

---

**JERSEY FUTURE HOSPITAL  
CO004 – SITE OPTION REPORT**

**APPENDIX 7 – Town Planning  
Assessment**

QUALITY ASSURANCE

Sign off: Kieren Morgan

Position: Principal



**Jersey Future Hospital Project**

**Assessment of planning issues for proposed Options A-D**

**27th March 2015**

*The judgments provided by the author are subjective and are based upon available information, with reference to local knowledge and experience.*

## Option A: Dual Site – Acute Services at General and Ambulatory Care at Overdale

### Key features:

#### Overdale:

- Development retained on existing site – owned and controlled by H&SSD.
- William Knott and Poplars buildings retained.
- New vehicular access onto Westmount Road.
- Location of development likely to require removal of trees on site and located in Westmount Park.
- Maximum number of floors will be two (at 4500mm floor to floor).

#### General Hospital:

- Development retained on existing site – owned and controlled by SOJ..
- Retention of Granite Building consistent with planning requirement (listed building). Potential loss of existing listed buildings at Edward Place to be discussed with SOJ Planning and Environment.
- Building heights for all new developments) consistent with those noted in the SOC and as advised by SOJ Planning and Environment Department.
- Improvements to townscape and public realm.
- New emergency vehicle access arrangements.

### Assessment of key issues:

Overdale	Issue	Comment	Assessment of issues		
			Low	Medium	High
	<b>Policy</b>	No presumption against development in the Green Backdrop Zone. Removal of trees needs to be justified.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<b>Access</b>	<p>Assessment needed to understand if the proposed use would result in an increase in trip generation.</p> <p>The road network serving the site is not ideal and mitigation measures are likely to be needed to improve blue light access, routes for emergency vehicles, the operation of junctions and improvement of the pedestrian environment.</p> <p>Connectivity to General Hospital and St Helier are issues that need to be resolved. Transport arrangements could be arranged to avoid peak hours. Parish of St Helier has indicated a requirement for a Hopper Bus.</p> <p>Investigation of sustainable transport choices needed to maximize choices for patients and users. Of all options, this location is likely to generate highest car use. Although staff likely to use hopper service, people who are ill, injured are likely to travel to the site by private car..</p>		<input type="checkbox"/>	

	<b>Parking</b>	Baseline assessment needed to inform parking provision.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<b>Landscape &amp; Visual Impact</b>	<p>Loss of trees and height of new buildings.</p> <p>Any new building is likely to be approximately 8.4m (max); this height has the potential to be visible from distant locations from the west, south and east.</p> <p>The position of new buildings will require an assessment of trees in Westmount Park and on site. It is likely that existing trees will need to be removed to ensure a compatible relationship to be achieved.</p> <p>Although there appear to be no protected trees on the site, there is a commemorative oak planted when the hospital was opened, that has ecological and cultural value.</p>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b>Impact on neighbours</b>	The potential for the position and height of new buildings to have an adverse effect upon neighbours will require careful assessment. Locations where maximum building heights are needed will need to take into account the amenities of neighbours.		<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>General Hospital</b>					
	<b>Policy</b>	No presumption against development.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<b>Access</b>	Rationalisation of access arrangements including new emergency vehicle access from Newgate Street. Details need to be agreed with TTS.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<b>Parking</b>	Existing parking arrangements retained.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<b>Heritage – above ground</b>	Presumption against the loss of potential listed buildings (2,3 & 4 Edward Place). The overall benefit to society likely to outweigh concerns. Changes allow the setting of the existing listed building (part of the General Hospital site) to be improved.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<b>Heritage – below ground</b>	Assessment of any below ground heritage assets required.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<b>Townscape</b>	Removal of prominent, modern building allows improvement of setting of listed buildings; and strategy to improve public realm to be introduced. Any increase above existing height needs to be tested and justified against policy guidance for St Helier.		<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b>Employment</b>	Any loss of employment uses needs to be justified – likely to be accepted on basis of over-riding strategic benefit.	<input type="checkbox"/>		

