

## 11 HERITAGE

- 11.1 This assessment considers the potential impacts (temporary and permanent) on heritage assets within the proposed JFH and its context, including listed buildings, listed places, areas of archaeological potential and non-designated assets.
- 11.2 It presents the methodology used to assess the potential effects of the proposed development and establishes baseline conditions and identifies key heritage assets. Potential effects of the proposed development are described and mitigation methods are proposed.
- 11.3 This chapter should be read in conjunction with Appendix H-1 (Heritage Impact Assessment) which provides a more detailed assessment of heritage assets, and in conjunction with the Jersey Future Hospital TVIA (Chapter 15).

### Legislation and Planning Policy

- 11.4 This assessment has been made within the following legislative and planning context:

#### Revised Island Plan (2014)

- 11.5 Policies HE1 Protecting Listed Buildings and Places states that:
- There will be a presumption in favour of the preservation of the architectural and historic character and integrity of Listed Buildings and Places, and their settings. Proposals which do not preserve or enhance the special or particular interest of a Listed Building or Place and their settings will not be approved.
  - Permission will not be granted for:
    1. the total or partial demolition of a Listed Building;
    2. the removal of historic fabric, which might include roofing materials, elevational treatments (such as render or stucco) and their replacement with modern alternatives;
    3. the addition of external items, such as satellite dishes, antennae, signs, solar panels and roof lights, which would adversely affect the special interest or character of a Listed Building or Place, and its setting;
    4. extensions, alterations and changes which would adversely affect the architectural or historic interest or character of a Listed Building or Place, and its setting.

- In those exceptional cases where there is a loss of the historic fabric of a Listed Building or Place, the Minister will ensure that the recording of that fabric to be lost is undertaken, as appropriate.
- Applications for proposals affecting Listed Buildings and Places which do not provide sufficient information and detail to enable the likely impact of proposals to be considered, understood and evaluated, will be refused.

11.6 Policy HE 5 – Preservation of archaeological resources states that:

- The Minister for Planning and Environment will require an archaeological evaluation to be carried out, to be provided and paid for by the developer, for works which may affect archaeological resources: this information will be required as an integral part of an application. The form of the evaluation will be dependent upon the nature of the archaeological resource and the development proposal and may involve more than one phase of evaluation and investigation depending upon the outcome of initial investigations and the significance and nature of the archaeology.
- Planning applications for development proposals which do not provide sufficient information to enable the value of archaeological remains and the likely impact of the proposed development to be determined, will be refused.
- There will be a presumption in favour of the physical preservation in situ of archaeological resources and their settings.
- Development which would involve significant alteration or cause damage, or which would have a significant impact on archaeological resources and the setting of visible archaeological resources, will only be permitted where the Minister for Planning and Environment is satisfied that the intrinsic importance of the resource is outweighed by other material considerations, including the need for and community benefit of the development.
- Where it is determined that the physical preservation of archaeological resources in situ is not justified, the Minister will ensure, through the use of planning obligation agreements and/or planning conditions, that appropriate provision for; the excavation and recording of the resources; the publication of the findings; and in some cases, the treatment and deposition of finds, is made and funded by the developer.

## **Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 (the Law) and the Planning and Building (Environmental Impact) Order 2006**

- 11.7 The statutory context for EIA is from Article 13 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 (the Law) and the Planning and Building (Environmental Impact) Order 2006 (the EI Order).

### **Consultation**

- 11.8 Consultation with the Historic Environment Team of the Planning and Building Services of the States of Jersey was undertaken in 2017 in the context of the previous hospital development proposal. Their response (paraphrased) is as follows:

*'The grading of Listed Buildings is not used to define assessments. Instead the study should establish a suitable radius and assess based on impact in context. There is no formal Historic Environment Record (HER) to consult, but listing information for each site is held online under the planning register. Jersey does not yet have any published guidance on setting, and reference should be made to other jurisdictions to evidence the approach.'*

- 11.9 This has been considered within this assessment for the updated proposals.

### **Methodology**

- 11.10 The method for determining baseline conditions involved the compilation of a desk-based assessment (Appendix H-1) and was undertaken in accordance with the following standards and guidance:

#### **Template Brief for an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment v3**

- 11.11 Template Brief for an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment v3, produced by the States of Jersey and Oxford Archaeology, which states that the aim of the DBA is to:

- Identify the potential of the Red Line Boundary to include archaeological deposits and to determine, where possible, their condition and likely level of survival;
- Define the scope and nature of the proposed development and any impact on the archaeological resource;
- Help identify any health and safety concerns (e.g. soil contamination).

#### **Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA): Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment (revised 2017)**

- 11.12 This standard states that a DBA:

*'will determine, as far as is reasonably possible from existing records, the nature, extent and significance of the historic environment within a specified area. Desk-based assessment will be undertaken using appropriate methods and practices which satisfy the stated aims of the project, and which comply with the Code of conduct and other relevant regulations of ClfA. In a development context desk-based assessment will establish the impact of the proposed development on the significance of the historic environment (or will identify the need for further evaluation to do so), and will enable reasoned proposals and decisions to be made whether to mitigate, offset or accept without further intervention that impact'.*

**SOJ Department of the Environment Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)  
Practice Note 18: Environmental Impact Assessment**

11.13 The method for assessing value, magnitude of impact and effects has been initially derived from the Department of the Environment Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) Practice Note 18: Environmental Impact Assessment, and specifically in line with section D2 of the SPG (Environmental Impact Assessment): Assessing the Effects.

**Highways Agency Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) (HA 208/07)**

11.14 The assessment has also adopted the approaches detailed in Highways Agency Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) (HA 208/07), which has been adapted to accommodate island heritage. It is recognised that whilst the DMRB has been tested in UK planning case law, this has no bearing on Jersey and the manual carries no weight in planning decisions in the island. However, it does represent a robust tool for assessing the significance of the archaeological resource and the impact to that resource, particularly in the absence of island specific guidance.

11.15 This assessment considers all heritage assets, designated and non-designated. These include Listed Buildings, Listed Places, Areas of Archaeological Potential and Non-Designated Assets, mainly archaeological sites.

11.16 The assessment considers both temporary and permanent construction impacts on heritage assets. Temporary impacts will predominantly be impacts on setting through construction related activities and may be reversible; whereas permanent impacts are likely to be physical (direct or indirect) and relate to setting.

11.17 The process relies upon professional judgement at each stage and is not quantitative. However, how these judgements are reached and the rankings of value and magnitude of effects are observable facts (such as spatial relationships, number of heritage assets, their grades etc). As such, the Significance of Effects are given as a guide rather than a definitive determination.

## Assessment of Value/Sensitivity

11.18 The value and sensitivity of cultural heritage receptors is based upon Table 11.1 below. This assessment is based on the designated status of an asset and, as defined in the SPG (D2.4), expert judgement. It considers the *Criteria for the listing and grading of heritage assets* (Article 51 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 (amended)) and recognises that Jersey is still undergoing a review into its Historic Environment.

11.19 This assessment concludes that there is no reason to challenge the listing grades applied to historic buildings as part of the review. However, it also recognises that occasionally sites may have a lower or higher than average sensitivity within a local context.

**Table 11.1: Criteria for Assessing Heritage Value**

Criteria for Assessing Heritage Value		
Value	Criteria	Designation
VERY HIGH	Assets of acknowledged national or international importance, with outstanding qualities which contribute to its significance and can contribute significantly to acknowledged international research objectives; Historic landscapes of international value, whether designated or not; extremely well preserved historic landscapes with exceptional coherence, time-depth, or other critical factor(s).	World Heritage Sites or equivalent
HIGH	Buildings and places of exceptional public and heritage interest to Jersey and of more than Island wide importance, being outstanding examples of a particular historical period, architectural style, building type or archaeological site; Buildings and places of special public and heritage interest to Jersey, being important, high quality examples of a particular historical period, architectural style, building type or archaeological site, that are either substantially unaltered or whose alterations contribute to its special interest.	Listed Building or Place: Grade 1 and 2
MEDIUM	Buildings and places of special public and heritage interest to Jersey, being important, good quality examples of a particular historical period, architectural style, building type, or archaeological site; but with alterations that reduce the special interest and/or particular elements worthy of listing.	Listed Building or Place: Grade 3
LOW	Buildings and places of special public and heritage interest to Jersey, being good examples+ of a particular historical period, architectural style or building type; but defined particularly for their exterior characteristics and contribution to townscape, landscape or group value. Assets of local important; Assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations; Assets of limited value, but with potential to contribute to local research objectives;	Listed Building or Place: Grade 4; Undesignated Archaeological Assets
NEGLIGIBLE	Assets with very little or no surviving archaeological interest; Buildings of little or no architectural or historical note; buildings of an intrusive character; Landscapes with little or no significant historical interest	
UNKNOWN	The importance of the resource has not been ascertained; Buildings with some hidden (i.e. inaccessible) potential for historic significance.	

