

THE STATES OF DELIBERATION
of the
ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

THE STATES' TRADING SUPERVISORY BOARD

CASTLE CORNET BRIDGE RENOVATION

The States are asked to decide: -

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled 'Castle Cornet Bridge Renovation' of the States' Trading Supervisory Board, they are of the opinion:-

1. To note that Option 6, as described in Table 4, Section 4.6 of the Policy Letter, provides the lowest costed risk solution for renovation by way of replacing the existing Castle Cornet Bridge with a like-for-like structure with some design enhancements and to agree that it is the preferred option.
2. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee, subject to its approval of the Full Business Case, to increase the existing capital vote for the replacement of the Castle Cornet Bridge, funded from the Capital Reserve to a maximum of £7 million to fund the like-for-like replacement of that structure with some design enhancements, in accordance with Option 6, including the professional fees and contingencies.

THE STATES OF DELIBERATION
of the
ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

STATES' TRADING SUPERVISORY BOARD

CASTLE CORNET BRIDGE RENOVATION

The Presiding Officer
States of Guernsey
Royal Court House
St Peter Port

21st November 2023

Dear Sir

1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The renovation of Castle Cornet Bridge (“CCB”) was included in the June 2022 Government Work Plan (“GWP”) Update as an essential infrastructure project and approved as a “Must Do” scheme. The States’ Trading Supervisory Board (“STSB”) agreed to oversee the project, accepting that the bridge forms part of Guernsey Ports’ overall estate.
- 1.2 There is an essential requirement for the bridge to provide access to Castle Cornet, and the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture (“CfESC”) which is responsible for the castle, is considered the primary stakeholder.
- 1.3 The bridge links the head of the Havelet Wall to the Castle Breakwater with a side span to the entrance of Castle Cornet, known as the approach bridge. It provides the only pedestrian and vehicular access to the breakwater and castle, and route for utility ducts.
- 1.4 The current CCB was built in the 1950s and is now at the end of its life. The underside of the reinforced concrete deck has been corroding and compromised for some time, but it has been possible to extend the safe use with monitoring and strict restrictions on access. The monitoring cannot stop corrosion and, if this condition is not addressed, the bridge will need to be closed due to risk of collapse. It is impossible to give a definitive timescale for this, but monitoring has already resulted in vehicular access restrictions over time.
- 1.5 The STSB recommends that the bridge is replaced with a like-for-like structure with some design enhancements which meet modern health and safety

standards, improve accessibility, and are likely to meet planning policies. With the declining condition of the bridge, to undertake the project as efficiently as possible it is recommended the Policy & Resources Committee (“P&RC”) is given delegated authority to make an investment decision within the financial envelope of £7.0m in line with the Finance and Investment Plan supported by a Full Business Case.

- 1.6 The deterioration of the bridge has been known about for some years; however detailed surveys and monitoring over an extended period have been necessary to identify the most appropriate solution. The condition is now of such concern that, having identified the optimum solution, there is considerable urgency to complete this project. Following the recommendations of the latest annual inspection, the bridge was closed to all vehicles at the end of October 2023.
- 1.7 Based on the detailed cost estimates compiled by the project’s technical advisers, including allowances for costed risk and optimism bias, the preferred option represents the least cost solution. At this pre-tender stage, these estimates are considered to be reasonable, but the final costs will be influenced to a large extent by the construction method that is eventually adopted. The project team has adopted a realistic but conservative approach in this respect, and there is scope for some innovation on the part of a contractor.
- 1.8 Once funding for the project is secured, it is anticipated that the procurement process will commence at the end of 2024, with construction starting the latter half of 2025. Construction is expected to take twelve months with temporary pedestrian access to Castle Cornet maintained.