## Option B: Single Site Overdale

### Key features:

- Includes Jersey New Waterworks site and Field (opposite Overdale Hospital site east of Westmount Road). William Knott and Poplars buildings retained.
- New vehicular accesses onto Westmount Road and Tower Hill.
- Extent of new building occupies most of existing site.
- Location of development will require removal of trees located in Westmount Park and all trees on site.
- Maximum number of floors will be four (at 4500mm floor to floor) with one floor at lower ground (at 4500mm floor to floor).  
Car-parking proposed includes drop-off, short stay and disabled parking on site and main visitor parking in the above mentioned Field.

### Assessment of key issues:

	Issue	Comment	Assessment of issues		
			Low	Medium	High
	<b>Policy</b>	No presumption against development in the Green Backdrop Zone. Removal of trees needs to be justified. Potential for _small incursion onto land designated as Protected Open Space. Mitigation measures may need to be discussed and agreed with H&SSD and SOJ Planning and Environment. Loss of trees of high quality, commemorative flat oak and group of coastal pines will also need mitigation measures as above. Inclusion of Field to provide car-parking involves development of land designated as Green Zone overall benefits likely to outweigh policy presumption against.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b>Access</b>	The proposed use is likely to result in an increase in trip generation. Continuous blue light access needed  The road network serving the site is not ideal and mitigation measures are likely to be needed to improve blue light access, routes for emergency vehicles, the operation of junctions and improvement of the pedestrian environment.  Connectivity to St Helier and wider island is an issue that will need to be resolved.  Investigation of sustainable transport choices needed to maximize choices for patients and users. Of all options, this location is likely to generate highest car use. Although staff likely to use hopper service, people who are ill, injured are likely to travel to the site by private car..		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Parking</b>	Baseline assessment needed to inform parking provision. Requires the loss of a green field.		<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b>Landscape &amp; Visual Impact</b>	This option requires maximization of site occupancy. This will require the loss of trees and has implications for the height of new buildings.			<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

		<p>Any new building is likely to be approximately 4/5 storeys (as described above) in height (excluding any plant rooms); even with excavation this height has the potential to be extremely visible from locations from the west, south and east.</p> <p>The position of new buildings will require an assessment of trees in Westmount Park to understand how many will need to be removed to enable a compatible relationship to be achieved. The magnitude of loss may have an effect upon the ecological value of the woodland.</p> <p>Although there appear to be no protected trees on the site, there is a commemorative oak planted when the hospital was opened, that has ecological and cultural value.</p>			<input type="checkbox"/>   <input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Impact on neighbours</b>	The potential for the position and height of new buildings to have an adverse effect upon neighbours will require careful assessment. Locations where maximum building heights are needed will need to take into account the amenities of neighbours.			<input type="checkbox"/>

## Option C: Single Site General Hospital

### Key features:

- Includes development on land not owned and controlled by SOJ.
- Loss of listed buildings (2,3 & 4) Edward Place as mentioned above).
- Maximum number of floors will be seven (at 4500mm floor to floor).
- Improvements to townscape and public realm.
- Emergency vehicle access relocated to Newgate Street with extension of same to Kensington Place.

### Assessment of key issues:

	Issue	Comment	Assessment of issues		
			Low	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	High
	<b>Policy</b>	No presumption against development	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<b>Access</b>	Rationalisation of access arrangements including new emergency vehicle access from Newgate Street (as secondary route. Primary route will be via Gloucester Street and Newgate Street). Details need to be agreed with TTS.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<b>Parking</b>	Existing parking arrangements retained	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<b>Heritage – above ground</b>	Presumption against the loss of listed buildings (2,3 & 4 Edward Place as described above). The overall benefit to society likely to outweigh concerns.  Changes allow the setting of the existing listed building (part of the General Hospital site) to be improved.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<b>Heritage – below ground</b>	Assessment of any below ground heritage assets required.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<b>Townscape</b>	New buildings increase the height and mass of built form, which will have an impact upon the townscape character of the site and the surrounding area. The significance of the impact will depend upon design and massing choices. The height will require careful justification as it exceeds guidance provided by Tall Buildings policy and St Helier Design Guidance. However, the proposals are consistent with the guidance stated in the previous SOC as provided by SOJ Planning & Environment.  New building arrangements will enable improvements to the public realm, particularly the setting of the Listed Building on site and the frontage of the site with The Parade.	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

