

# JERSEY FUTURE HOSPITAL CO021 – SITE OPTION REPORT

# APPENDIX 2 – VERIFICATION OF PREVIOUS SITE DESELECTION

**QUALITY ASSURANCE** 

Sign off: Terry Langdon

Position: Director





#### **FUTURE HOSPITAL PROJECT**

| No | Site  | Reasons for rejection   | Rejection   | Current position  |
|----|---|---|---|---|
|    |   |   | stage   |   |
| 1  | Current<br>General<br>Hospital Site   | Planning massing guidance was released which introduced a limited building height of five medical floors along Kensington Place, five to six floors on Newgate Street and Gloucester Street and seven floors in the centre of the new hospital building and along The Parade.  Proposals non-compliant, | Ministerial consideration of revised short-listed options proposed by WS Atkins   | Superseded by Site<br>Options Appraisal Brief<br>(Option C) |
| 1B | Extended General Hospital site (including additional land acquisition)                    | requested reconfiguration.  Did not out-perform original Site 1 proposal  | Revised short-<br>listed options<br>analysis by WS<br>Atkins                      | Superseded by Site<br>Options Appraisal Brief<br>(Option C) |
| 1C | Extended General Hospital site along Kensington Place, with retention of Granite Building | Proposal offered less efficient ward layouts with extended patient routes to other related clinical departments but also presented a six-storey, solid facade to Kensington Place.  | WS Atkins test<br>of alternative<br>design<br>solutions<br>available at<br>site 1 | Superseded by Site<br>Options Appraisal Brief<br>(Option C) |
| 1D | Extended General Hospital site along Kensington Place                                     | Proposal presented operational issues regarding efficient clinical links between the extended ward and other related departments.   | WS Atkins test<br>of alternative<br>design<br>solutions<br>available at<br>site 1 | Superseded by Site<br>Options Appraisal Brief<br>(Option C) |
| 1E | Extended General Hospital site along Kensington Place                                     | Revised Concept proposal requested  | WS Atkins<br>SOC Refined<br>Concept<br>Addendum                                   | Superseded by Site<br>Options Appraisal Brief<br>(Option C) |





#### **FUTURE HOSPITAL PROJECT**

| No    | Site         | Reasons for rejection  | Rejection           | Current position                           |
|-------|--------------|--|---------------------|--|
|       |              |  | stage               |  |
| 2, 23 | Overdale     | Unacceptable impact on community                                       | WS Atkins           | Superseded by Site                         |
| and   | Hospital and | based services which are currently                                     | short-list          | Options Appraisal Brief                    |
| 24    | Fields 1550  | sited at Overdale; the community                                       | recommendati        | (Options A and B)                          |
|       | and 1551     | strategy being to consolidate  | on                  |  |
|       | Westmount    | services on the Overdale site.   |                     |  |
|       |              | Vehicular access from main roads to the site is poor.                  |                     |  |
| 2B    | Westmount    | Did not out-perform short-listed                                       | Revised short-      | Superseded by Site                         |
| 26    | Health       | proposals  | listed options      | Options Appraisal Brief                    |
|       | Quarter      | proposais  | analysis by WS      | (Option B)                                 |
|       | (Overdale    |  | Atkins              | (Option 2)                                 |
|       | Hospital     |  | 7                   |  |
|       | Fields 1550  |  |                     |  |
|       | and 1551,    |  |                     |  |
|       | Westmount    |  |                     |  |
|       | Quarry and   |  |                     |  |
|       | People's     |  |                     |  |
|       | Park)        |  |                     |  |
| 3     | St Saviour's | Planning restrictions exist on the                                     | WS Atkins           | No change - rejection                      |
|       | Hospital     | existing buildings on the site which                                   | short-list          | valid                                      |
|       |              | would severely compromise clinical                                     | recommendati        |  |
|       |              | functionality. Access issues and                                       | on                  |  |
|       |              | convenience for patients and staff is                                  |                     |  |
| 4     | Esplanade    | Pick of identifying an alternative                                     | MOG 2 <sup>nd</sup> | Superseded by Site                         |
| and   | Car Park,    | Risk of identifying an alternative financial centre unacceptably high. | August 2012         | Superseded by Site Options Appraisal Brief |
| 14    | Zephyrus/We  | ililaticiai ceritre dilacceptably flight.                              | August 2012         | (Option D)                                 |
|       | stwater/     |  |                     | (Option b)                                 |
|       | Crossland    |  |                     |  |
| 5     | Former       | The smaller part of the site would                                     | SoJ Officer         | No change - rejection                      |
|       | D'Hautree    | require a c.8 storey high building on                                  | assessment          | valid                                      |
|       | School Site  | a prominent site above town. To  | prior to long-list  |  |
|       |              | create a larger footprint would  | -                   |  |
|       |              | require relocation of Highlands  |                     |  |
|       |              | College functions which would not                                      |                     |  |
|       |              | be achieved within 3-5 years   |                     |  |





