

Review of the Future Hospital Preferred Access Route to Overdale

Response Submitted by:

Tom Binet

Fairview

St Saviour

1. Will you be affected by the proposed access route to Overdale? If so, how?

Physically? Other than as a future user of the proposed new hospital, no.

Financially? As a taxpayer, yes, definitely.

2. How do you think the access route will affect the homes, leisure facilities and surrounding areas and the overall impact on the landscape?

Badly! Apart from those property owners who will be forced to vacate their homes (by way of a highly unsympathetic compulsory purchase order), a road of the width proposed will adversely affect the quality of life of those homeowners whose houses will end up adjacent to it, and most others within the vicinity.

The size and structure of the roadway itself is likely to change to entire character of the People's Park and surrounding area, leaving it a shadow of its former self; in addition, most of the mature trees in the area will have to be removed and the entire bowling green complex will be eliminated. The skyline will also be adorned with a very large building and extensive carpark.

Finally, with regard to the overall impact, it should not be forgotten that the proposed new road would completely erase yet another historic site of local interest; Gallows Hill.

3. Do you feel the plans offer easy access using bus, bicycle or walking and take into account appropriate sustainable methods of transport?

No. However the new road is arranged, it cannot have any material effect on the gradient involved. Many people visiting a hospital will be doing so, as a result of being unwell, in some way. With that in mind, the idea that any meaningful number of hospital users will cycle, or walk, up such a steep climb is very naive.

A hospital based at Overdale will undoubtedly lead to the vast majority of people travelling to it by car. Therefore, given that the car will become the default mode of transport under the proposed road plan, the government should amend its proposal to properly incorporate sustainable transport options now, rather than leave it as an afterthought.

4. Do you feel the public were given adequate time to properly consider all the information provided by the States to engage properly in consultation?

Definitely not. In the first instance, the information provided by the States was, and remains, woefully inadequate. Furthermore, it could be argued that those responsible for the issue of appropriate information did not even leave time for the States itself to engage properly.

5. Do you feel that any views of the public (whether minority or majority views) were adequately addressed by the Government of Jersey?

Please see answer to 4. above. Has nobody noticed that this Government only starts consulting the public, on any given issue, once their decisions have been taken?

6. Was your voice heard?

No. And anyone with any knowledge of the way in which such things are currently dealt with in the island, will know that the Government of Jersey probably has very little intention of taking any notice of my opinion, or anyone else's.

I wish the Review Panel the best of luck in their endeavours

Tom Binet