2 Introduction

- 2.1 The CCB forms part of the setting of the Castle Cornet, which is a Protected Monument, and is within the St Peter Port Conservation Area. The CCB comprises a nine span, reinforced concrete deck, built in around 1951, on granite supports that are thought to date from when the bridge was first constructed in the 1800s - originally with an iron and timber deck. It links the Castle Emplacement area of the harbour to the breakwater. The single span approach bridge linking it to the castle is also reinforced concrete and was constructed around 1964.
- 2.2 Access to Castle Cornet is vital to sustain its economic model, its use as a public resource and for ongoing maintenance work, which may include capital projects.
 - Castle Cornet is Guernsey’s most popular visitor attraction for which admission is charged. It also has a role as a venue for community and civil events and provides tenanted accommodation.
 - Castle Cornet net revenue was £224k in 2022.
 - Castle Cornet is also a popular attraction for visiting cruise ship passengers.

- 2.3 The CCB also provides access to the Castle Breakwater, which helps provide safe waters within the harbour, and the Castle Light which provides navigational assistance to the maritime community as well as being a local point of interest. Built circa 1861-1864, both require regular maintenance and although the area can be reached by sea, vehicular access is a far safer and more versatile option.
- 2.4 The breakwater is also a popular public amenity, as a place to walk, fish from, and enjoy watching harbour activity. Such benefits are difficult to quantify in financial terms but are of great value to the wellbeing of the wider community.
- 2.5 Due to the risk of injury from spalling concrete, access to under the bridge is prohibited to the public. To mitigate the risk of public access, there are temporary barriers at the top of the steps leading to the beach, signage on each of the bridge arches and steel cables have been installed across the archways.

Bridge Structure and Condition

- 2.6 The CCB has a total length of approximately 95m, with each individual span measuring around 10m. The structure is composed entirely of in-situ reinforced concrete supported on a series of granite piers. At each end, granite half piers support the bridge deck at the junction between the respective harbour and breakwater approaches. The current bridge deck is completed with a metal handrail and a series of masonry pillars which have been given a rendered finish.
- 2.7 Concrete specialists McFarland Consulting has carried out regular detailed inspections, the latest in October 2023, comprising a delamination¹ survey and non-destructive testing. These surveys have concluded that there has been significant ongoing deterioration.
- 2.8 The latest inspection report recommended that the bridge be closed to all vehicular traffic. It can remain open for pedestrian use in the short term, and this will need to be reviewed annually. In addition to ongoing monitoring, access to the underside of the bridge is restricted and regular visual inspections are carried out to identify any defects that may present an immediate hazard. Deterrents have been put in place, however, it is impossible to completely block off access to the underside of the bridge and therefore the health and safety risk cannot be eliminated completely.

¹ Delamination is a process where concrete protecting the internal steel reinforcement is pushed off in a layer due to the expansion of the steel as it rusts. The steel rusts as the age and degradation of the concrete allows ingress of air, water and seawater.

Table 1 - Summary of Inspection Results

Structure	Inspection Year and Amount of Loss					
	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Total Defects²	327.6m ²	333.5m ²	334.0m ²	354.2m ²	382.0m ²	392.6m ²
% of Soffit³ presenting defects	53%	54%	54%	58%	63%	64%
% of Bridge presenting defects	27%	28%	28%	29%	31%	32%

Planning Considerations

2.9 Guernsey Ports has consulted with the Development & Planning Authority (“DPA”) regarding renovation of the CCB. The DPA emphasised that work should consider the quality of the design. This is paramount with the awareness that the bridge leads directly onto a legally protected monument. The DPA will consider:

- **Setting of the protected monument:** improvement to the setting, e.g. visual enhancement of the castle.
- **Improved access:** some enhancements desirable, e.g. lighting, seating.
- **Sustainability:** resources should be used to minimise long-term negative impacts.
- **Design materials:** should conserve or enhance what is already there.
- **Granite piers:** preference for retaining these elements of the original bridge.
- **Design changes:** should be lightweight, to not detract from the castle, e.g. thin profiles.