## Assessment of Magnitude

11.20 The impact to the asset from the proposed scheme will be assessed in accordance with the criteria outlined in Table 11.2 below.

**Table 11.2: Criteria for assessing the magnitude of impact\***

Magnitude of Impact	
Magnitude	Impact
EXTREME	Effects that are of extreme magnitude are the key factors in determining an application. They are generally effects that will impact on the Island as a whole or involve features that are so unique that, if lost, could not be replaced.
MAJOR	Change to most or all key archaeological materials, historic building elements or historic landscape components, such that the asset is totally altered. Comprehensive changes to setting. Major effects are important considerations and are generally effects that will impact at a Parish level
MODERATE	Changes to many key archaeological materials, historic building elements or historic landscape components, such that the asset is significantly modified. Considerable changes to setting that affect the character of the asset. These effects are important at a local level which cumulatively could lead to a greater overall impact.
MINOR	Changes to key archaeological materials, historic building elements or historic landscape components such that the asset is slightly altered. Slight changes to setting, such that it is noticeably changed. Although these effects are important to consider for the development project, they are unlikely to be of importance to the determination of the application.
NEGLIGIBLE	Very minor changes to archaeological materials, historic building elements or historic landscape components or setting that hardly affect it.
NO CHANGE	No change

\*Based on EIA SPG and DMRB

## Assessment of Significance of Effects

11.21 Effects have been evaluated by combining the assessment of both the value/sensitivity of an asset and the magnitude of impact, to predict the significance of the effect (see Table 11.3). These effects can be beneficial or adverse, temporary or permanent and are dependent on the nature of the development, the mitigation and any enhancement measures.

11.22 The Department of the Environment (SoJ) SPG on Environmental Impact Assessment does not determine what effects are considered significant. Therefore, in accordance with DMRB guidance, Moderate or Moderate/Large effects and above are considered to

be Significant. However, where the significance of the effect is considered to be moderate/slight this is not considered to be Significant.

**Table 11.3: Criteria for determining the significance of the effect**

Significance of the effect						
Heritage Value	<i>Very High</i>	Neutral	Slight	Moderate/large	Large or very large	Very large
	<i>High</i>	Neutral	Slight	Moderate/slight	Moderate/large	Large/very large
	<i>Medium</i>	Neutral	Neutral/Slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate/large
	<i>Low</i>	Neutral	Neutral/Slight	Neutral/Slight	Slight	Slight/moderate
	<i>Negligible</i>	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral/ Slight	Neutral/ Slight	Slight
	<i>No change</i>	<i>Negligible</i>	<i>Minor</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Major</i>	
Magnitude of Impact						

## Study Area

11.23 The Study Area places the development in its local and historic context and provides a more robust impact assessment in context. The data has been obtained from the States of Jersey Listed Buildings or Places database and the Historic Environment Record compiled by Heritage Planning Services.

11.24 Direct physical impacts to assets away from the development itself will not occur and therefore it is the impact to the setting of those assets that needs to be considered.

11.25 As part of this review the scope of heritage assets was defined as:

- All Grade 1 and 2 designated assets whose setting will be affected by the development;
- All designated assets in the streets immediately adjacent to the development;
- All non-designated assets (e.g. archaeological sites) within 500m.

## Baseline

### Archaeology: General Hospital site

11.26 A full description of the archaeological background of the red line boundary is presented in the Heritage Desk-Based Assessment (Appendix H-1) and is only summarised here.

- 11.27 The red line boundary is located within the designated St Helier Area of Archaeological Potential (AAP). The SoJ Supplementary Planning Guidance on Archaeology (2008) states that the basis for defining the designation of an AAP is *where there exists evidence of known archaeological significance, based on the listing or registration of one or more archaeological Site of Scientific Interest (SSI) or an Archaeological Site (AS), but where it is possible to infer the likelihood of the survival of other archaeological material; where there are find spots of limited artefact evidence, or where other documentary evidence might indicate the potential existence of archaeology* (SPG: 8).
- 11.28 A number of archaeological sites are known within the redline boundary and the Study Area. Those which may be affected by the proposed JFH are discussed below. None of the archaeological sites mentioned are designated as Archaeological Sites (AS) or Listed Buildings or Places under the States of Jersey criteria. They are thus non-designated assets, most of which are subterranean, potentially no longer survive physically or are unlikely to be impacted directly or indirectly by the proposed JFH, but nevertheless contribute to an understanding of character and potential of the archaeological resource.
- 11.29 Even though the site was likely marginal and perhaps even marsh land during the prehistoric period, Prehistoric activity has been recorded in the vicinity, although nothing has been found directly on the proposed development site. For example, a Late Bronze Age gold torc was found in Lewis street to the west, whilst Iron Age activity is located to the south at Broad Street and to the east at the Parade/Old Street.
- 11.30 Gallo-Roman activity is also fairly well defined in the Study Area and appears to congregate around the Parade, in close proximity to the redline boundary. A Roman coin hoard of 12 coins was found directly on the hospital site itself, whilst evidence for possible occupation came from the Parade/Old Street. It has been suggested by a number of archaeologists (such as Emeritus Professor Barry Cunliffe and local island archaeologist Charlotte Hotton) that the Parade was the focus of activity in the Roman period and there may have been a harbour facility nearby. At present this level of occupation is conjecture, however the presence of Gallo-Roman activity in the area is evidenced by the coin hoard.
- 11.31 There is little to suggest that the area within the redline boundary was utilised for settlement or cultivation during the post-Roman and Medieval periods. Unlike the Prehistoric and Roman periods where evidence comes from a variety of locations around the site, Early and Later Medieval activity is very much confined to the east of the Site, specifically at Old Street where a 7th century building has been recorded. Various excavations in St Helier have contributed evidence towards plotting the Medieval expansion of St Helier, this evidence suggests that the Site lay to the east of the Medieval settlement core. In fact, evidence suggests that there may have been a



contraction of the Medieval development with Old Street being possibly the most westerly limit.

- 11.32 During the 18th century there is clear expansion of the town. The Parade develops as a series of buildings with rear garden plots and in 1765 the first Hospital was constructed. By the time the second hospital was built in the late 18th century, some semblance of Gloucester Street had begun to form with buildings appearing opposite the hospital complex.
- 11.33 By 1834, urbanisation had expanded rapidly. Not only had much of the eastern part of Gloucester Street formed, but so to had George Street (later Kensington Place) and Elizabeth Place, so that the Hospital had become contained within this expansion.
- 11.34 In 1811 Newgate Prison was constructed adjacent to the hospital and by the later 19<sup>th</sup> century the original theatre, later rebuilt as the Opera House, had been constructed.

#### **Archaeology: Westaway Court site**

- 11.35 Based on the available evidence there is little to suggest that there was a prehistoric, Gallo-Roman or Early Medieval presence on the Project Site.
- 11.36 During the Medieval period it is likely that the site was part of the rural hinterland to St Helier, evidenced by nearby excavations which showed the presence of ridge and furrow.
- 11.37 Notably, this assessment identified the existence of hitherto unidentified archaeology in the form of a variety of historic buildings that had once occupied the Project Site. At one point these buildings were related to a formal garden. The earliest evidence for a building on site occur is the late 18th century, but by the middle to late 19th century, further buildings have been built.
- 11.38 By the early 20th century, those historic buildings appear to have been demolished and replaced by other buildings including a creche, which themselves were replaced by the building of the existing tower and low-rise blocks that were completed in 1976.
- 11.39 Despite this truncation there is some potential for the survival of archaeology, although it is unlikely to be of such significance to preclude development. Furthermore, it is noted that the current application involves minimal ground disturbance.
- 11.40 Therefore, it is considered that any further archaeological investigation could be secured through an appropriately worded planning condition.

