make the COM meeting today, I did however want to comment on the Hospital site paper.

Having read all of the provided paper I'm of the opinion that there is not sufficient evidence to change site. I also note from the media that the independent planning inspectors report has now been received by the planning Minister.

During the election campaign I said 'that I thought any new Health Minister would seek to have the new states re confirm the site decision'. I recognise that this is a difficult position as it is ultimately a decision for the Heath and DFI Ministers. However I personally would not seek a ratification of the current site or seek to ask the States to change site until the planning application has been determined. We may need to deal with a rejection of the site by the inspector, we have also asked him to look at sites so it would be sensible to see his opinion, before any vote by the States. The previous scrutiny panel said that the planning decision was one of the three constraining remaining issues which needed to be resolved.

If COM do decide that they would like to change site, there needs to be a clear communication about which site it now prefers and why. It might simply be that Ministers, post the election, want to change site, that is a perfectly acceptable political decision but will have some important consequences. It should not seek to be portrayed as a technical decision with sufficient evidence, which as I said, the papers provided for the agenda item, don't provide.

Which ever site Is chosen there will be detractors and that will have to be accepted. Let's remember that the staff questionnaire showed that the greatest number of staff having a preference, preferred a return to people's park, which I've not heard any Minister or politician support publicly. So if COM change site only a small percentage of staff asked will be potentially satisfied with the new site chosen.

I'm sorry not to be with you all in person, but I would ask officers to provide more information on the implications of changing the site, not least of which will be the money. I would also ask officers to provide further information about the overall budget particularly in light of the view coming from some quarters that a hospital could be built for under ?100m.

A final decision does need to be made, but I would not be able to make a decision to change site on what has been provided to Ministers and therefore I would have no choice but to vote to maintain the current site.

Best regards,

Ian

Sent from my iPhone

Message Key:	00031454510A46D04E2551BCE524A5D073E7A294
From:	John Rogers <J.Rogers@gov.je>
To:	[redacted]Robin Whitby <R.Whitby@gov.je>,Bernard Place <B.Place@gov.je>
Subject:	RE: Robin Whitby Availability
Date:	Monday, December 17, 2018 21:11 GMT

Robin,

I agree with [redacted] work a plan out between the team as required.

Best regards

john

From: [redacted]
Sent: 17 December 2018 15:56
To: Robin Whitby <R.Whitby@gov.je>; Bernard Place <B.Place@gov.je>
Cc: John Rogers <J.Rogers@gov.je>
Subject: RE: Robin Whitby Availability

Robin

In view of the state of the project [redacted] I think it would be wise for you to remain in the UK and work remotely - it's difficult to be prescriptive on what we will need.

There will no doubt be some 'preparation' for the debate that debunks the myths that are being perpetuated

Ray

Message Key:	00031454E6D5BFDCF094777FAE70BFF9E3BFC6DC
From:	John Rogers <J.Rogers@gov.je>
To:	[redacted] Bernard Place <B.Place@gov.je>, [redacted]
Subject:	RE: future hospital
Date:	Thursday, January 17, 2019 13:01 GMT
Attachments:	image001.jpg (4 KB)

Yes please [redacted]

John

From: [redacted]
Sent: 17 January 2019 10:18
To: Bernard Place <B.Place@gov.je>; [redacted]
Cc: John Rogers <J.Rogers@gov.je>
Subject: FW: future hospital

Could we work up some answers where possible?

[redacted] | Communications
Future Hospital
+44 (0) 1534 447876 | [redacted] | futurehospital.je<http://futurehospital.je/> | www.gov.je<http://www.gov.je/>

From: [redacted]
Sent: 17 January 2019 09:51
To: [redacted]
Subject: future hospital

Hi [redacted]

Following on from our chat yesterday, I was hoping to ask some questions of the Future Hospital team and what the latest situation is. I appreciate there may be some areas they can't discuss.

1. What has the response been to the Environment Minister's decision to reject the planning application?

2. Given the feedback from the first application, should the team have done more to address Mr Staddon and Steve Luce's concerns in the second application?

3. Are the team continuing to work on the project?

4. At what stage did they find out work on the project had been halted?

5. How much of the 38 million spent to date would be lost by changing site now?

6. Is there any delay to the timeline after Monday's decision? When will a new hospital be open?

7. How do the team progress from here?

8. Will a new team be formed should the site approval be rescinded?

Kind regards,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

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

Message # 4

Message Key:	000314547FD445954876FBC00DFB7CAB543D09ED
From:	John Rogers <J.Rogers@gov.je>
To:	[redacted]
Cc:	Bernard Place <B.Place@gov.je>
Subject:	RE: POG agenda
Date:	Thursday, January 24, 2019 09:45 GMT

[redacted]

We need to go through the risk log and gain some understanding of the next steps.

John

From: [redacted]
Sent: 24 January 2019 09:40
To: [redacted] John Rogers <J.Rogers@gov.je>
Cc: Bernard Place <B.Place@gov.je>
Subject: POG agenda

Hi John and [redacted]

Bernard and I have drafted an agenda for POG on Monday. Please let me have any comments.

Should I run this past Kevin before circulating?

Kind regards

[redacted]

[redacted] | Future Hospital Project

[redacted]

Third Floor |28-30 The Parade | St Helier | Jersey | JE2 3QQ

www.futurehospital.je<http://www.futurehospital.je>

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