3 Strategic Context

Guernsey Ports

3.1 The STSB is mandated to ensure the efficient management, operation and maintenance of Guernsey Ports.

3.2 Guernsey Ports is operationally responsible for maintaining the harbour infrastructure, facilities and equipment that are required to support the

² Amount of concrete loss and steel exposed

³ The underside of the bridge deck

commercial movement of sea passengers and freight, and provide berthing and marina facilities for local and visiting leisure boats. It also has "Maritime State" responsibilities, including maintenance of navigation markings. The Castle Breakwater is an important element of the provision of safe harbour for vessels while the Castle Light is an important navigational aid.

3.3 Without CCB providing vehicle and pedestrian access to the breakwater and Castle Light, it would be considerably more complex and costly to maintain these essential pieces of infrastructure.

3.4 The CfESC, through Culture & Heritage Services, has mandated responsibility for the management of States museums, galleries, and historical and archaeological sites. The published Heritage Service Work Plan 2022 lists five strategic priorities, of which four require the CCB as the access point for Castle Cornet:

- To ensure our assets and collections are understood, managed and cared for, for the benefit of current and future generations.
- To develop partnerships to ensure a holistic and collaborative approach to management of and engagement with culture and heritage across the Bailiwick.
- To encourage and enable people to engage with Guernsey's heritage through participation.
- To realise the economic and social value of our assets and collections.

3.5 CCB provides the only means of access to Castle Cornet for vehicles and pedestrians. The bridge is therefore necessary to enable the CfESC to fulfil its mandate.

4 Summary of Project Business Case

4.1 The Project has compiled an Outline Business Case which has been reviewed and approved by the Ports Board, the STSB, CfESC and subject to an independent Project Healthcheck. A precis of that review is included at Section 9. This section summarises the content of the Outline Business Case.

4.2 In reviewing the desired outcomes for this project, the Investment Objectives listed in Table 2 have been identified and applied to the options in Table 4.

Table 2 - Investment Objectives

Investment Objective 1	Ensure nothing more than scheduled maintenance of the bridge is required for a minimum of 50 years
Investment Objective 2	Ensure safe and adequate pedestrian and vehicle access to Castle Cornet, the Castle Breakwater and Castle Light navigational aid, and provide a secure route for utilities
<i>Doing this will:</i>	
Maintain pedestrian access to the breakwater and castle	to enable revenues to be maintained at the castle with access for visitors; for residents to access the castle; for ease of access for maintenance of the navigational aid (lighthouse) and the breakwater; for leisure users to access the breakwater
Provide vehicular access to the breakwater and castle	to enable emergency vehicle access; revenues to be maintained at the castle with access for event companies, caterers and facilities management; for residents to access the castle; for ease of access for maintenance of the lighthouse and the breakwater; and for ease of maintenance of the castle
Enable utilities (water, sewage, telecoms, electric)	to continue to run under or alongside the bridge

4.3 The scope of the project is to ensure the CCB can be used for the long-term future by pedestrians and vehicles. Included in the scope:

- Bridge infrastructure: the abutments, the decking, granite piers, handrails, pillars and utility ducts, and the approach bridge which links the main bridge to the castle.
- Provision of pedestrian access to the castle during delivery of the project.
- Utility services maintained to Castle Cornet and Castle Light navigational aid.

4.4 The Critical Success Factors (CSF) were developed by the project team in conjunction with Ports operational staff and officers from Culture & Heritage. These CSF have been used alongside the Investment Objectives for the project to evaluate the long list of possible options.