## **Built Heritage (Listed Buildings and Places)**

11.41 A list of all designated assets within the Study Area can be found in Table 11-5 below.

### **Designated Grade 1 Listed Building - General Hospital, Entrance Lodge and Forecourt**

- 11.42 For clarity, the General Hospital (1860), Entrance Lodge (1877) and Forecourt are collectively referred to as the Designated Grade 1 Listed Building. Where referred to individually, the term Granite Block refers to the main Granite Block building, the Granite Entrance Lodge to the 1877 Entrance Lodge and the Forecourt to the forecourt and the Granite Bell Tower to the bell tower. The term hospital is used to refer to the original buildings on site and occasionally the Granite Block.
- 11.43 Originally constructed as a Poor House in 1765, the hospital was twice destroyed by fire before it was rebuilt in 1860 and survives in the form seen today, the Granite Block. The Granite Entrance Lodge fronting Gloucester Street was built in 1877.
- 11.44 The Granite Block is set within a mixed modern development of varying dates and design, but all the original historical features that contributed to the immediate historic setting of the hospital, such as the formal gardens and later the chapel, have been destroyed by modern development.
- 11.45 In its original 18<sup>th</sup> century form, the Hospital was set within formal grounds, with a path from Gloucester Street leading to the main entrance and passing through gardens. Thus, the historic setting would have been defined by an open aspect towards Gloucester Street and northeast towards the Parade. By the latter part of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, buildings had already begun to appear on Gloucester Street, opposite the northern range of the Hospital and its grounds. At this point the hospital entrance would have looked out across the rear gardens of properties fronting the Parade and towards the emerging town of St Helier. However, the Richmond map of 1795 (surveyed earlier) places a row of buildings directly opposite the Hospital entrance.
- 11.46 By the time the Granite Block was built in 1860 much of Gloucester Street had developed. As such, the original views across St Helier would have been curtailed. The upper storeys of the Granite Block are visible from sites such as Fort Regent, but such visibility is limited from St Helier itself. It is likely, therefore, that views from Gloucester Street and Parade Gardens (rather than wider views to or from St Helier) were the important elements that contributed to the setting of the Granite Block and continue to do so today.
- 11.47 There is still a clear visual, architectural and historic association between the Granite Block and the Granite Entrance Lodge fronting Gloucester Road. This connection is vital and contributes to the value of the asset.

- 11.48 The granite belfry, located south of the Granite Entrance Lodge is not contemporary, but was relocated from the hospital chapel that was demolished in 1984. Whilst, it remains an important historic feature that adds to the heritage value of the Grade 1 Listed Building, this is to a far lesser extent than the connection between the Granite Block and the Granite Entrance Lodge. Indeed, it appears somewhat incongruous in its present location.
- 11.49 Both Peter Crill House and the later hospital blocks on the Parade significantly restrict views to the Granite Block. Whilst the Granite Entrance Lodge is visible at street level, only the southern wing of the Granite Block can be seen from the Parade.
- 11.50 The immediate setting of the Granite Block and Lodge has already been compromised by development of the temporary theatre building, which interrupts views from Gloucester Street to the Hospital and between the Hospital and the Granite Entrance Lodge.
- 11.51 The Granite Block and Granite Entrance Lodge are heritage assets of **high** value, as attested by their statutory designation as Grade 1 buildings. The setting of these assets within the street scene strongly contributes to this, but the wider setting adds little historically and has already been impacted by later developments.

### **Opera House**

- 11.52 The Opera House is a Grade 2 Listed Building and an impressive example of a late 19<sup>th</sup> century style, albeit rebuilt in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It is comparable to examples in Britain.
- 11.53 Its setting has been somewhat diminished by larger modern buildings in the commercial district at the western end of Gloucester Street. However, it remains a considerable presence on the street scene and one of the most distinctive buildings in the street. Internally the building has greater architectural value.
- 11.54 The setting of the building is important in regard to the approach to it. There is no suggestion that views from the building, either up Gloucester Street or across Newgate Street contribute to the value of the asset. When the theatre was first constructed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, it would have looked out across Newgate Street to the high wall of the prison. There is little to suggest that such views were important and certainly the architecture of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century implies that there were no balconies that provided views out to the street. The modern glazed extension projecting from the first floor contains an extension to the foyer bar. It does not afford a clear view of the Granite Block owing to the distance and intervening structures.
- 11.55 As such, it is the approach to the Opera House and not the views from it that contribute to its value historically. Nevertheless, it adds to the existing street scene.

11.56 The Opera House is considered to be a heritage asset of **High** value. The street scene contributes to this, but not to the same scale as the Granite Block.

### **Gloucester Street**

11.57 There are a number of other listed properties on Gloucester Street (nos.13, 15, 17, 19 & 25), forming parts of earlier 19<sup>th</sup> century terraced houses as shown on the 1834 Le Gros map. It is possible that these were late 18<sup>th</sup> century in date, as buildings are shown in the general location on earlier maps.

11.58 Some external features survive (including fluted pilasters incorporating rare scallop shell and ball ornaments on two of the buildings) but their significance is derived from their group value and the contribution they make to the street scene.

11.59 No.25 is listed Grade 3. Nos.13, 15, 17 & 19 are listed Grade 4.

### **Kensington Place**

11.60 There are a number of listed properties on Kensington Place (nos.5, 31, 35 & 37), all dating from the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. The most distinctive is No.5, located towards the eastern end of the street and listed at Grade 3. Nos 31, 35 & 37 are a closely related group located west of the junction with Kensington Street. They retain some original external features and contribute to the streetscape.

11.61 No.5 is listed at Grade 3. Nos 31, 35 & 37 are listed at Grade 4.

### **Elizabeth Place**

11.62 A series of Grade 3 terraced houses of early 19<sup>th</sup> century date as shown on the Le Gros map of 1834, retaining a number of original features, some external and some internal. They have value as a group.

11.63 Nos 4-5, 7, 8, 9 & 14 are listed at Grade 3. Nos. 3, 6 & 10 are listed at Grade 4.

### **Edward Place**

11.64 Nos. 2, 3 & 4 Edward Place are three terraced three-storey houses dating from the mid-nineteenth century, facing Parade Gardens. They are each listed at Grade 3. No.1 Edward Place was demolished in the 1980s to make way for the 1980s hospital block. The facades of the remaining houses have all been altered to some degree, but provide a visual closure to Elizabeth Place. No.5 at the corner of Edward Place and Kensington Place is more altered than the others and is not listed.

### **Savile Street**

- 11.65 Savile Street is a quiet residential street which adjoins the north side of the Westway Court site. Directly opposite the development, along the north side of the street, is a terrace of two-storey nineteenth-century houses. One of these (No.24, on the corner with Rouge Bouillon) is listed Grade 4.
- 11.66 There are other Grade 4 listed buildings in Savile Street located further from the Westway Court site. The nearest is the former corner shop at No.5 Savile Street which stands at a bend in the road. Other listed buildings in Savile Street are located further to the south, however the bend in the street means that they are visually separated from Westway Court.

### **Rouge Bouillon**

- 11.67 This section of the road near the junction with Savile Street and Parade Road is lined with nineteenth terraced houses, including a number of listed buildings. On the west side of the road, Nos 3 and 5 Rouge Bouillon are listed at Grade 3. On the east side of the road, No.4 and Nos.6-16 Rouge Bouillon are listed at Grade 3.

### **Parade Gardens**

- 11.68 Originating as a military parade ground, Parade Gardens was laid out in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century as an early public park. The smaller southern section of the park is dominated by an imposing granite monument to General Don. The larger northern section contains a bronze bust to Phillipe Baudains within a circular feature. All Saints Church is a classical building of 1835 (provisionally listed building) which provides a focal point on the east side of the park. Also on the east side of the park are two pairs of listed nineteenth-century villas: 1 & 2 Hampton Villas (both listed at Grade 3) and 3 & 4 Hampton Place (both listed at Grade 4).
- 11.69 Historically the Parade Gardens had a visual link with the Granite Block. When both were established they would have been inter-visible. They are roughly contemporary in date and are part of the westward expansion of St Helier.
- 11.70 This asset is listed at Grade 2 and therefore considered to have **high** value.

### **Peoples Park, Westmount Gardens and Lower Park and Victoria Park**

- 11.71 Peoples Park is a mid-late 19<sup>th</sup> century naturalistic seaside public park and recreational space of relatively simple design and retaining heritage value in Jersey as an early public park forming part of an extensive ensemble of 19<sup>th</sup> century public parks with Westmount Gardens and Victoria Park.

- 11.72 Westmount Gardens and Lower Park is a naturalistic cliffside seaside park of mid-late 19<sup>th</sup> century origins, with later alterations, which expertly exploits the topography to provide easy walks and marine views. Of heritage value in Jersey as an early and complex public park on the island representing part of the history of the island as a tourist resort and part of an ensemble with the contiguous Peoples and Victoria Parks
- 11.73 Victoria Park is a compact mid-19<sup>th</sup> century formal public park. Although its layout has been altered, particularly the replacement of the focal bandstand with the statue of Queen Victoria, and the loss of much of the original path network, the historic character as the contrasting element of a group of three contiguous public parks survives, and includes one of the few examples of Victorian public sculpture and a good quality public facility. It forms the formal pivot point between the two adjacent larger and naturalistic public parks, People's and Westmount Parks. It is of heritage value in Jersey as part of an extensive ensemble of 19<sup>th</sup> century public parks.
- 11.74 Neither of these parks had a visual connection to the Granite Block or the Red Line Boundary generally, nor can it be argued that views of St Helier formed part of their wider setting. By the time the parks were built the area west of the hospital, including George Street (now Kensington Place), Lewis Street and Cheapside, had all developed. In all likelihood, it was the views towards the sea and the castle that formed the setting of these parks.
- 11.75 Each of these three parks are listed at Grade 3 and are therefore considered to have **medium** value.

