



Planning Panel
Sir Charles Frossard House
La Charroterie
S. Peter Port
Guernsey GY1 1FH

Appeal Decision Notice

Appeal Hearing and site visit held on 14th June 2017 at Les Cotils Centre, St. Peter Port

Members: Mr. S Fell (Presiding), Mrs. S. Evans, Mr. D. Harry.

Appeal Site:	Happy Landing Hotel, Rue des Landes, The Forest
Protected Building Reference:	PB1658
Date added to Protected Buildings List:	19 th July 2016
Date Appeal Submitted:	11 th December 2015
Appeal Case Reference:	PAP/021/2016

- The Appeal is by Octane Property Ltd. and Jacksons CI Ltd. against the decision of the Authority made on 19th July 2016 under section 33 of the Land Planning and Development (Guernsey) Law, 2005 to add the Happy Landings Hotel to the Protected Buildings List.
 - The Appeal is made under the provisions of section 18 of The Land Planning and Development (Special Controls) Ordinance, 2007.
 - The appellant companies were represented by Mr. J Le Gallez, assisted by Ms. L Marshall and he called Mr. J. Wright of Purcell, a practice of architects, designers and heritage experts. Mr. A. Opie, the Manager of The Happy Landings Hotel, assisted the Tribunal during the site visit and also gave evidence.
 - The Development & Planning Authority was represented by Mr. A. White, Principal Conservation and Design Officer, Miss. E. Jordan and Mr. N. Joyce, Conservation and Design Officers.
-

Decision

1. The appeals on all grounds are dismissed. The entry in the Protected Buildings List is therefore retained without modification.

Introduction

2. The Happy Landings Hotel is a purpose-built, two-storey, rendered and painted, flat-roofed hotel that dates from 1938/1939 and stands with its primary façade fronting Rue des Landes, which lies to the south. Immediately adjacent to the west and north of the Happy Landings Hotel is the Jacksons Garage site, and beyond that a little over a hundred metres to the north-west lies Guernsey Airport. The recently constructed terminal building is the replacement of a succession of airport buildings which were first opened in 1939. The Hotel marks the western edge of the Forest Church Conservation Area, the boundary of which was modified in 2016 so as to include the appeal property.
3. In March 2016, there was discussion between the Development & Planning Authority (“the Authority”) and architects PF+A with a view to the demolition of the hotel and the extension and re-organisation of the Jacksons Garage site. This triggered the review of the heritage significance of the Happy Landings Hotel, culminating in its addition to the List of Protected Buildings on 19th July 2016, and subsequently resulting in this appeal.

The Legal Framework

4. Section 33(1) of the Land Planning and Development (Guernsey) Law, 2005 (“the 2005 Law”) requires the Authority to prepare, maintain and keep under review a list (known as the Protected Buildings List) of buildings with special historic, architectural, traditional or other interest, the preservation of whose character as such is, in its opinion, a matter of public importance.
5. In considering whether or not to list any building, section 33(2) of the 2005 Law states that the Authority may take into account:
 - (a) Any way in which the exterior of the building contributes to the historic, architectural, traditional or other interest of any group of buildings of which it forms part; and
 - (b) the desirability of preserving any feature of the building (whether internal or external) consisting of a man-made object or structure fixed to the building, or forming part of the land in the vicinity of the building.
6. Section 1 of the Land Planning (Special Controls) Ordinance, 2007 (“the Special Controls Ordinance”) sets out information that must be included in the list of protected buildings. It also refers to information which may be included in the list, but which is not mandatory. The notification and publicity requirements following the

inclusion of a building in the Protected Buildings List are set out in section 4 of the Special Controls Ordinance.

7. We are satisfied that due process has been followed by the Authority in adding the Happy Landings Hotel to the Protected Buildings List.
8. The Authority's publication *Conservation Advice Note CN6: Criteria for the selection of buildings for the Protected Buildings List* (March 2014) elaborates on the criteria set out in the 2005 Law (sections 33 and 34) and more importantly it explains in considerable detail the criteria used in the assessment of buildings for possible inclusion, based on a building's historic, architectural, traditional or other interest. The term "*other interest*" is deemed by the Authority to include archaeological interest, group value, features and setting. The Authority's appeal statement explains that CN6,

"... provides a consistent, robust and transparent baseline against which all existing protected buildings and those buildings with the potential to be added to the list can be assessed on a consistent Island-wide basis".

