

20.10.20

Dear Senator Moore,

Many politicians have already interfered in what should have been a fair, open and transparent process to finally choose the appropriate site to build our new hospital.

Within a matter of days, the 5 sites announced were dramatically reduced to 2 sites, so how did the Government actually follow the due process that was originally agreed. This is why we have taken years to make a decision, undertaken various reviews / inquiries and spent millions of pounds! Surely all 5 sites should have been tabled with the actual pros/cons of building the New Hospital on each site together with indicative costings otherwise how can it be a fully open transparent informed decision making process.

I wish for the following major risks/ issues to be taken into consideration when undertaking the above review that is now yet again in your hands:

1. Physical location is on high ridge over the new substation and the major inner road with a valley drop. It is totally inaccessible for the elderly, parents with babies / children and wheelchair users. It will be very difficult to walk up any of the roads or even cycle to as they are dangerously steep and very narrow.
2. The road structure to the hospital will be horrendously treacherous due to the narrow winding steep roads from the town centre and Tower road. This could cause delays for blue light ambulances and possibly put patients' lives at risk. Even a shuttle bus route from town will be totally impractical as the number 19 currently only goes down Westmount and actually has to swerve across the other side of the road to get around. Even if Westmount is widened the incline/ decline will still be a huge factor for vehicle safety.
3. All ambulances would have to be 4 by 4's to actually get up any of the hills during the winter icy /snowy and raining months. When it rains on the elevated ridge it is like a flowing river down Westmount, New St Johns, Old St Johns and Tower Road. Also, the less steep hill, Queens road is the same.
4. To build on such a difficult site of various levels and different terrain will have a huge effect on the overall costings and will be extremely challenging for the architectural design. The removal of trees will have a devastating effect and could possibly cause subsidence onto the major inner road and new substation.
5. The wind factor on the top ridge is excessive, this will affect the build and demolition. It needs to be seriously considered in the material design. It will have to withstand massive wind speeds and gusts to gale force coming from all directions as the height of the ridge and top fields have no protection.
6. To clear the site will also have a massive impact on costs due to the removal of asbestos, buildings already crumbling and boarded up. Again, the several levels of the site will be difficult to build on and digging out could cause major stability risks to the ridge and top fields.
7. It is totally irresponsible to allow this site to be approved due to the impractical accessibility. To expect sick, injured, elderly, parents with young children/babies and disabled patients to get on a shuttle bus from town to travel up the hills to access the hospital is reckless. The plans currently state

the 800 space car park should be within a 15 minute walk, where is that going to be built, halfway to St Aubin's or on the Esplanade? How ridiculous when every road leading to the hospital will be up massive steep hills. If we are building a futuristic Hospital which will end up costing over £800 million then the parking should be attached or at least adjacent to it.

8. It was recently announced that the original entrance from the inner road was no longer being considered as the George V properties would need to be demolished, why was this yet again taken off the plans without following due process? Surely this could have been a better option to allow a more lower level accessibility to the main Hospital entrance and to accommodate the car park which would not be a 15 minute walk away up steep hills.

9. Even Philip Staddon's report raised serious concerns over the Overdale site. Inaccessibility, the intensification of the build on the elevated ridge together with the green back drop valley having a significant adverse visual impact. He also stated that this option would create significant challenges within the Islands plan. Mr Staddon's report should be taken into consideration within your review, which I am sure it will be.

I am aware that the Island does not have a perfect site, however, if logic is applied then the new build should be on flat land, involving very little demolition and a site that is large enough to allow for future expansion also incorporating the car park. So, I cannot understand why the 2 sites at Millbrook and St Andrews park were dismissed so quickly. They must be large enough to have been considered in the last 5. The accessibility to both these sites is far greater, with no hills to endure plus building at either of these should be significantly quicker, easier, keeping the overall costs down.

I know you have a huge responsibility to undertake this review, one which I had hoped would include the original sites. However, thank you for allowing me the platform to express my concerns.