#### **FUTURE HOSPITAL PROJECT**

| No | Site                                 | Reasons for rejection   | Rejection  | Current position               |
|----|--------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|
|    |                                      |   | stage  |                                |
| 6  | Former JCG                           | The majority of the site is occupied by a primary school and the remaining site too small with too many restrictions to accommodate a hospital. Relocating the primary school would take longer than 3-5 years and would have a high cost.  | SoJ Officer assessment prior to long-list  | No change – rejection valid    |
| 7  | South Hill                           | The small size of the available site would present difficulties in accommodating the required volume – it is estimated that a seven storey structure would be required in a prominent location overlooking the harbour.   | SoJ Officer assessment prior to long-list  | No change – rejection valid    |
| 8  | Land at<br>Airport                   | Not in accord with the Island Plan. Site meets minimum area required but neighbouring fuel depot would be a fire hazard and would have to be moved. Transport and access issues considered less optimal than other sites. Exposure to climate also considered an issue.   | WS Atkins short-list recommendati on   | No change – rejection valid    |
| 9  | Summerland<br>/ Ambulance<br>Station | The site is too small without the ambulance site, which would take longer than 3-5 years to move. Even with the ambulance site, this would be too small a site for a new hospital.  | SoJ Officer assessment prior to long-list  | No change – rejection valid    |
| 10 | Warwick<br>Farm                      | Site not suitable because it would require re-designation of this green zone land site and, in addition, the visual and development impact of such a large building in this rural setting would have been out of keeping with the surroundings coupled with considerable transport impacts which were not considered sustainable. | Ministerial<br>consideration<br>of short-listed<br>options<br>proposed by<br>WS Atkins | No change – rejection<br>valid |





#### **FUTURE HOSPITAL PROJECT**

| No  | Site                 | Reasons for rejection  | Rejection          | Current position            |
|-----|----------------------|--|--------------------|-----------------------------|
|     |                      |  | stage              |                             |
| 11  | Fort Regent          | Whilst this site raises a number of                                    | SoJ Officer        | No change - rejection       |
|     |                      | questions in terms of access,  | assessment         | valid                       |
|     |                      | topology and heritage issues, the                                      | prior to long-list |                             |
|     |                      | current occupancy of the site (i.e.                                    |                    |                             |
|     |                      | port and concert facilities) would                                     |                    |                             |
|     |                      | need to be relocated and this was                                      |                    |                             |
|     |                      | unlikely to be achieved within 3-5                                     |                    |                             |
|     |                      | years.   |                    |                             |
| 12  | Snow Hill Car        | Providing the required volume on a                                     | SoJ Officer        | No change – rejection       |
|     | Park                 | site of this shape and footprint                                       | assessment         | valid                       |
|     |                      | would require a very tall building, in                                 | prior to long-list |                             |
|     |                      | the order of 14 storeys, which would                                   |                    |                             |
|     |                      | be out of keeping within the local area. The site would also result in |                    |                             |
|     |                      | an inefficient building shape.   |                    |                             |
| 13  | Elizabeth            | The current port facility would have                                   | SoJ Officer        | No change – rejection       |
|     | Harbour              | to be moved in order for this site to                                  | assessment         | valid                       |
|     |                      | be available. There are no plans to                                    | prior to long-list | · and                       |
|     |                      | do this and this would not be  | prior to long not  |                             |
|     |                      | achieved within 3-5 years. The cost                                    |                    |                             |
|     |                      | of moving the port to provide a  |                    |                             |
|     |                      | hospital are unlikely to be justified.                                 |                    |                             |
| 14B | Zephyrus /           | Proposal rationalised to address                                       | WS Atkins test     | Superseded by Site          |
|     | Crosslands /         | issues of planning and massing.  | of alternative     | Options Appraisal Brief     |
|     | Cineworld /          | Taken forward into 14C.  | design             | (Option D)                  |
|     | Les Jardin de        |  | solutions          |                             |
|     | la Mer               |  | available at       |                             |
|     |                      |  | site 14            |                             |
| 14C | Zepyhrus /           | Not selection as final   | WS Atkins          | Superseded by Site          |
|     | Crosslands /         | recommendation   | SOC, October       | Options Appraisal Brief     |
|     | Les Jardin de        |  | 2013               | (Option D)                  |
| 15  | la Mer<br>Bellozanne | Preliminary plans by Transport and                                     | SoJ Officer        | No change rejection         |
| 13  | Valley               | Technical Services show that the                                       | assessment         | No change – rejection valid |
|     | v alley              | area left in the valley once liquid                                    | prior to long-list | valiu                       |
|     |                      | waste facilities have been upgraded                                    | prior to long-list |                             |
|     |                      | would not meet requirements.   |                    |                             |
|     |                      | Location is also problematic as is                                     |                    |                             |
|     |                      | Location is also problematic as is                                     |                    |                             |





