

Public Inquiry – Future Hospital Planning Application - Reference PP/2018/0507

Inspector's Notes Pre-Inquiry Meeting held between 10.00 a.m. – 1.10 p.m. on Thursday 2nd August at the St. Paul's Centre (Lower Hall), New Street, St Helier JE2 3RA

1. Welcome and introductions

Attendees

Philip Staddon - Inspector

Representing the Department - John Nicholson - Principal Planner, Development Control, States of Jersey

Representing the Applicant - Christiaan Zwart, Fiona Sibley, Richard Glover, Robin Whitby

Interest parties: Caroline Boir, John Baker, Paul Turner, Pam Le Fevre, Vivian Aygun, Graham Bisson, Andy Howell, Nicholas Broomfield, Richard Le Sueur, David Richardson, Eric Falla, Deputy Steve Ahier, Mike Dun, Nicholas Blampied.

The Inspector welcomed everyone and explained the purpose of the meeting. The focus was on procedural matters and making preparations for the forthcoming Inquiry to ensure that it ran smoothly and efficiently. He made clear that it was not an opportunity to discuss the merits of the application or alternative sites.

2. Submission of revised plans and associated consultation / publicity

The Inspector led a discussion concerning the recent submission of a revised set of application drawings and documents. These would be subject to re-advertising and re-consultation.

The Applicant advised that the amendments had arisen from two sources: firstly, from internal clinical planning processes and, secondly, from consultee feedback on the originally submitted scheme drawings. The Applicant advised that the revised scheme can now be regarded as settled and further substantive changes were not envisaged.

The Applicant offered to place some hard copies of key documents in publicly accessible locations.

John Nicholson offered to make hard copies (of the revised and superseded documents) available for inspection at the Planning service's offices, should individuals wish to do so.

3. Consultation responses – update

Two actions were agreed from the update on the position with consultee responses:

- i) John Nicholson to provide a list of application consultees to the Inspector.
- ii) John Nicholson to seek the formal views of Jersey Architecture Commission (JAC) on the revised scheme ahead of the Inquiry.

4. Extended Terms of Reference for the Inquiry (Proposition P.90/2018) concerning alternative sites evidence

The Inspector explained his approach to alternative sites evidence as set out in his letter to the Minister dated 23 July 2018. He made clear that, as alternative sites are only a potential material consideration in this case, he will be adopting a suitably proportionate approach.

At the Inquiry, up to 1 sitting day will be allocated to this subject. The Inspector will reviews all written submissions made on this matter and he will also undertake unaccompanied site inspections of the other sites ahead of the Inquiry.

5. Format of the Inquiry - the suggestion of 'Inquiry Themes' and discussion of potential themes for the Inquiry sessions

The Applicant had made a written submission to the Inspector requesting that the Inquiry is structured around identified themes. This suggestion was widely supported and will assist the focus and efficiency of the proceedings. The key is to ensure that the right themes are selected and that there are no obvious gaps. Some themes also have a close connection with others. Potential themes include:

- The case for the application, including the 'Outline' approach, the Health Impact assessment and any other related proposals¹
- Design principles and parameters, townscape and visual impacts
- Heritage
- Amenity
- Transport and Access
- Construction and demolition impacts
- Other matters – energy, sustainability, socio-economic impacts, flood risk
- Alternative sites
- Conditions and Planning Obligations
- Summing up / conclusions

¹ At the pre-Inquiry meeting there were various references to separate applications for demolition proposals and a replacement electricity sub-station.

Once the Inspector has received all of the evidence submissions, he will produce agendas and identify 'main issues and questions' for each of the themed sessions. Interested parties will be invited to ask questions and make contributions at all of the themed sessions.

6. Provision for interested parties to address the Inquiry

In addition to the facilities for making written submissions and the opportunities to participate in the themed Inquiry sessions, the Inspector also proposes to hold an additional open 'plenary' session on one evening during the Inquiry week. This will allow an additional facility for those unable to attend the daytime proceedings.

Some interested parties alleged that clinical staff had been 'gagged' from making their views known and asked if evidence could be submitted in confidence. The Inspector made clear that this was not possible in a Public Inquiry into a planning application and all evidence must be in the public domain.

7. Room layout, seating, sitting times and resources (including electronic library and projection facilities)

Concerns were raised about room facilities and, in particular, the need for a microphone / speaker system to assist those with hearing impairments. The Department confirmed that similar facilities would be available to those successfully employed at the 2017 Inquiry (which worked well).

8. Inquiry programme - order of sessions, number of sitting days, appearances, participant availability issues etc.

Based on the theme suggestions above (item 5), the Programme Officer has subsequently produced a draft programme, which is attached as an appendix to this note. However, it is important to appreciate that the programme is a draft at this stage, which will remain flexible and be subject to change.

The draft programme will be populated with participants as they become known.

The Inspector is mindful of availability issues for the Department's lead officers on Friday 21st September and that those issues recur in the following week. The draft programme endeavours to accommodate this constraint, with a view to seeking to avoid adjournment, and the need to reconvene at a later date.

9. Statements of Common Ground

The Applicant advised that it hoped to produce factual statements of common ground (with the Department) on the various Inquiry themes.

10. Planning conditions and obligations

The Applicant advised that it would be working with the Department to produce a largely agreed set of conditions and Planning obligations. These would be produced on a 'without prejudice' basis, but would be available for consideration by the Minister, should he be minded to grant Outline Planning permission for the proposal.

11. Timetable for document submissions

The initial Statements of Case deadline was 6 July 2016. In view of the revised applications documents submissions (item 2 above) and the extended terms of reference (item 4 above), it is appropriate to offer more time.

The Inspector proposes that further submissions on the amended plans / documents, and in respect of alternative sites, are subject to a new deadline of 5.00 p.m. on Friday 7th September 2018.

Post meeting note - for those submitting detailed Proofs of Evidence, the Inspector has set a deadline of 5.00 p.m. on Friday 31st August 2018. However, any Proof dealing solely with the alternative sites issue can be submitted up until 5.00 p.m. on Friday 7th September 2018.

12. Site inspections

The Inspector advised that he was familiar with the main hospital site and its surroundings and had undertaken a detailed site tour in 2017. He will undertake unaccompanied 'refresh' site inspections.

He will consider the need for an accompanied visit to the Westaway Court site.

The Inspector will make arrangements to visit the 'alternative sites' ahead of the Inquiry. These visits will be unaccompanied.

13. Any other matters

Covered in the notes above.

14. Close

At 1.10 p.m.