

Response to a Question Pursuant to Rule 14 of The Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees

Subject: Fort Richmond Conveyance

States' Member: Deputy A W Taylor

Date received: 21st October 2024

Date of reply: 20th November 2024

Questions

In a media release dated 26th July 2024, titled *Response to Guernsey Press request for comment on Fort Richmond*, the Policy and Resources Committee stated:

"...the States considered, on the basis of **formal assurances (emphasis added)**, that the adjoining landowners would be willing and capable of agreeing any boundary exchanges to suit their specific requirements following completion of the sale".

In response to a Rule 14 question dated 11th October 2024, the Policy and Resources Committee stated:

"It was not intended, through the media release of 26th July, to infer that the Allez family had supplied formal assurances to the States of Guernsey. **No such assurances had been received (emphasis added)**."

Having considered the above information, I request answers to the following:

- 1. Were formal assurances provided by the purchaser of Fort Richmond?
- 2. If yes, when were they provided?
- 3. Were the assurances considered by the relevant political committee prior to the conveyance of Fort Richmond?
- 4. If the assurances were considered by the relevant political committee, was the officer recommendation to accept the assurances?

(irrespective of whether any assurances were given/received)

- 5. Did the relevant political committee ever resolve to proceed with the conveyance of Fort Richmond using the 1922 map/boundaries?
- 6. If yes, was this decision based on an officer recommendation?

Response

- 1. Yes
- 2. Formal assurances were provided on 3rd June 2019, prior to the conveyance.
- 3-6. At the time of the conveyance, political responsibility for property and real estate owned or leased sat with the States' Trading Supervisory Board. The Committee is therefore unable to comment on the approach adopted at the time.