Review of the List of Protected Buildings

9. In early 2012, the Authority embarked on a review of the then existing List of Protected Buildings to determine whether any buildings should be removed from the List and any buildings added. The methods and processes used in undertaking this review are set out in *Conservation Advice Note 4: Community Guide to the review of the Protected Buildings List* (July 2013).
10. Following the appeal decision on the White Gables case in 2013 (Ref: PAP/001/2013) a system of ad-hoc review was also put in place by the Authority whereby a building that had been identified as a potential candidate for listing can be considered on a reactive basis if there is a perceived threat to its well-being. This is the process that has been triggered in this case.

The Happy Landings Hotel Entry in the Protected Buildings List

11. At the outset of the Hearing we sought clarification from the Authority as to which of the interests specified in s.33(2) of the 2005 Law were held to apply in this case, as this was not apparent from the entry on the protected buildings list. Mr. White confirmed that the principal interests are historic and architectural, though the setting of the building is also held to be relevant, and is considered to be an aspect of the 'other interest' category, as explained in para. 4.10 of Conservation Advice Note 6 ("CN6").
12. The plan that forms part of the Protected Buildings Entry shows the extent of protection that is intended. This includes the building footprint only, save for a recently-constructed brick barbeque area at the rear. The land around the building and any enclosing boundary structures are accordingly excluded. The extent of listing is

summarised on the Entry as, “the whole of the building”.

13. The Special Controls Ordinance, in s.(1)(5), states that the protected buildings list,

“... may also include a description of any particular special interest by reason of which it is listed and of any feature which the Authority considers it is desirable to preserve, although any such description shall be indicative only and shall not be taken to be an exhaustive description of any relevant special interest or of any such feature”. The Authority’s response to this is to prepare a Summary of Significance.

This is a discretionary paragraph that provides useful information on the protected building and indicates in broad terms the reason for its protection. We believe that this information should be routinely be included in any entry on the protected buildings list.

14. In this case the Summary of Significance is not included in the entry but can be found in the pro-forma Building Survey Report, a document that captures survey and other data about the building and provides the essential raw material to enable a qualitative assessment to be made. The Summary of Significance is included here as it provides a useful synopsis of the key aspects of the property that led to its protection. It reads:

“A purpose-designed hotel with some alterations made to upgrade to modern standards, Happy Landings is a rare Art Deco-inspired building of which there are few examples, especially non-residential, in Guernsey. It was designed by Arthur Durand, of international repute, and constructed 1938-1939 in association with the development of Guernsey Airport. It has ties to military use: utilised by the RAF and then the Luftwaffe during World War II and the German Occupation. The main block retains symmetrical proportions and plan form, which survives in the lobby, stairs and ballroom at ground floor and in evidence of the original circular route at first floor, with rear wing to one side and ballroom centrally positioned at the rear. A large amount of original fabric remains, including internal doors and windows, staircase, flooring and fireplaces which reinforces the character of the building. Simple ornamentation is retained, including coving, doors, façade, Crittall windows and aeroplane motif. The external appearance has changed little since the building was constructed. Associations with the airport remain strong”.

The Grounds of Appeal

15. Section 18(3) of the Special Controls Ordinance sets out the grounds on which an appeal to a Planning Tribunal can be made. These are:
- (a) that the protected building has no special interest;
 - (b) that land regarded as part of the protected building is more than is necessary to protect –
 - (i) any man-made object or structure forming part of the land in the vicinity of the building, or

- (ii) an object not forming part of the building,
- (c) that the entry is in any material respect factually incorrect, or
- (d) that the insertion or amendment of the entry was (for any other reason) ultra vires or unreasonable.