### **Fort Regent**

- 11.76 Fort Regent is the only substantial, and best-preserved, late Georgian fort in the Channel Islands. It is a key part of the history of fortifications in Jersey and the development of defensive theory and design in the context of a changing military environment, particularly the threat of French invasion.
- 11.77 As expected of a post-Medieval fortification, Fort Regent offers commanding views across the island and notably across St Helier towards and beyond the red line boundary towards Westmount.
- 11.78 There is no known historic visual connection between Fort Regent and Westmount, although undoubtedly it offers a contemporary view across St Helier to another dominant local landmark.
- 11.79 Fort Regent is listed at Grade 1 and is considered to have **high** value.

## Elizabeth Castle

- 11.80 Elizabeth Castle represents a magnificent architectural example of a multi-phase site. Historically important, the site has transitioned through major periods of British and European upheaval and change, and has consequently become a key heritage asset of extraordinary significance to Jersey.
- 11.81 An Augustine Abbey was founded by Guillaume Fitzhamon in the 12<sup>th</sup> century and although during the Medieval period the site underwent several alterations, it was not until the later part of the 16<sup>th</sup> century when works on what would become Elizabeth Castle began in earnest. The fortification was finally completed around AD 1600.
- 11.82 Elizabeth Castle is a visually dominating heritage asset, visible from much of the island and certainly many parts of St Helier. Historically, views from St Helier to the castle would have persisted until post-medieval expansion of the town.
- 11.83 Views from the castle towards St Helier are undoubtedly important, but it has no historical visual connection to any specific feature (such as a lookout tower), certainly when looking towards the red line boundary.
- 11.84 As such, the contribution that setting makes to the value of the asset is weighted more towards views to the castle than from it.
- 11.85 Elizabeth Castle is listed at Grade 1 and is considered to have **high** value.

## The Outline Planning Application

- 11.86 The outline planning is for *'the demolition of Stafford Hotel, Revere Hotel, 36-40 and 44 Kensington Place including Sutherland Court, and parts of the General Hospital including: Peter Crill House, Gwyneth Huelin Wing, link block, engineering block and chimney, 1960s and 1980s blocks on the Parade, temporary theatre block and Westaway Court. Phased construction of new hospital buildings at the General Hospital site and at Westaway Court, refurbishment of the Granite Block for continued non-clinical hospital use, improvements and construction of one half-deck of parking to Patriotic Street Car Park, and all associated landscaping and public realm, highways and access, plant and infrastructure works. Fixed matters: Means of Access. Matters reserved (by parameter plans): Scale and Mass; Siting; Landscaping; Appearance and Materials.'*

## Construction Phase Effects (including enabling works, demolition and construction)

- 11.87 The potential impacts can be both direct and indirect and are likely to include:

- Removal of structures attached to the Granite Block (Link Block attached on the south side, attachments to hospital buildings at the rear, 1960 Block and 1980s Block to the north);
- Interim measures to make good the Granite Block during construction phase;
- Demolition of Peter Crill House, Gwyneth Huelin Wing, Laboratory Block, Engineering Block, 1960 Block and 1980s Block, temporary theatre and the buildings along Kensington Place;
- Demolition of Westaway Court;
- Ground disturbance for construction activities including compounds, crane bases, access, foundations and associated services;
- Indirect setting impacts, including visual and aural impacts such as traffic and construction activity and plant (such as cranes).
- Construction of the Future Hospital and any associated compounds, crane bases and working areas

11.88 More details of these effects are discussed below and a summary is set out in Table 11.4.

### **Grade 1 Listed Building**

11.89 There are a number of direct construction impacts on the Grade 1 Listed Building, notably the exposure of the external historic fabric of the Granite Block through the removal of the Link Block and other attached structures to the rear and north sides.

11.90 The removal of modern extensions will fully expose the historic facades of the Granite Block. Whilst this will require mitigation works in terms of condition assessment and historic building recording, the result will be a significant opening up of the Granite Block's facades, greatly enhancing its setting and restoring the asset to something more closely resembling its origins. This must be seen as a Large beneficial effect.

11.91 The outline application includes the refurbishment of the Granite Block for continued non-clinical hospital use. Currently there are no detailed proposals for the internal and external refurbishment of the Granite Block and Entrance Block, or for the re-landscaping of the forecourt. These will be the subject of later planning applications. Therefore, it is not possible at this stage to predict with certainty the magnitude of impact or the significance of the effect. However, the work will be undertaken in accordance with Heritage Principles for future refurbishment works, incorporated within a stand-alone Design Principles document. This will help to ensure that works treat the building



sympathetically and appropriately, minimising harm and enhancing the character and appearance of the listed asset, both internally and externally.

- 11.92 There will undoubtedly be some impact on the setting of the heritage assets during construction. These are however temporary, and therefore the magnitude of the effect is considered negligible and resulting significance of the effect is considered negligible.

### **Listed Buildings in the vicinity of the development site**

- 11.93 Additional traffic, noise and dust arising from the Construction Phase will have a limited effect on heritage assets adjacent to the site and in neighbouring streets: Gloucester Street, Kensington Place, Edward Place, Elizabeth Place, Rouge Bouillon and Savile Street. Although there will be some changes to their setting, mainly through construction activity, the temporary nature of these effects will result in a negligible magnitude of effect. The significance of these effects on heritage will be negligible.

### **Non-Designated Archaeological Assets**

- 11.94 There is low-moderate potential for the occurrence of Prehistoric and Gallo-Roman activity on site and if they do occur they are likely to be of low value. Nevertheless, where such activity has been found in other excavation contexts it has tended to be at depths in excess of 2m below present ground level and as such may survive beneath even the developed parts of the site. When Peter Crill House was built the foundations do not appear to have been deep and therefore archaeology in this area may survive at shallower depths.
- 11.95 The magnitude of impacts to any archaeological remains should they be present, is anticipated to range from **negligible** to **major** dependant on the nature and extent of buried deposits. This would result in a predicted effect of significance of potential unknown activity ranging from **neutral** to **moderate/large**.
- 11.96 There is also **moderate/high** potential for Palaeoenvironmental deposits to survive within the Site footprint. The site is likely to have been on a liminal boundary between dryland and wetland. The occurrence of a gold torc and later Roman coin hoard imply some land availability for deposition (even if semi-waterlogged). Such a liminal zone is likely to have good Palaeoenvironmental potential. Such deposits are likely to be considered medium/high in terms of their value, but they are not features in themselves and therefore would not be reason for refusal and need not be retained in situ.
- 11.97 There is low potential for Early or Later Medieval activity to occur on site given its location removed from the medieval settlement core to the east, except for agricultural practices association with outlying cultivation. According to records the area was marshland, and excavations nearby have suggested it was on the dune edge. This does not rule out

Medieval archaeology, only that current evidence does not support it. If it does occur, agricultural related activity of Medieval origin it is likely to be of low value. The magnitude of impacts to any archaeological remains should they be present, is anticipated to range from Negligible to Major. This would result in a predicted effect of significance of potential unknown activity ranging from Neutral to Moderate/Large.