Table 3 - Project Critical Success Factors

Critical Success Factor		Related Core Investment Objective
1	Provide access for vehicles up to 36 tonne gross weight (max 12 tonnes per axle) to the Castle Breakwater	Ensure safe and adequate pedestrian and vehicle access to Castle Cornet, the Castle Breakwater and Castle Light, and provide a secure route for utilities.
2	Vehicular access to the Breakwater to have a minimum clear width of 3.0m	Ensure safe and adequate pedestrian and vehicle access to Castle Cornet, the Castle Breakwater and Castle Light, and provide a secure route for utilities.
3	Provide accessible pedestrian access to the Castle and Castle Breakwater	Ensure safe and adequate pedestrian and vehicle access to Castle Cornet, the Castle Breakwater and Castle Light, and provide a secure route for utilities.
4	Maintain pedestrian access to the Castle leading up to and during construction works	Ensure safe and adequate pedestrian and vehicle access to Castle Cornet, the Castle Breakwater and Castle Light, and provide a secure route for utilities.
5	For the spur to the castle (known as the approach bridge) to have a minimum clear width of 2.55m to maintain pedestrian access only	Ensure safe and adequate pedestrian and vehicle access to Castle Cornet, the Castle Breakwater and Castle Light, and provide a secure route for utilities.
6	For utility supplies to the Castle and Breakwater to be maintained	Ensure safe and adequate pedestrian and vehicle access to Castle Cornet, the Castle Breakwater and Castle Light, and provide a secure route for utilities.
7	For the bridge to have a design life of no less than 50 years	Ensure that nothing more than scheduled maintenance of the bridge is required for a minimum of 50 years.

Option Evaluation

- 4.5 An initial list of options was compiled following an inspection of the bridge in 2018 and updated following the inspection of the bridge in 2022.
- 4.6 The Long List of Options has been evaluated against the Investment Objectives and Critical Success Factors, and the results are detailed in Table 4.

Table 4 - Long List Evaluation

Option	Description	Main advantages	Main disadvantages	Conclusion
1. Do nothing	Keep structure serviceable and safe in short-term (1-3 years) until a decision on its future. Annual inspection and hammer rap survey to remove loose material and monitor deterioration.	Very little financial outlay.	Deterioration will continue, likely to result in complete closure in the near future.	Will not meet the CSF, not sustainable. Discounted.
2. Short term monitoring	As Option 1 with a Structural Health Monitoring System to better understand load capacity and allow loadings not normally permitted through traditional structural assessment to use the bridge.	Relatively small financial commitment provides data to monitor deterioration rate. Allows restricted vehicle access.	Deterioration not addressed, likely to result in complete closure in the near future.	Will not meet the CSF, not sustainable. Discounted.
3. Medium term repairs	Undertake essential repairs where current defects exist to provide a design life of 10-15 years, with remedial works taking approximately 12 months.	Provides time to decide on long-term solution.	Not a long-term solution. Extent of defects means negligible saving. Steel reinforcement condition likely to require vehicle restrictions.	Will not meet the CSF, not sustainable. Discounted.
4. Long term repairs (repair arch beams, replace deck)	Widespread remediation and installation of a cathodic protection system across all concrete elements to achieve a 50 year design. Remedial works would take approximately 12 months.	Would achieve a design life of 50 years. Possibly has lowest whole life carbon emissions.	Most expensive, riskiest option. Very limited time until deterioration beyond repair. Deck removal may show condition of supports worse than expected, necessitating replacement.	Meets requirement for a long term solution and the CSF. Shortlisted.

Option	Description	Main advantages	Main disadvantages	Conclusion
5. Replace with like-for-like structure	Demolish existing structure (except granite piers) and construct new reinforced concrete structure. Construction likely to take 12 months to complete and achieve a design life in excess of 50 years.	Relatively straightforward to estimate build cost. Construction timeframe should be reasonably accurate to estimate.	No design innovation. No improvement to health & safety (e.g. modern handrail standards), or accessibility (e.g. better lighting).	Unlikely to meet Planning Policy or Building Control regulations. Discounted.
6. Replace with like-for-like structure with design enhancements	As for Option 5 but with increased functionality - e.g. handrails that meet HSE guidance, better lighting, seating. Modern materials and design may enable a sleeker, lower profile bridge, respectful of the Conservation Area and not detracting from the castle.	As for Option 5, plus meets modern health and safety standards, improves accessibility, and likely to meet planning policies.	Restricts design innovation.	Meets requirement for a long term solution and CSF. Shortlisted
7. Replace with unknown design via a competition	A design competition asking for proposals that meet a minimum specification and maximum budget. Entries assessed by a judging panel with winning design going to tender.	An opportunity to encourage innovative design on island.	Potential significant delay (6 to 24 months) due to lack of interest, entries not meeting minimum spec, or unsuccessful planning application. Contractors may not be interested in constructing. Cost not known until tendered.	Meets requirement for a long term solution and CSF, may take longer to deliver. Shortlisted.