16. In the appeal submitted by Mr. Falla of PF+A on 8th August 2016 on behalf of the appellant companies the only ground of appeal indicated was under part (a) cited above, i.e. that the building has no special interest. The appellant company subsequently engaged Mourant Ozannes to represent them at the appeal hearing.
17. In its letter of 31st March 2017, Mourant Ozannes stated that the other three grounds of appeal identified in sections 18(3) (b), (c), and (d) would also be argued, a position that the authority subsequently challenged, as these additional grounds were identified many months after the appeal had been lodged. These supplementary arguments raised on behalf of the appellant companies will be dealt with at the end of this decision, on the basis that the consideration of these matters will in no way disadvantage the Authority.
18. Given that the principal ground of appeal is that the building does not have sufficient historic or architectural interest to warrant listing, a position thoroughly elaborated by Mr. Wright in his comprehensive written report, we consider that the most equitable approach in this case is for us to assess the Happy Landings Hotel against each of the criteria set out in Advice Note CN6, in the light of the opposing arguments made by the parties.
19. In making our assessments against the CN6 criteria, we consider that the context in which our qualitative judgments are made is fundamental. It is usual when determining the relative significance of an historic building to review the property in its regional, national or international context, according to the building's status. Were the Happy Landings Hotel to be located in England then its relative historical and architectural value would likely be judged against other purpose-built, suburban or provincial hotels and perhaps other commercial buildings of this period throughout the country. In the Guernsey environment this approach is patently unsatisfactory and inappropriate, as the Island is a separate and relatively small jurisdiction, and has evolved along its own political, economic and cultural path that in many respects is different from that of the United Kingdom; such differences are reflected in Guernsey's distinctive history and architectural traditions. The Tribunal accordingly considers that comparative assessments based on the stock of historic buildings in England should therefore be made with caution.
20. In the interests of providing a coherent thread through the multiple assessments that follow, it should be clarified at the outset that it is not the appellant companies' contention that Art Deco design influence is absent from the Happy Landings Hotel, rather it is that the building does not provide a sufficiently good example of this design idiom to warrant its listing as a protected building.

Assessment of Historic Interest against the numbered headings set out in Advice Note CN6

i. **Age:**

21. In the case of relatively recent buildings, additional requirements are imposed when the listing assessment is made. In the commentary contained within para. 4.5 of the Advice Note is the following key statement:

“Buildings constructed between 1900 and 1939 should be of significant definite high quality and character to consider adding to the list, and will often be the work of important architects, or exceptional examples representing stylistic development in Guernsey”.

The date of construction of the building, between 1938 and 1939, is not in dispute. We will return to this matter in reaching our overall conclusion on the historic and architectural interest of the Happy Landings Hotel.

22. Mr. Wright contended that the Happy Landings Hotel falls short of all of the above mentioned requirements, while Mr. White took the opposite position. We explore these matters in detail in our assessment of the building against each of the listed criteria.

ii. **Rarity:**

23. The explanatory text associated with this heading states:

“Importance is attached to the rarity of a building type, style or construction. This will be most significant when there are few examples of a particular building type left”.

24. It was accepted by the parties at the Hearing that the Happy Landings Hotel is one of few commercial buildings of this period that survives in the Island, with or without Art Deco influence. The Authority’s assertion that purpose-designed hotels are a rare building type in the Island was not challenged on behalf of the appellant companies. In his original report submitted with the appeal, Mr. Falla cited the former Odeon Cinema, Upland Road, St. Peter Port as a more accomplished Art Deco building, though the clarity of the design appears to us to be somewhat confused by its blocky, classical undertones; in any event this structure has been demolished.
25. In its written statement the Authority provides photographs of three other local commercial buildings that it considers to reflect Art Deco influence. We agree with Mr. Wright that the former St. Peter Port Garage which was located in Trinity Square, St. Peter Port, which has also been demolished, does not appear to display Art Deco features but is an example of a competently designed *modern movement* façade. While the building at 13 Le Pollet, St. Peter Port, displays some Art Deco motifs, we consider this to be executed in a fussy and rather half-hearted manner. The electricity

sub-station at Rue du Pré, St. Peter Port, which is apparently one of a series of similar buildings, we regard simply as a robust and utilitarian building of its period. No examples of any other buildings in the Island with Art Deco influence were drawn to our attention.

26. From the evidence presented to us, we can only conclude that the Happy Landings Hotel is very probably the only surviving example in the Island of a prominent 1930s commercial building that displays Art Deco influence. It is accordingly appropriate that importance is attached to it because of its rarity.

iii. **Authenticity:**

27. Under this heading CN6 advises that,

“The extent of original fabric in a building and therefore its ability to show its significance, and levels of integrity, is important”.

We were aware from the written submissions and survey drawings that when the building was first constructed it comprised a two-storey range to the south with a central entrance and lobby leading past the staircase to a centrally positioned ballroom attached at the rear. Enclosing the ballroom on its west side was a single storey wing, a feature that was not repeated on the east side. Save for the absence of an east wing, the internal plan form was laid out in a broadly symmetrical manner, and is notably symmetrical in the layout of the lobby with its central staircase.

