

Name: Jean Lelliott

Email address: jean.elliott@gmail.com

Phone no: 01534-631852

Details:

The access to Overdale has always been controversial. The Government has a duty to protect unnecessary public spending and this is even more important in the financial situation we find ourselves in Post Covid.

This proposed access road is an unnecessary expense, especially when there are other, more suitable, sites available.

Although I believe that any site will impact on someone, somewhere, and it is certainly unfortunate for those people whose homes would be affected by compulsory purchase, for me it is the loss of important historical sites which is unacceptable.

Jersey people have had quite enough of the imported civil servants riding roughshod over our heritage and history and it must stop.

This site also runs the risk of lengthy delays due to court actions surrounding compulsory purchase and during all this time the price continues to rise.

The other two sites could be developed more quickly and cheaper.

Looking at the project team's own criteria, it is impossible to understand how this site was chosen, except of course that the whole selection process was clearly heavily manipulated. Both Warwick Farm & St Saviour's Hospital are already in public ownership and vacant bar a few plants. The remaining lease on Warwick Farm should be easy to compensate for. Either of these two sites would be far cheaper to develop.

According to the report.

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA AS AGREED BY OUR HOSPITAL CITIZENS' PANEL

1. Is the site large enough to accommodate all the required clinical and support services including staff and service (access) facilities?

O. Yes

WF. Yes

SSH. Yes

2. Does the site provide the ability for expansion? Will the site be able to deliver the hospital in the project timeline?

O. Maybe

WF. Yes

SSH. Yes

3.Does the highway network, locally and strategically, have the capacity to access and serve the hospital?Can the site be well served by public transport?

O. Maybe (Hardly!!!)

WF. Yes

SSH. No

4.Will the site allow / encourage the sustainable use of resources?

O. Maybe (Really? How?)

WF. No

SSH. No

5.Is the utilities infrastructure sufficient?

O.Yes

WF. No*

SSH. No* *No explanation given

6.Will the site impact current healthcare services?

O. Maybe? (There would be major impacts)

WF. No

SSH. No

7.Is there sufficient space around the hospital building to enhance and support patients, staff and visitors?

O. Yes

WF. Yes

SSH. Yes

8.Is the site in a quiet location?

O. Yes

WF. Yes

SSH. Yes

9. Is there enough dedicated car parking and is it suitable?

O. Yes
WF. Yes
SSH. Yes

10. Is the site directly below the flight path to the airport?

O. No
WF. No.
SSH. Maybe (Having checked with pilots it isn't)

11. Is the site in the Built-Up Area?

O. No
WF. No
SSH. Yes? (Hardly built up)

12. Is the site on brownfield (previously developed) land?

O. No (Part of it is)
WF. Yes
SSH. Yes

13. Is the site a greenfield site?

O. Yes
WF. Maybe
SSH. Yes (actually none of these answers make sense if you look at the previous question)

14. Can the site be accessed from various directions?

O. Yes
WF. Yes
SSH. Yes

15. Can the site be accessed by dedicated cycle routes?

O. No
WF. Yes
SSH. No

16.Can any public facility or amenity that is lost be compensated for?

O. Yes Bowling club? Historical places?

WF. Yes

SSH. Yes

17.Is there a risk of pollution or contaminated land?

O. No

WF. Yes (Please explain how this is different to Bashfords, Samares Nurseries etc)

SSH. No

18.Will there be a detrimental impact on the local population during the operation of the hospital?

O.Yes

WF. Yes

SSH. Yes

19.Will there be a detrimental impact on the local population during construction of the hospital?

O. Yes

WF. Yes

SSH. Yes

20.Will the site allow a building that will fit in with the built character of the area?

O. No

WF. No

SSH. No

21.Will the historic environment / assets be lost or harmed?

O. Maybe (Major historical losses on access route)

WF. Maybe (Only a German bunker which we have loads of)

SSH. Yes

22. Will development of the site harm important views?

O. Yes

WF. Yes

SSH. Yes (All answers need an explanation)

Bearing all this in mind, why would you build an access road to a site which clearly comes 3rd out of these 3 options?

1st = Warwick Farm

2nd = St Saviour's Hospital

3rd = Overdale

The other sites must be thoroughly evaluated and costed and there is also additional land available adjacent to Warwick Farm which could be purchased for future fool-proofing if needed. This land would make the Warwick Farm site the largest of all three sites.

Let's look again at what the Government website says about the rejected sites.

St Saviour's Hospital - It's says that it is in a remote location - yet according to the 'outcome matrix' it states that it is in a built up area.

Warwick Farm - it says that there is a likelihood of needing major road improvements and yet in answer to question 3 in the 'outcome matrix' it says that the highway network, locally and strategically has the capacity to access and serve the hospital.

Also with regard to Warwick Farm it says that the lack of social and community facilities nearby would not support sustainable behaviour. Really? It has a pub virtually opposite with an excellent restaurant. Rondel's Farm Shop also has a cafe, there is a butchers shop there and a fishmonger and other retail outlets, a supermarket up the road and another is the process of being built close by. What is there at Overdale? Absolutely nothing!

It states that Warwick Farm is in the green zone, when the 'outcome matrix' has correctly identified it as brown field.

On page 12 of the Planning Inspector's report from the last public Inquiry it states." 25.Under Jersey Law,10 it is a requirement that an application for Planning Permission is accompanied by certificates confirming that the site landowners approve of the application being made. However, in this case, two of the landowners have refused,or are unable,to certify their approval of the application. 26.In such circumstances, Article 9 (4) of the Law allows for an application for planning permission to be accepted for consideration, if the Minister for the Environment is satisfied that doing so would be in the public interest. The Minister has accepted the public interest case in respect of the application. This has enabled the application to be validated and thereafter formally considered."

Looking at the above, if there is a challenge from the home and land owners, the planning application would only be able to proceed under the same laws. ie it must be considered to be in the best interests of the public as agreed by the Minister for the Environment.

The same independent inspector said of Overdale, "Whilst this is an existing hospital location and within the built-up area, it is physically separated from the main town and the topography makes it inaccessible, particularly by walking and cycling modes of travel. The intensification of development required to accommodate the hospital,combined with the elevated ridge location within the Green

Backdrop Zone,would result in very significant adverse visual impacts. There could also be adverse residential amenity and biodiversity impacts. This option would create significant challenges with the Island Plan".

It seems that the main objections from the Government to the other two sites are due to the fact that neither are in the 'built up area' When exactly will the Government and the Planning department realise that the 'built up area' is no place for a hospital which should be in the countryside with fresh air?

Until the best site is truly settled, why would any sane person agree to destroying a major part of the west of the ring road and an important historical area on a whim? We don't even know if the planning application for the hospital would be passed so you do not make unnecessary and expensive changes on a 'maybe'.

To be honest, the project team who came up with the timetable for this project should just leave now as they clearly do not understand how the process works. Where is the design brief? What are we even trying to build? Can we have the answers to these important questions first please?