Shortlist evaluation

4.7 The three shortlisted options from the original long list (Table 4) were:

- Option 4 - Long-term repair
- Option 6 - Replacement with design enhancements
- Option 7 - Replacement through a design competition

4.8 These were scored against the following evaluation criteria:-

- **Timeframe:** The anticipated timeframe for delivery is important given the extent to which the bridge has deteriorated, and the risk that vehicle access would be, and is now, prohibited entirely.
- **Base cost:** Specialist advisers with experience of concrete structures, including in a maritime environment, compiled estimates of construction costs. These were based on preliminary designs of each option, with allowances for material quantity, equipment mobilisation, professional fees, health and safety standard adjustments, and weather and construction risk.
- **Risk cost:** A value was assigned to the key risks that are most likely to occur for each option, reflecting the anticipated likelihood and the subsequent mitigation costs.
- **Optimism bias:** An additional allowance to reflect the risk that over-optimistic assumptions are made at the early stage of a project, such as capital costs, operating costs, works duration and benefits delivery.

4.9 Option 6 unequivocally scored best against all four evaluation criteria, with the shortest anticipated delivery time, lowest base cost, least risk cost and lowest optimism bias, and is likely to meet Planning Policy. Option 4 ranked second against all criteria, and Option 7 third.

4.10 By comparison, the estimated base cost for Option 4 was 21% higher than Option 6, with a 288% greater risk cost and 53% higher optimism bias. Although construction could start around the same time, there is a risk that the condition of the bridge will deteriorate beyond repair before then, or the repairs be so extensive as to effectively require Option 6.

4.11 Option 7 was assumed to have the same base cost for construction as Option 6 but would take up to two years longer to deliver. This was primarily due to the two-phase procurement process and would add to the project management cost. The risk cost was 145% higher than for Option 6, and the optimism bias around 80% higher.

4.12 The preferred option is therefore replacement of the current bridge like-for-like with some design enhancements (Option 6).

Environmental Impact

- 4.13 The main disbenefit of the preferred option is that it is likely to lead to a removal of large amounts of the existing concrete, to be replaced with new material, e.g. steel, concrete. Any new materials inevitably have a carbon footprint, which has an environmental impact, but that can be offset by the removed material being recycled and used elsewhere on-island.
- 4.14 It is anticipated that there will be little if any medium- to long-term impact to the immediate marine environment. In the short-term, during demolition and possibly to a lesser extent construction, there may be some disturbance. The contractor will be responsible for clearing all debris from the site, which has been included within the base cost price estimates.
- 4.15 All shortlisted options retain the structures already fixed in the seabed, so there should be little impact on the environs during construction. Part of the tender process will require mitigations against pollution and site disturbance. Suppliers will be asked to minimise their carbon footprint.

Preferred Option Cost

- 4.16 This project will create a capital asset, which will be depreciated over its expected minimum design life of 50 years.
- 4.17 Based on the detailed cost estimates compiled by the project technical advisers, including allowances for costed risk and optimism bias and project management costs, the preferred solution (Option 6) represents the least cost of the shortlisted options. Without disclosing the current estimates prior to tendering of the design and build contract, the projected total capital costs for Option 7 are around 35% higher than Option 6, and Option 4 costs are around 70% higher than Option 6.
- 4.18 At this pre-tender stage, these estimates are considered by Channel Island based cost consultants to be reasonable, but the final costs will be influenced to a large extent by the construction method that is eventually adopted. The project team has adopted a realistic but conservative approach in this respect, as corroborated by the independent Project Healthcheck, and there is scope for some innovation on the part of a contractor that may keep the overall project cost down.
- 4.19 Current estimates for the capital costs of each option, inclusive of base cost, costed risk, optimism bias and project management costs, can be made available to States Members before the debate.