- 11.98 Previous building activity and Levelling works associated with the various phases of later hospital and prison related development and the 19th century development of the Westaway site are likely to have impacted upon any pre-dating archaeological deposits within their footprint. This may have resulted in their removal or the de-watering of any surviving paleo-environmental deposits. Visual inspection of the site revealed distinct differences in ground levels across the site with clear areas of build-up, reduction and slope. Any ground build-up has the potential to act as a buffer over archaeological deposits, safeguarding their removal. Given the differing levels across the site, this potential buffer is likely to only apply in localised pockets across the site, removal of pre-dating archaeological deposits through historic groundworks and building phases is more likely. There is Moderate/High potential for survival of archaeology related to the first two hospital buildings and Newgate Prison within the development footprint. If they survive they are likely to be considered **low-medium** heritage value. The magnitude of impacts to these archaeological remains, should they be present, is anticipated to range from **negligible** to **major**. This would result in a predicted effect of significance of potential unknown activity ranging from **neutral** to **moderate/large**.
- 11.99 There are no known archaeological monuments or events recorded on the Westaway Site. Examination of historic maps shows that prior to 1737 the Westaway Site was likely in agricultural/pastoral use. However, by the late 1780s (as shown on the Richmond map of 1795) a small building is identifiable at the southwest corner of the plot, fronting what would become Elizabeth Place. Further buildings were developed on the southwestern part of the Project Site by 1834, fronting Elizabeth Place and abutting Parade Gardens and these were probably a natural extension of the small building shown on the 1795 map, to form residential properties as part of the expansion of St Helier. By 1934, the 19th century buildings appear to have been knocked down and replaced.
- 11.100 As a result of the buildings identified on historic maps within the Westaway site boundary, a potential for survival of post-Medieval archaeology associated with these former phases of occupation has been identified. However, the site is likely to have been significantly truncated by the construction of the existing flats in the later 20th century. Where deposits do survive they are likely to be considered of **low- medium** heritage value. The magnitude of impacts to these archaeological remains, should they be present, is anticipated to range from **negligible to major**. This would result in a predicted effect of significance of potential unknown activity ranging from **neutral to moderate/large**.

**Table 11.4: Predicted effects on non-designated archaeological assets**

Name	Value	Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of effect
Archaeology	Low-Medium	Destruction of below ground archaeology through construction activity.	Negligible to Major	Neutral to Large/Very Large adverse
Geoarchaeology	High	Destruction of environmental deposits through construction and/or piling	Negligible to Major	Slight to Large/Very Large adverse

### Operational effects

11.101 During the Operational phase, impacts will be predominantly visual in nature, permanent and related to the setting of heritage assets. The location of listed assets likely to be affected by the development is shown in Figure 11.1. A summary of effects is set out in Table 11.5.

#### Granite Block and Granite Entrance Lodge

11.102 The plans for the proposed new hospital involve the construction of a new suite of buildings, replacing through demolition, Peter Crill House, the Gwyneth Huelin Wing, the Laboratory Block, the Engineering Block, the 1960 Block, the 1980s Block, temporary theatre block and buildings along Kensington Place. The scale and mass of the new development on the site of these buildings makes it significantly larger than the existing buildings on site with a demonstrable height increase, except on the site of the 1980s Block, where the proposed Entrance Block (Block C) will be significantly lower than the existing building. The parameter envelope shows the maximum height of this as 15.6m.

11.103 It is accepted that the mass of the proposed new Block B, considered in isolation, may have an adverse effect on the setting of the Grade 1 Listed Building and therefore an impact on its heritage value. The impact on its setting is illustrated in the TVIA Viewpoints 2, 3, 20 & 22. However, any harm caused by the increased mass of Block B is more than offset by the proposed development, which will make the asset more open, visually accessible and help to restore a semblance of its former historic context, all of which must be regarded as enhancing the assets and making a beneficial contribution to the heritage value of the Grade 1 Listed Building.

11.104 The proposed design of Block B incorporates setbacks at roof level, which serve to reduce the dominant form of the larger building, reducing any consideration of a “cliff-like character”. These set backs on the Gloucester Street frontage and along the southern side of the forecourt reduce the parapet height to 15.6m, with a set back floor rising to 20.6m. This compares with the parapet height of 17.2m on the Granite Block.

- 11.105 The proposed development incorporates a 6.4m-wide gap between the rear of the Granite Block and Block B which will increase to 11.5m at the upper levels. This will allow a continuous public circulation route on all four sides of the Granite Block, making it much less visually and physically constrained than it is currently.
- 11.106 Currently, Peter Crill House blocks views from various parts of Gloucester Street to the Hospital. Block B will be set back 4m from Gloucester Street, to match the existing set back of the southernmost part of Peter Crill House. This will be sufficient to permit a public access route between the boundary wall on the street and the front of Block B. This will create greater pedestrian route between the corner of Newgate Street, opposite the Opera House, and the forecourt of the Granite Block.
- 11.107 Whilst much of the Hospital building is visible from opposite the Entrance Lodge, as one moves further down Gloucester Street, those views are compromised by Peter Crill House. From the Opera House, only the upper story of the north range can be seen, although this is interrupted by the temporary theatre building in the Hospital grounds. As such, only fleeting glimpses of the 1860 Hospital building can be seen from street level, unless directly opposite the Entrance Lodge
- 11.108 The setting of the Entrance Lodge and the Forecourt will be significantly improved by returning this space to a vehicle-free amenity space. The removal of the 1960 Block and temporary theatre will open up new views from the forecourt towards Parade Gardens. Removal of the existing hard landscaping will enable a much more sympathetic and 'greener' treatment, incorporating lawned areas and trees. Re-grading of the forecourt, including removal of the existing vehicle ramp for emergency vehicles, will permit a much improved relationship to the Granite Block.
- 11.109 The setting of the Entrance Block will also be enhanced by the restoration of the landscaped forecourt between it and the Granite Block, and by restoring sections of the granite wall which once formed a continuous enclosure to the forecourt.
- 11.110 The proposed development will result in a far more open setting to the north and re-establish a relationship between the Granite Block and Parade Gardens. As such, a heritage asset that is currently visually and physically constrained will be enhanced by restoring some semblance of its original setting. Furthermore, the proposals include the introduction of public pedestrian routes around the Grade 1 Listed Building.
- 11.111 The principal benefits will be the restoration of the forecourt as a vehicle-free amenity space and the replacement of the 1960 Block with a landscaped area bordering the Parade. These works will restore part of the historic context and original setting of the 1860 hospital and providing greater public access. Whereas the building is currently crowded by unsympathetic development on each side, the proposed development will

restore it to being a free-standing building unencumbered by these constraints. This will be a very significant improvement to its setting.

- 11.112 Considered in isolation, the increased scale and mass of the proposed Block B would lead to an adverse impact on the setting of the Granite Block. However, taking into account the beneficial effects described above, the net impact will be decidedly positive. Furthermore, the adverse effect is capable of further mitigation through detailed design.

### **Opera House**

- 11.113 The Opera House is located less than 30m from the new proposed hospital building. The proposed Block B will be of a scale and mass larger than Peter Crill House. However, the corner of Block B will be no closer to the Opera House than Peter Crill House is currently, so there is no change in terms of proximity. The height of the parameter envelope for Block B (at this location fronting Gloucester Street) is 20.6m, with a set-back podium to a height of 15.6m along Newgate Street, Gloucester Street and facing the forecourt of the Granite Block. Thus the full height will not be immediately apparent from street level in Gloucester Street and Newgate Street.
- 11.114 The perimeter of Block B along Gloucester Street is designated as a primary frontage i.e. a zone for active retail and will thus offer a more active frontage than exists currently. The forecourt of Peter Crill House is used as a hospital car park and is not accessible from the street. The development allows a new pedestrian route between the Opera House and the forecourt of the Granite Block, where currently there is none, which will enhance the existing relationship. It is proposed to retain the historic sections of the former prison wall along Gloucester Street.
- 11.115 Currently, the magnitude of impact to this asset would be **minor**, with the resultant significance of effect considered to be **slight adverse**. However, the adverse effect of the greater mass of Block B could be substantially offset through the improved design quality of the replacement building compared to Peter Crill House, which does not make a positive contribution to the character of the street.

### **Gloucester Street**

- 11.116 The Listed Buildings on Gloucester Street, forming part of an early 19<sup>th</sup> century terrace, are situated nearly opposite the new proposed building.
- 11.117 Block B offers an active frontage at ground level and has the potential for a more attractive piece of architecture compared to the utilitarian and unwelcoming appearance of Peter Crill House.

- 11.118 The larger scale and mass of Block B compared to Peter Crill House could have a slight adverse impact on the setting of these assets. However, as with the Opera House, the upper storey of Block B is set back from the road side so the full height is not visible in views from street level in Gloucester Street.
- 11.119 The removal of the 1960 Block and temporary theatre block will have a significant beneficial effect by increasing the visual interconnection between Gloucester Street and Parade Gardens. It is considered that this positive effect outweighs any adverse effect from the increased mass of Block B compared to Peter Crill House.
- 11.120 The magnitude of impact to these assets would be **minor**, with the resultant significance of effect considered to be **neutral**.

