WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE MINISTER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE
BY DEPUTY A.F. CURTIS OF ST. CLEMENT
QUESTION SUBMITTED ON MONDAY 2nd NOVEMBER 2026
ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON MONDAY 9th NOVEMBER 2026

Question

"In relation to the delay of Phase 1 of the redevelopment of Fort Regent (Phase 1), will the Minister advise –

(a) how the 2026 election period contributed to the delay, including any decisions that had to be postponed;

(b) what changes or refinements to Phase 1 have been made, including –
  (i) which body or office was responsible for initiating refinements to the scope of Phase 1;
  (ii) what cost impact, if any, the refinements have had on the budget for the redevelopment of Fort Regent, including on any project management costs incurred by the States of Jersey Development Company;
  (iii) what delays, if any, occurred when approving the refinements; and

(c) the current timeline and scope of Phase 1?"

Answer

(a) The 2026 election period and subsequent establishment of a new Council of Ministers contributed materially to a delay because the Regeneration Steering Group (RSG) could not be convened to consider programme options and emerging cost information during that period.

The RSG exists to provide policy guidance in relation to major regeneration projects, including Fort Regent. The RSG routinely meets on a quarterly basis.

The final meeting of the RSG ahead of the 2026 election period took place on 11th February 2026. At this meeting, the RSG was advised by the States of Jersey Development Company (SoJDC) of an expected delay to the overall programme unless a higher-risk decision was taken to progress planning and technical design works concurrently. The RSG expressed dissatisfaction regarding the delayed timeline and requested the presentation of the two possible timelines at the next meeting of the RSG for its consideration.

Per the established pre-election rules, from the 20th April 2026, the Council of Ministers were restricted in their ability to initiate actions of a continuing or long term character upon which a new Council of Ministers or Minister could be expected to take a different view (States Assembly | R.32/2026). As a result, the RSG was unable to meet and consider the requested timeline options and therefore was unable to issue a policy direction on changes to the programme until after the elections had been concluded and a new RSG formed.

In the intervening period, Officers were advised by SoJDC at the end of June 2026 (the period between the election and the formation of a new Council of Ministers) that estimated costs had increased to the extent that it would have a material bearing on any future decision of the RSG. Whilst it is understood that the initial £110M cost associated with the programme was identified two years ago, and prior to full feasibility and design works concluding, cost increases arising as a natural progression of the programme, for example inflationary pressures, design changes and

safety requirements were compounded by risks unforeseen ahead of the pre-election period such as the impact of the conflict in the Middle East.

Taking into account the magnitude of the cost variance and the range of potential solutions, officers concluded that works on the current programme should be paused until a decision could be made once a new RSG was in place. This action was considered important to ensure that no additional programme costs were incurred that may be later considered abortive by the new Council of Ministers.

Upon the formation of the new Council of Ministers in July 2026, the immediate priority for the Council of Ministers was to begin the development of the Common Strategic Policy and draft Budget, for presentation to the States Assembly. For this reason, the earliest opportunity to convene the newly established RSG was the 17th September 2026.

It is important to be clear that since its first meeting, the RSG has placed a strong focus on resolving plans for the Fort and will be meeting monthly to ensure progress is sustained. At its meeting of the 17th September, in light of increased costs, it was decided that wider options should be evaluated to ensure the redevelopment represents best value for money through an economic analysis.

It was simultaneously recognised that essential core refurbishment activity must continue, including the refurbishment to the roof, internal works to remove asbestos, and, the modernisation of core utilities infrastructure, working within the funding allocation already made in the Budget.

These works - whilst largely representing those originally intended for the first phase of the original two-phase programme – are being rescoped to ensure that they are proportionate and do not compromise the subsequent phase of activity that will still be necessary to bring the building back into full use.

A draft revised scope of work for Phase 1 has already been presented to the RSG at its second meeting on 28th October 2026, and the intention is to progress this towards the opening of an Expression of Interest and then a full tender process, to begin at the earliest opportunity.

As was always the intention, plans for the subsequent phase of works that will define the future use of the Fort will be subject to a full business case and Assembly approval in the next draft Budget.

(b) (i) The body responsible for directing refinements to the scope of Phase 1 is the RSG.

(ii) Changes to the total cost of Phase 1 works are not expected, as the scope was instructed to remain within established funding limits. At the time of answering, SoJDC's revised estimate of project management costs associated with the refined scope has not yet been finalised, whilst not expected to be substantial given a significant proportion of work and planning had already been undertaken to support the original Phase 1 scope.

(iii) As described in the answer to part (a), the new RSG has mobilised refinements to Phase 1 scoping at its earliest opportunity to do so and is committed to closely oversee the progression of the programme moving forwards. There are currently no delays since the altered direction was established.

(c) The revised timeline remains subject to formally agreeing the revised scope of work together with the final procurement programme to mobilise delivery. The Assembly will be aware that existing funding has already been reprofiled in the draft Budget 2027 to reflect the delay that has already occurred. Whilst substantial variance is not expected at this time, the RSG will be prepared to present an Amendment should any variance in profiling become necessary.