Table 5 - Capital Costs for the Shortlisted Options

Option	Total Cost Range
Option 4 – Repair	£ 10,500,000 - £11,500,000
Option 6 – Replace with like-for-like with design enhancements	£ 6,000,000 - £7,000,000
Option 7 – Replace with unknown design via a design competition	£ 8,600,000 - £9,600,000

5 Procurement Strategy

- 5.1 Key to the delivery of the project is the appointment of a specialist technical and design advisor at the outset, as they will have the expertise and contacts to undertake initial commercial assessment to evaluate potential delivery capability and capacity. With this information obtained, the next overarching steps will be the preliminary design and submission to DPA, preparation of tender documentation, Expressions of Interest, Invitation to Tender, Full Business Case, appointment of contractor, followed by works on-site. The preferred option costs allow for project management resources to be contracted in to maintain the delivery timescale.
- 5.2 The procurement strategy will follow current States Corporate Procurement Policy and Rules. It is proposed that the contract used will be design and build, for which the main contractor is responsible for both design and construction. Interest in this approach can be gauged with market testing prior to Expressions of Interest (EOI) to reduce possible delays to a successful procurement outcome. This approach has become commonplace and can give the following advantages:
- Unified project recommendations
 - Collaborative problem solving
 - Less risk to the client from designer and contractor dispute
 - One point of responsibility
 - Savings in time and money
- 5.3 Specifically, for CCB, the methodology of project delivery will be hugely influential on the cost. The base cost estimate has assumed the use of a jack-up barge⁴ as identified by the concrete specialists undertaking the bridge

⁴ A floating platform that has movable legs attached to the hull. These legs can be retracted and extended vertically, meaning that once the legs make contact with the seabed, the platform can be made stable out of the water as the tide recedes.

monitoring and annual inspection. However, a contractor could have different equipment available to them which could heavily influence the price. This will also make the works achievable for local contractors.

6 Funding of CCB Replacement

6.1 Total project costs for the replacement of CCB have been estimated to be less than £7.0m. Of this, the estimated costs to carry out the design, approvals and procurement prior to contracting for construction and implementation as well as the continued monitoring of the bridge for safe use is estimated to be £686,000. Table 6 provides a summary of these costs.

6.2 Approximately £131,500 of the £686,000 has already been spent in 2023 developing the project to the current stage and has been funded by the Ports as project initiation cost. The P&RC agreed in September 2023 to fund the balance of £519,500 plus up to £35,000 in contingency to enable the project to continue while full project funding is sought.

Table 6 - Approved Funding to reach Contract Award Stage

Description	£
Bridge monitoring and inspection costs	216,000
Client project management including communications, legal work and independent project reviews	200,000
External specialist support including outline design, Planning application, Health & Safety Project Co-ordinator role, finalisation of the delivery plan	235,000
Sub-total	£651,000
<6% Contingency for variations or potential emergency works e.g., road plates to extend use of bridge until site works can begin	35,000
TOTAL	£686,000
Funded by:	
Ports	131,500
General Reserve	519,500
General Reserve (Contingency to be requested if required)	35,000

6.3 The replacement bridge will be constructed of materials that will have low maintenance requirements throughout its design life.

6.4 There is no direct income to attribute to the costs of replacing the CCB. The June

2022 GWP Update recognised the importance of the bridge to the island and agreed in principle a funding envelope of £5-10 million. The project was included in the portfolio agreed by the States in the October 2023 Finance & Investment Plan debate.