### **Kensington Place**

- 11.121 Block A will replace a number of properties along the east side of Kensington Place. The increased height and length of this block will have a significant effect on character of the street and on the setting of the listed houses located on the opposite side of the street. The visual impact is illustrated in TVIA Viewpoints 4 & 7. The parameter envelope shows the height of Block A as 20.6m with a set-back from Kensington Place at a height of 15.6m.
- 11.122 The magnitude of impact to 5 Kensington Place (listed at Grade 3) would be **moderate**, with the resultant significance of effect considered to be **moderate**. This is a distinctive building in the street which currently faces the Engineering Block and the rear of 1 Edward Place. Its setting has already been compromised by the unattractive buildings opposite. There is potential to mitigate the adverse impact of the increased scale of Block A through design.
- 11.123 The magnitude of impact to 31, 35 & 37 Kensington Place (listed at Grade 4) would be **moderate**, with the resultant significance of effect considered to be **slight**. These are typical of the terraced houses which once lined both sides of the street.
- 11.124 There is potential to mitigate the adverse impact of the increased scale of Block A through design, including the articulation of the facades in a way which breaks up the mass of the building and avoids it appearing as a single horizontal monolith. The Design Principles submitted as part of the application suggest that, through the use of materials and local setbacks the Kensington Place frontage, Block A will be articulated as a series of buildings of relevant plot width to the existing grain of this street.

### **Edward Place**

- 11.125 The demolition of the 1980s Block will have a major effect on the setting of the three Grade 3 Listed Buildings in Edward Place (Nos.2, 3 & 4). These once formed a terrace

of five properties until No.1 was demolished as part of the development of the 1980s Block. The site of No.1 is now occupied by a ramp for vehicles servicing the hospital. This has left an exposed gable end on No.2 which is largely screened by the adjacent 1980s Block.

- 11.126 The proposed Entrance Block will be set back from the Parade and will be significantly lower compared to the 1980s Block, at a maximum height of 15.6m. This reduction in scale and proximity will be a major beneficial effect on the setting of Edward Place. However, the greater visibility of the exposed gable end of No.2 Edward Place will require a design solution which mitigates this potentially adverse effect.
- 11.127 The magnitude of impact to these assets would be **major**, with the resultant significance of effect considered to be **moderate/large**.

#### **Elizabeth Place**

- 11.128 The demolition of the 1980s Block will have a minor beneficial effect on the setting of the Listed Buildings at Elizabeth Place. Inter-visibility is softened by trees in Parade Gardens.
- 11.129 The replacement of Westaway Court will have an impact on the setting of the properties towards the north end of Elizabeth Place, most directly on No.14 – see below.
- 11.130 The magnitude of impact to these assets would be **minor**, with the resultant significance of effect considered to be **slight beneficial**.

#### **Savile Street**

- 11.131 The visual impact of the new development on the terraced houses on the north side of Savile Street is illustrated in Viewpoint 25. There will be a moderate impact on their setting given the greater proximity of the new development. However, given that the current Westaway Court buildings are unattractive and out-of-keeping with the character of the surrounding streets, there is considerable potential for any adverse impact due to proximity to be outweighed by the improved design quality of the new development.
- 11.132 There are other Grade 4 listed buildings in Savile Street located further from the Westaway Court site. The nearest is the former corner shop at No.5 Savile Street which stands at a bend in the road. There will be a slight improvement to its setting by the replacement of Westaway Court by a lower building. Other listed buildings in Savile Street are located further to the south and their setting will not be affected.

## Rouge Bouillon

- 11.133 Rouge Bouillon is a busy through road and a continuation of Elizabeth Place. Currently the tower of Westaway Court is a prominent feature on the skyline which comes into view as the road approaches Parade Gardens.
- 11.134 There will be a minor impact on the setting of designated assets in Rouge Bouillon arising from the difference in mass and scale of the new development compared to the existing buildings on Westaway Court. However, given that these buildings are unattractive and out-of-keeping with the character of the surrounding streets, there is considerable potential for the design quality of the new development to benefit their setting. However, the overall effect cannot be accurately predicted in advance of a detailed design.

## Parade Gardens

- 11.135 Although there was inter-visibility between the Parade Gardens and the Granite Block historically, this view has been blocked by the 1960 and 1980s blocks on the Parade. Following removal of the 1960 and 1980s Block there will be a new view of the Granite Block from Parade Gardens, and new views southwards along Gloucester Street. This is illustrated in Viewpoint 22 of the TVIA. The east side of the Granite Block, currently concealed, is a high-quality masonry façade which will be fully exposed in views from Parade Gardens.
- 11.136 There will be a new view of an improved hospital frontage consisting of the Entrance Block (Block C), which will be set back from the Parade, with the taller Block B behind it. The impact of these two blocks on the setting of Parade Gardens will be significantly less than the current impact of the 1960 and 1980s blocks.
- 11.137 The proposed development will have a major positive effect by restoring views between Parade Gardens and the Granite Block. This will also improve the backdrop of the Don Monument when viewed from the south end of Parade Gardens.
- 11.138 The magnitude of impact on Parade Gardens from development on the General Hospital site would be **moderate**, with the resultant significance of effect considered to be **moderate/large beneficial**.
- 11.139 The redevelopment of Westaway Court will introduce a larger building on the opposite side of the Gardens. This increase in scale, taken in isolation, will have an adverse impact on the setting of the Gardens and the nearby listed buildings in Hampton Place and Elizabeth Place. However the existing buildings on this site are poorly related to their surroundings and there is considerable potential to mitigate the increase in scale by improving the quality of design. The outline proposals show that the new building will introduce a more active street frontage.



11.140 The magnitude of impact on Parade Gardens from development on the Westaway site would be **minor**, with the resultant significance of effect considered to be **slight adverse**.

### **Peoples Park, Westmount Gardens and Lower Park and Victoria Park**

11.141 The increased scale and mass of the proposed new hospital building will be visible from these assets. However the elements of setting that contribute to the heritage value of these parks does not derive from views towards St Helier, or where it does, this is only a minor element in the contribution to value. It is the views to and from the sea that contribute to this value.

11.142 The upper storeys of the new building will be visible in some views from higher ground. This is illustrated by Viewpoint 11 of the TVIA which shows the view from the footpath besides Westmount Road. From here the new hospital will be seen against the background of a varied surrounding townscape. Although lower than the 1980s building, it will have a larger mass.

11.143 The upper storeys of the new hospital building will be visible in some views from the lower areas of these parks. This is demonstrated by Viewpoint 10 of the TVIA which shows the upper storeys rising above the roofline of buildings in Peirson Road, many of which are listed, and silhouetted against the skyline

11.144 The magnitude of impact to these assets would be **minor**, with the resultant significance of effect considered to be **slight adverse / neutral**.

### **Fort Regent**

11.145 Fort Regent dominates the town centre of Fort Helier. Its robust defensive character and height above the town make its setting relatively immune to changes in the town below. From the ramparts the upper parts of the proposed development would be visible on the far side of the town centre of St Helier, set against the backdrop of Westmount – see Viewpoint 14 of the TVIA.

11.146 In the context of this very varied townscape, composed of buildings of varying heights and character, the appearance of the development would merge with the varied grain of St Helier that already dominates the setting.

11.147 Any consideration of the impact to the setting of Fort Regent should be weighted to views towards the Fort as it was clearly designed to be a prominent visual place. While undoubtedly it also served as a lookout, there is no historic visual association to or from another heritage asset when looking across towards the proposed development.

11.148 As such it is considered that the impact to this asset would be **negligible** with a resultant significance of effect being **slight adverse**.

## Elizabeth Castle

- 11.149 Elizabeth Castle a Grade 1 listed asset, located approximately 1.3km southwest of the red line boundary on a granite promontory in St Helier harbour.
- 11.150 The proposed hospital development will be lower than the existing 1980s Block and will be set further back from than existing modern development along the waterfront. It is also partly screened by the Radisson Hotel.
- 11.151 Visitors to Elizabeth Castle, looking back to St Helier will not see a higher building, but one at the same height as other developments along the waterfront. The view from the entrance gate of the Castle is illustrated in Viewpoint 15. This confirms that the proposed new hospital building is barely visible
- 11.152 Due to this, it is predicted that the Magnitude of Impact would be **negligible**. Ultimately, it is considered that the significance of effect would be **slight adverse**.