## Option D: Single Site Waterfront

### Key features:

- Development relies on the acquisition of sites not owned H&SSD.
- Development of part of the site has already been confirmed by a Masterplan approved as Supplementary Planning Guidance. Any change in development proposals will require a change in policy and the approval of the States.
- Further Supplementary Planning Guidance is provided by planning policy 'The Jersey Waterfront 2006'.
- The scheme involves the loss of Les Jardins de La Mer, which is designated as Protected Open Space in the revised Island Plan, 2011 and is one of the island's popular public open spaces.
- Vehicle access from the west requires traffic management interventions to enable vehicles to cross the dual carriageway.
- Part of the site has been identified to provide temporary car-parking during the construction of The Esplanade Quarter Car-Park.
- Maximum number of floors is five (at 4500mm floor to floor).
- Building heights on Les Jardins de La Mer site are restricted by policy provided for by St Helier Design Guidance (2013). Building heights on other parts of the site are restricted to 6-storeys by other SPG.

	Issue	Comment	Assessment of issues		
			Low	Medium	High
	<b>Policy</b>	Development of this site will require new Supplementary Planning Guidance and approval by the SOJ.			<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Access</b>	<p>Transport Strategy – ensure that any changes to road system can accommodate predicted vehicle volumes and provide required blue light access. Existing Masterplan has an approved Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The site is close to St Helier Town Centre and Liberation Bus Station. The site has easy access to Primary Route Network.</p> <p>Ensure that proposals are compatible with development proposals for Esplanade Quarter.</p> <p>Access via La Rue de L'Eteau may be restricted as the road can get congested and vehicles currently park illegally, which causes congestion.</p>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b>Parking</b>	<p>Temporary car-parking whilst The Esplanade Quarter is being constructed will need to be maintained or provided elsewhere.</p> <p>Patriotic Street retained for patient and staff parking.</p> <p>Number of spaces provided on site informed by baseline assessment of current transport modes by staff and visitors.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>		



	<b>Contaminated Land</b>	Legacy issues – cost and remediation implications. Potential risk that contamination found can't be remediated or disposed of – see current local asbestos issue.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b>Flooding</b>	Coastal and combined surface water drainage – further assessment being prepared.			
	<b>Public space</b>	The loss of Jardin de La Mer is likely to be viewed as contentious. Any replacement, which is likely to be on General Hospital site, would have to replicate quality. Question about resources already invested. Building on JdM contrary to St Helier Design Guidance and Policy SC04.			<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Townscape Building heights</b>	The Jersey Waterfront 2006 SPG appears to provide for over 6-storeys in area (this excludes Jardin de la Mer) – subject to excellent design – may need to be off-set with provision of public open space. The proposed building height of five floors (at 4500mm floor to floor) exceeds policy guidance and will need to be justified.			<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Townscape Vistas</b>	Extending onto Jardin de La Mer site moves the edge of town further west – implications for important vistas and views – any increased height and mass compared with context (over 6-storeys) – loss of views down Gloucester Street and views from Millenium Court (although there are no legal rights to a view)			<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Heritage</b>	Any alteration of granite sea-walls, slip-ways may cause concern – there was an objection to impact of Esplanade Quarter upon The Esplanade sea-wall – a Grade 3 Listed structure.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<b>Housing</b>	Loss of approved residential development. However there is no identified shortage for this type of housing.	<input type="checkbox"/>		