- 6.5 Subject to Full Business Case approval, it is proposed that funding of this preferred option is met through a capital vote funded by the General Revenue Reserve.

7 Timescale and Implementation Plan for the Preferred Option

- 7.1 It is aimed that the project will be completed by the end of 2026, following the required procurement processes, planning applications and political approval timescales. Until construction begins, it will be necessary to continue monitoring the bridge to ensure it can be used safely.
- 7.2 The final project cost will not be known until the tender of the design and build contract has been completed. It will however be influenced to a large extent by the construction method that is eventually adopted, and while reasonable estimates have been made, there is scope for some innovation on the part of a contractor.
- 7.3 Subject to a tendering process, the Full Business Case for the preferred scheme will be completed and will support the investment decision by the P&RC within the financial envelope of £7.0m in line with the Finance and Investment Plan.

Table 7 - Key Milestones

Milestone Activity	Target Date
Meeting of the States of Deliberation	Q1 2024
Appointment of specialist support	Q1 2024
Outline design, Planning application and tender documentation	Q2, Q3 2024
Procurement process for contractor	Q4 2024, Q1 2025
Project Assurance Review	Q2 2025
Final Business Case approval	Q2 2025
Enter into contract	Q3 2025
Project completion	Q3 2026
Post Implementation Review	Mid 2027

8 Consultation

- 8.1 Both internal and external stakeholders were identified at an early stage of the project. To reach OBC stage, workshops were held with key stakeholders to determine the project Investment Objectives, Critical Success Factors, Benefits and Risks.
- 8.2 The OBC has been considered and approved by the Ports Board, the STSB, and the CfESC.

9 Project Business Case Review

- 9.1 An independent Project Healthcheck review has been undertaken, to review the OBC (including the development of the shortlist and the preferred option) and to provide assurance at this key stage of the project.
- 9.2 The review confirmed an overall Amber status. This status supports the preferred option and its affordability within the identified funding provision in the GWP. The report recognised that the biggest risks relate to the heightened urgency of delivery with the declining state of the existing bridge, the approvals timetables, and in securing more assurance about the delivery strategy.

10 Conclusion

- 10.1 The preferred option (Option 6 – like-for-like replacement with design enhancements) represents the most cost-effective long-term solution, with least risk, for the provision of access to Castle Cornet and Castle Breakwater for vehicles, pedestrians and utility ducts.
- 10.2 The project is considered urgent as the bridge condition is deteriorating. Restrictions for use are in place and will be further limited in the very near future.
- 10.3 Enabling funding has allowed some progression of the scheme, reducing the risk of project delays while following due process for full funding.

11 Compliance with Rule 4

- 11.1 Rule 4 of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees sets out the information which must be included in, or appended to, motions laid before the States.
- 11.2 In accordance with Rule 4(1):
 - (a) By addressing the deterioration of Castle Cornet Bridge, the propositions will:

- Enable the STSB to meet its responsibilities, through Guernsey Ports, to maintain harbour infrastructure as detailed in Section 3.2;
 - Enable the CfESC to fulfil its mandate as detailed in Section 3.4 and meet the strategic priorities of the Heritage Service Work Plan 2022;
 - Contribute to the Government Work Plan Strategic portfolio to “Grow economic competitiveness”, specifically the visitor economy;
- (b) The Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture and the Policy & Resources Committee have been consulted in the preparation of the propositions.
- (c) The Propositions have been submitted to His Majesty’s Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications.
- (d) The financial implications of the proposition are included in Sections 6.1 – 6.5.

11.3 In accordance with Rule 4(2):

- (a) The Propositions relate to the mandate of the STSB in respect of ensuring the efficient management, operation and maintenance of any States-owned unincorporated trading concerns.
- (b) The Propositions have the unanimous support of the STSB.

Yours faithfully

P J Roffey
President

C N K Parkinson
Vice-President

N G Moakes
Member

S J Thornton
M R Thompson
Non-States Members