#### **FUTURE HOSPITAL PROJECT**

| No | Site                                      | Reasons for rejection   | Rejection                                 | Current position  |
|----|---|---|---|---|
|    |   | ,   | stage                                     | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,   |
|    |   | co-location with municipal activities such as liquid waste treatment.   | -   |   |
| 16 | Jersey Gas<br>site, Tunnell<br>Street     | Site footprint not considered viable for construction of a hospital with optimal clinical adjacencies.  | WS Atkins long-list site analysis         | No change - rejection valid   |
| 17 | Le Masurier's<br>land, Bath<br>Street     | The site is too small and would require a tall building (c.12 storeys) to meet the likely area requirements. This would be out of keeping with this area of town. | SoJ Officer assessment prior to long-list | No change – rejection valid   |
| 18 | Former Jersey Brewery, Ann Street         | Site has a small footprint which would require a tall building (c.11 storeys). This is out of keeping within the surrounding area.                                | SoJ Officer assessment prior to long-list | No change – rejection valid   |
| 19 | Westmount<br>Quarry                       | Site footprint and topography not considered viable for construction of a hospital with optimal clinical adjacencies.   | WS Atkins long-list site analysis         | No change – rejection valid   |
| 20 | Longueville<br>Nurseries, St<br>Saviour   | The site is not large enough to support a development in this area and it may not be available within 3-5 years.  | SoJ Officer assessment prior to long-list | No change – rejection valid   |
| 21 | Samares<br>Nurseries, St<br>Clement       | A range of travel and accessibility issue a key concern for this site including road capacity and limited site access issues. Not in accord with the Island plan. | WS Atkins short-list recommendati on      | No change – rejection valid   |
| 22 | Field 1219, Grande Route de Mont a L'Abbe | Site footprint not considered viable for construction of a hospital with optimal clinical adjacencies. Very limited site access potential.                        | WS Atkins long-list site analysis         | No change – rejection valid   |
| 25 | Parade<br>Gardens                         | Considered on the basis that the public park could be recreated on the current hospital site, however a covenant on the site prohibits building on it.            | SoJ Officer assessment prior to long-list | Re-evaluated under long list park site evaluation August 2015 – rejection valid |