**Table 11.5: Predicted effects on designated assets** (see also Figure 11.1)

Asset	Listing Grade	Heritage value – see note below	Impact on setting - see note below	Overall impact	Comments
General Hospital HE1003	Grade 1	High	Major	Large/very large	Both positive and negative impacts. Impacts on setting are illustrated by TVIA Viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 20 & 22.
Jersey Opera House HE0220	Grade 2	High	Moderate	Moderate/slight	Faces down Newgate Street, almost directly opposite proposed development
13 Gloucester Street HE1002	Grade 4	Low	Moderate	Slight	Everton House. Early-nineteenth century house, directly opposite the site of Peter Crill House
15 Gloucester Street HE0221	Grade 4	Low	Moderate	Slight	Early-nineteenth century house, directly opposite the site of Peter Crill House
17 Gloucester Street HE0214	Grade 4	Low	Moderate	Slight	Early-nineteenth century house, directly opposite the site of Peter Crill House
19 Gloucester	Grade 4	Low	Moderate	Slight	Early-nineteenth century house, directly

Asset	Listing Grade	Heritage value – see note below	Impact on setting - – see note below	Overall impact	Comments
Street HE0222					opposite the site of Peter Crill House
25 Gloucester Street HE0113	Grade 3	Medium	Moderate	Slight	Early-nineteenth century house, directly opposite the site of Peter Crill House and adjacent to Opera House
10 Patriotic Place – ‘Rosedale’ HE1288	Grade 4	Low	No change	Neutral	Setting has already been overwhelmed by adjacent development. Development unlikely to be visible.
14 Patriotic Street HE0392	Grade 4	Low	Negligible	Neutral/slight	Retained Art Deco-style façade adjacent to Patriotic Street carpark. Setting has already been overwhelmed by adjacent development and development behind façade.
5 Kensington Place HE 1142	Grade 3	Medium	Moderate	Moderate	A mid-late C19 terraced house. Directly opposite proposed energy centre at north end of Kensington Place.
31 Kensington Place HE 0288	Grade 4	Low	Moderate	Slight	A mid-late C19 terraced house. Directly opposite proposed Block A.
35 Kensington Place HE 1144	Grade 4	Low	Moderate	Slight	A mid-late C19 terraced house. Directly opposite proposed Block A.
37 Kensington Place HE 0290	Grade 4	Low	Moderate	Slight	A mid-late C19 terraced house. Directly opposite proposed Block A.
2 Edward Place HE1266	Grade 3	Medium	Major	Moderate/large	One of a terrace of three mid-19th century houses

Asset	Listing Grade	Heritage value – see note below	Impact on setting - see note below	Overall impact	Comments
3 Edward Place HE1267	Grade 3	Medium	Major	Moderate/large	One of a terrace of three mid-19th century houses
4 Edward Place HE1268	Grade 3	Medium	Major	Moderate/large	One of a terrace of three mid-19th century houses
3 Elizabeth Place HE 0986	Grade 4	Low	Minor	Slight	Early nineteenth-century house facing Parade Gardens shown. One of a group (3-10 Elizabeth Place) shown on Le Gros Map of 1834
4-5 Elizabeth Place HE 0213	Grade 3	Medium	Minor	Slight	As above
6 Elizabeth Place HE 0987	Grade 4	Low	Minor	Slight	As above
7 Elizabeth Place HE 0988	Grade 3	Medium	Minor	Slight	As above
8 Elizabeth Place HE 0114	Grade 3	Medium	Minor	Slight	As above
9 Elizabeth Place HE 0989	Grade 3	Medium	Minor	Slight	As above
10 Elizabeth Place HE 0990	Grade 4	Low	Minor	Slight	As above
14 Elizabeth Place HE 0991	Grade 3	Medium	Major	Moderate/large	Helvetia House School. Increase in scale of development opposite shown in Viewpoint 25.
Parade Gardens HE1915	Grade 2	High	Major	Moderate/large	Positive impact of reduced scale of Entrance Building shown in Viewpoint 22. Increased scale of Westaway Court shown in Viewpoints 21 & 23.



Asset	Listing Grade	Heritage value – see note below	Impact on setting - see note below	Overall impact	Comments
All Saints Chapel, Savile Street HE1275	Potential listed building	Medium	Minor	Slight	Neo-classical church and chapel prominently situated on east side of Parade Gardens. Considered equivalent to a Grade 2 listed building.
5 Savile Street HE 1533	Grade 3	Medium	Minor	Slight	Corner shop, end of terrace. Potential benefit.
24 Savile Street HE 1542	Grade 4	Low	Major	Moderate	Pair with no.22. Increase in scale of development opposite shown in Viewpoint 25.
1 Hampton Villas, Hampton Place HE1074	Grade 3	Medium	Minor	Slight	Facing Parade Gardens
2 Hampton Villas, Hampton Place HE1075	Grade 3	Medium	Minor	Slight	Facing Parade Gardens
3 Hampton Place	Grade 4	Low	Minor	Slight	Facing Parade Gardens
4 Hampton Place	Grade 4	Low	Minor	Slight	Facing Parade Gardens
3 Rouge Bouillon HE 1369	Grade 3	Medium	Moderate	Slight	Nos 3, 5, 7 & 9 form a group, but only 3 & 5 are listed
5 Rouge Bouillon HE 1370	Grade 3	Medium	Moderate	Moderate	Nos 3, 5, 7 & 9 form a group, but only 3 & 5 are listed
4 Rouge Bouillon HE1391	Grade 4	Low	Moderate	Slight	
6 Rouge Bouillon HE 0439	Grade 3	Medium	Moderate	Moderate	Nos 6 - 16 form a mid C19 terrace group
8 Rouge Bouillon HE1393	Grade 3	Medium	Moderate	Moderate	Nos 6 - 16 form a mid C19 terrace group
10 Rouge Bouillon HE 1394	Grade 3	Medium	Moderate	Moderate	Nos 6 - 16 form a mid C19 terrace group
12 Rouge Bouillon	Grade 3	Medium	Moderate	Moderate	Nos 6 - 16 form a mid C19 terrace group

Asset	Listing Grade	Heritage value – see note below	Impact on setting - – see note below	Overall impact	Comments
HE 0663					
14 Rouge Bouillon HE 0439	Grade 3	Medium	Moderate	Moderate	Nos 6 - 16 form a mid C19 terrace group
16 Rouge Bouillon HE 1395	Grade 3	Medium	Moderate	Moderate	Nos 6 - 16 form a mid C19 terrace group
Victoria Park HE1916	Grade 3	Medium	Minor	Slight	See Viewpoint 10 of the TVIA
Peoples Park HE1897	Grade 3	Medium	Minor	Slight	
3 Peirson Road HE1292	Grade 4	Low	Negligible	Neutral/Slight	
5-6 Peirson Road HE1293	Grade 4	Low	Negligible	Neutral/Slight	
13 Peirson Road (Park Lodge) HE0639	Grade 3	Medium	Negligible	Neutral/Slight	
The New Park, Pierson Road	Grade 3	Medium	Negligible	Neutral/Slight	
17-19 Peirson Road HE1291	Grade 4	Low	Negligible	Neutral/Slight	
20 Peirson Road HE1294	Grade 3	Medium	Negligible	Neutral/Slight	
21 Peirson Road HE 0393	Grade 3	Medium	Negligible	Neutral/Slight	
22 Peirson Road HE1295	Grade 3	Medium	Negligible	Neutral/Slight	
23 Peirson Road HE1296	Grade 3	Medium	Negligible	Neutral/Slight	
24 Peirson Road	Grade 3	Medium	Negligible	Neutral/Slight	



Asset	Listing Grade	Heritage value – see note below	Impact on setting - – see note below	Overall impact	Comments
HE1297					
25 Peirson Road (Park View Villa) HE 0394	Grade 3	Medium	Negligible	Neutral/Slight	
26 Peirson Road HE1298	Grade 3	Medium	Negligible	Neutral/Slight	
27 Peirson Road HE1299	Grade 4	Low	Negligible	Neutral/Slight	
28 Peirson Road HE1300	Grade 4	Low	Negligible	Neutral/Slight	
29 Peirson Road HE1301	Grade 4	Low	Negligible	Neutral/Slight	
Grand Hotel, Peirson Road HE1302	Grade 4	Low	Negligible	Neutral	
Jewish Cemetery HE1901	Grade 2	High	No change	Neutral	
German Casemate, Esplanade HE 0955	Grade 2	High	No change	Neutral	
Westmount Gardens HE1899	Grade 3	Medium	Minor	Slight	New development will be visible in high-level views across St Helier. See Viewpoint 11.
Elizabeth Castle HE1426	Grade I	High	Negligible	Slight	New development will be barely visible in views towards St Helier and seen in the context of other busy townscape and tall buildings. See Viewpoint 15.
Fort Regent HE1195	Grade I	High	Minor	Moderate/slight	New development will be visible in high-level views across St Helier but seen against the

Asset	Listing Grade	Heritage value – see note below	Impact on setting - – see note below	Overall impact	Comments
					backdrop of Westmount. See Viewpoint 14.
Noirmont Point BR0247	(various)	High	Negligible	Slight	New development will be almost imperceptible in views across St Aubyn’s Bay towards St Helier. See Viewpoint 18.
Nos 1 -10 Almorah Crescent HE 0001 etc	Grade 1	High	Minor	Moderate/slight	New development will be visible in high-level views across St Helier but less conspicuous than the 1980s block and hospital chimney are currently. See Viewpoint 27.
Almorah Crescent Communal Gardens HE 1908	Grade 2	High	Minor	Moderate/slight	As above.

## Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

### Construction mitigation

11.153 Details of mitigation measures can be found in Appendix H-1 (Heritage Impact Assessment). They will be secured in a set of binding heritage principles contained in the Design Principles, submitted for approval. This document provides an approach to works that will need to take place during construction. They are summarised below.

### ***Removal of extensions to Granite Block***

11.154 The development includes the removal of various links and extensions (link block attached on the south side, attachments to Gwyneth Huelin Building at rear, 1960 Block and 1980s Block to the north. To understand the impacts that could be caused to the Granite Block through the demolition of these structures, a Conservation Statement based on archival research and a Standing Building Survey (SBS) will be undertaken prior to works to determine the historic fabric of each of affected facades of the Granite Block.



- 11.155 This will lead to the production of a conservation mitigation strategy to be applied during demolition and removal works and following such works. This strategy will detail the method of demolition of the structures to be removed.
- 11.156 The effect of removing these extensions and linkages will be to expose substantial areas of the original granite facades which are currently concealed from view. The whole of the north façade, more than half of the south façade and parts of the rear facade will thus be exposed to view.
- 11.157 The demolition will be monitored by a suitably qualified historic building specialist to record and advance understanding of any historic features not accessible during the SBS.
- 11.158 Provided the SBS is undertaken and the conservation mitigation strategy is produced and then applied, the resultant effects should change to **major beneficial**.

### ***Archaeology***

- 11.159 Further field investigation is required to fully understand the effects of the FJH on the buried archaeological resource (for example, it is unclear how well, if at all, Newgate Prison survives). It is proposed that a programme of archaeological evaluation be agreed with the States of Jersey. This will require a Method Statement approved by the Historic Environment service. The results will inform any subsequent mitigation strategy. With these measures in place, and assuming no significant remains of a higher value are found, the overall impact should be reduced to **neutral**, for whilst the archaeology will be destroyed it will be preserved by record and in accordance with Policy HE 5 of the Island Plan (2011).

### ***Geoarchaeology and Palaeoenvironmental***

- 11.160 It is recommended that a programme of targeted geoarchaeological and palaeo-environmental investigation be carried out following the demolition phase incorporating the removal of Peter Crill House, Stafford and Revere Hotels, 33-40 (including Sutherland Court), Westaway Court and 44 Kensington Place.
- 11.161 The aim of the geoarchaeological and palaeo-environmental investigations will be to produce a basic model of the sub-surface stratigraphy, and to evaluate the potential of the sedimentary sequences for reconstructing the environmental history of the site and its environs.
- 11.162 The investigations may comprise borehole sampling to establish the potential for the survival and significance of geoarchaeological and palaeo-environmental evidence and to reference this to previously identified sequences.

11.163 With these measures in place, and assuming no significant remains of a higher value are found, the overall impact should be reduced to **neutral**, whilst for the geoarchaeology and palaeo-environmental evidence will be destroyed, it will be preserved by record and in accordance with Policy HE 5 of the Island Plan (2011).

### **Operation mitigation**

#### ***Grade 1 Listed Building***

11.164 The removal of extensions and linking structures on all sides of the Granite Block will allow it to be seen as a free-standing building with its repaired facades completely revealed to view. Furthermore, the removal of vehicle access and parking from the forecourt of the Granite Block and its reinstatement as a hospital garden will significantly enhance its setting.

11.165 Block B will be physically separated from the Granite Block by a 6.4m-wide pedestrian route running along its rear and south facades. This detachment will help to reinforce the Granite Block's special character as a distinct heritage asset.

11.166 The Design Principles submitted with the application state that the Newgate Street and Gloucester Street frontages will respect the more 'institutional' scale of these streets. A consistent elevational treatment will allow for these façades to present a robust and coherent material language which respects the adjacent Granite Block and presents a formal frontage to the Granite Block forecourt.

11.167 The design at street level, the setbacks at the upper levels and the introduction of new public realm are clear positives that enhance the asset. The Granite Block in particular, will no longer be obscured and subservient to the other structures, but will stand out as a free-standing heritage asset. The overall impact is considered to be **moderate beneficial**.

11.168 Impacts on the buried archaeological resource are limited to the construction phase of the development. Once operational, there would be no further impact on buried archaeological deposits.

### **Conclusions**

11.169 It is recognised that there will be impacts to most of the key heritage assets assessed in this chapter and that these comprise a range of positive and negative effects. The greatest impact is likely to be upon the Grade 1 Listed General Hospital 1860, comprising the Granite Block, Entrance Lodge and Forecourt. As noted above, any adverse impact to the setting of the Grade 1 Listed Building through the increased mass and scale of the proposed development will be more than offset through the

removal of various extensions and linkages which currently have a major adverse effect on its appearance, and by significant improvements to its immediate setting.

- 11.170 In neighbouring streets, there is potentially some adverse impact on the setting of listed buildings, most noticeably in Kensington Place where there is a significant contrast between the domestic scale of these nineteenth-century houses and the scale of the proposed Block B. These impacts are capable of being mitigated through design. In Gloucester Street, the slight increase in proximity of Block B to the street can be offset by improving circulation and ground-level activity along this frontage.
- 11.171 The removal of the 1960 Block and 1980s Block will have a significant beneficial impact on the setting of Parade Gardens. The latter building is especially prominent in many longer views in and around St Helier, and its replacement with a lower building, albeit of a greater footprint, will be a net benefit to the historic townscape.
- 11.172 The upper levels of the new development will be visible in longer views, including those from Westmount, Almorah Crescent and Fort Regent, and to a lesser extent from Elizabeth Castle and Noirmont. However, the top of the proposed hospital will be lower than the existing 1980s Block and will be seen in the context of a varied local townscape which already includes numerous buildings of similar height. The proposal to vary the roofline will help to mitigate the scale of the new building as seen in longer views.
- 11.173 The proposed building on the site of Westaway Court will appear larger than the existing buildings, although its maximum height will be 7.5m lower than the parapet height of the existing 9-storey tower. The new development promises to be better related to surrounding streets and will introduce a more active street frontage. The overall effect on the setting of listed assets, including Parade Gardens and listed properties in Elizabeth Place, Rouge Bouillon, Savile Street and Hampton Place, is considered to be neutral.
- 11.174 In terms of buried archaeology, a limited potential exists for the survival of prehistoric, Roman and medieval deposits within the Westaway and Hospital sites. This potential is enhanced for the Post-medieval period when map evidence proves the existence of 18th and 19th century buildings on the site. The high concentration of development across both sites is however likely to have removed pre-dating archaeological deposits the site, therefore limiting archaeological potential particularly from earlier periods. Ground works associated with the proposed development holds carry the potential to impact on any surviving in situ archaeological deposits within their footprint. Given the high level of previous impact, the loss of potential buried archaeology is likely to be localised and limited to deposits of low significance.

- 11.175 In addition to the mitigation measures identified above, there are a considerable number of further enhancements to the Grade 1 listed building and its setting which could be secured in the course of this development. These are identified in the Heritage Impact Assessment.
- 11.176 An accurate prediction of impacts and effects is difficult to make at the stage of an outline application. However, based on the current information and plans, a conservative assessment is that the impacts are considered to be overall beneficial to heritage interests. Further detailed design work based on the design principles and heritage commitments submitted as part of the application could help to mitigate any adverse impacts and confirm that the development is capable of yielding considerable benefits to heritage.



- KEY**
- Grade 1
  - Grade 2
  - Grade 3
  - Grade 4
  - Monuments and Churches
  - Development Site Boundary

- 01 4, 6-16 Rouge Bouillon
- 02 3, 5 Rouge Bouillon
- 03 14 Elizabeth Place
- 04 24 Savile Street
- 05 5 Savile Street
- 06 3-4 Hampton Place
- 07 1-2 Hampton Villas
- 08 3-10 Elizabeth Place
- 09 Parade Gardens
- 10 All Saints Church and Chapel
- 11 Don Monument
- 12 War Memorial
- 13 2-4 Edward Place
- 14 Granite Block
- 15 Entrance Lodge
- 16 13-19 Gloucester Street
- 17 25 Gloucester Street
- 18 Jersey Opera House
- 19 5 Kensington Place
- 20 35, 37 Kensington Place
- 21 31 Kensington Place

**DRAWING NUMBER**

Figure 11.1

**DRAWING TITLE**

Listed Buildings in the Vicinity of the Development Site

**SCALE AT A3**

Not to scale.