#### **FUTURE HOSPITAL PROJECT**

| No | Site           | Reasons for rejection                   | Rejection              | Current position      |
|----|----------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------|
|    |                |   | stage                  | Carrotte position     |
| 26 | Springfield    | The current facilities would need to    | SoJ Officer            | No change – rejection |
|    | Stadium        | be relocated, which would take          | assessment             | valid                 |
|    |                | longer than 3-5 years, also a key       | prior to long-list     |                       |
|    |                | public amenity in this area.            |                        |                       |
| 27 | FB Fields      | A covenant on the site prohibits        | SoJ Officer            | No change - rejection |
|    |                | building and retains the site for       | assessment             | valid                 |
|    |                | sport. The current facilities would     | prior to long-list     |                       |
|    |                | also have to be relocated.              |                        |                       |
| 28 | Mont de la     | Unable to support overall floor area    | Site validation        | No change - rejection |
|    | Ville          | requirements; issues with site          | screening              | valid                 |
|    | (swimming      | infrastructure, access, restrictions    | assessment             |                       |
|    | pool and land  | and current usage.                      | November               |                       |
|    | to South of    |   | 2012                   |                       |
|    | Fort Regent)   |   | 0                      | N                     |
| 29 | Grainville     | Current facilities would need to be     | Site validation        | No change – rejection |
|    | School         | relocated. Difficulties with site       | screening              | valid                 |
|    |                | access and infrastructure.              | assessment<br>November |                       |
|    |                |   | 2012                   |                       |
| 30 | Grainville     | Unable to support overall floor area    | Site validation        | No change – rejection |
| 30 | playing fields | requirements; issues with site          | screening              | valid                 |
|    | playing noids  | restrictions and current usage, with    | assessment             | vana                  |
|    |                | facilities and function to be           | November               |                       |
|    |                | relocated.                              | 2012                   |                       |
| 31 | Norman's site  | Issues with current site ownership      | Site validation        | No change – rejection |
|    | at Five Oaks   | and use. Difficulties in providing site | screening              | valid                 |
|    |                | access and infrastructure and           | assessment             |                       |
|    |                | sufficient floor area requirements.     | November               |                       |
|    |                |   | 2012                   |                       |
| 32 | Fields off     | Issues with site infrastructure and     | Site validation        | No change - rejection |
|    | Highview       | access and existing restrictions to     | screening              | valid                 |
|    | Lane, Mont a   | development. Site also unable to        | assessment             |                       |
|    | L'Abbe         | adequately support overall floor        | November               |                       |
|    |                | area requirements.                      | 2012                   |                       |
| 33 | Fields         | Unable to support overall floor area    | Site validation        | No change – rejection |
|    | adjacent to    | requirements; issues with site          | screening              | valid                 |
|    | St. Saviour's  | restrictions for development.           | assessment             |                       |





#### **FUTURE HOSPITAL PROJECT**

| No | Site          | Reasons for rejection                | Rejection       | Current position      |
|----|---------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
|    |               |                                      | stage           |                       |
|    | Church, St    | Significant challenges to site       | November        |                       |
|    | Saviour       | infrastructure and access likely.    | 2012            |                       |
| 34 | St Andrew's   | Unable to support overall floor area | Site validation | No change - rejection |
|    | Park          | requirements; issues with site       | screening       | valid                 |
|    |               | restrictions for development.        | assessment      |                       |
|    |               | Significant challenges to site       | November        |                       |
|    |               | infrastructure and access likely.    | 2012            |                       |
| 35 | Fields        | Unable to support overall floor area | Site validation | No change - rejection |
|    | opposite St   | requirements; issues with site       | screening       | valid                 |
|    | Saviour's     | restrictions for development.        | assessment      |                       |
|    | School        |                                      | November        |                       |
|    |               |                                      | 2012            |                       |
| 36 | Fields to the | Unable to support overall floor area | Site validation | No change - rejection |
|    | North of Five | requirements; issues with site       | screening       | valid                 |
|    | Oaks          | restrictions for development.        | assessment      |                       |
|    |               |                                      | November        |                       |
|    |               |                                      | 2012            |                       |
| 37 | Fields off    | Unable to support overall floor area | Site validation | No change - rejection |
|    | Trinity Hill  | requirements; issues with site       | screening       | valid                 |
|    |               | restrictions for development.        | assessment      |                       |
|    |               |                                      | November        |                       |
|    |               |                                      | 2012            |                       |
| 38 | Fields off La | Unable to support overall floor area | Site validation | No change – rejection |
|    | Grande        | requirements; issues with site       | screening       | valid                 |
|    | Route de St   | restrictions for development.        | assessment      |                       |
|    | Jean          |                                      | November        |                       |
|    |               |                                      | 2012            |                       |