28. During the accompanied site visit we carefully inspected the building both externally and internally. The wider setting of the building was viewed after the Hearing. Externally, we saw that the principal elevation that faces south towards the busy main road is mostly intact, the notable changes being the replacement of the original entrance canopy with a less elegant substitute, and the raising of the parking area in front of the building by 150mm or so, enveloping the first of three steps that lead to the entrance doors. It is our considered judgment that these changes, though regrettable, have not unacceptably undermined the architectural presence of this main façade or its sense of authenticity.
29. We saw that the east face of the building has been little changed, but the western flank and the rear elevation have been significantly altered. Behind the front range of the building, which is approximately 13.5m deep, an extra floor was added on top of the west wing at a later date to provide further bedrooms. This rendered addition was made at some time after 1951, as it does not appear on photographs of that era. A construction date of the early 1970s suggested by Mr. Wright in his written statement is not supported by evidence. The fenestration of this addition utilised a similar type of metal window to those found on the primary structure, and because of this, coupled with the painted render finish, the later work does not appear to us to be particularly incongruous or at odds with the three-dimensional form of the original hotel. Only a single PVCu window mars the otherwise consistent treatment of the fenestration on

this elevation.

30. The rear of the building has suffered more extensive alteration, as many of the windows have been replaced with PVCu units, and a modern steel fire escape descends from the northern end of the added first floor. Viewed from the parking area to the north of the hotel, the lantern light over the main staircase can be seen, and its steep roof pitch suggests that this may be a replacement of the original lantern. On the eastern side of the former ballroom a brick barbeque area has recently been constructed by Mr. Opie, but the small, rendered extension to which this is attached may be part of the original hotel – there is no evidence to indicate otherwise.
31. Internally, we saw that the formal layout of the ground floor is evident as soon as one enters the lobby, with its central stair and symmetrically arranged doorways and subsidiary spaces. The rear of the lobby is lit by means of internal glazed lights that are served by light-wells to left and right. Much of the internal joinery, door furniture and decorative trim survives within the lobby and in the paired corridors leading to the former ballroom, as do the brick fireplaces that back on to the light-wells. The ancillary space to the right of the entrance doors has lost the timber screen that separates it from the lobby itself – this appears to have been reused to form the west wall of the bar behind the staircase. We consider that the level of authenticity in this principal entrance and circulation space is high.
32. The same cannot be said of the bar area to the east of the lobby, which has been comprehensively remodelled, or of the former ballroom, which has been subdivided to form a breakfast room and pool room and is somewhat spartan in character. The other ancillary spaces at ground level have retained much of their original form and layout, but provide little of architectural interest. The same observation applies at first floor level, where the essential plan form with its symmetrical layout is mostly intact. However, this has been modified by the interruption of the circular access corridor by a partition and fire door, by the adaptation of individual bedrooms to provide en-suite bathrooms, and by the replacement of some of the original joinery. We conclude that the authenticity of the fabric at this level is relatively good, with many surviving period features, but the intrinsic architectural quality is unremarkable.
33. Our judgment on the question of the authenticity of the fabric is that this is relatively high, despite first impressions. The original plan form remains clearly legible, and where decorative features were provided at the outset these have survived to a considerable extent. The unsympathetic interventions that have been made, such as replacement doors and windows, are also apparent and in our opinion do little to obscure the form and character of the building as it was first conceived. The only substantial addition is the additional floor over the west wing but this has been carried out in a sympathetic manner and we do not consider that it causes significant harm to the form or character of the original building. Our conclusion is that the level of authenticity displayed in the building fabric has not been undermined to such an extent as to seriously compromise the significance of the building in architectural and historic terms. We will return later to the intrinsic architectural merits of the building.

iv. **Historic Importance:**

34. CN6 advises that,

“A building may be significant because it illustrates a good, early example of a particular architectural type or structural development – such as an early cast iron structure – or because it forms an important part of the history of a particular style, type, or feature, and its development. The earliest known examples of a style, type, or feature will be the most important”.

35. Mr. Wright cogently argues in his written submission that the Happy Landings Hotel can be said to be neither pioneering nor a successful example of type. He says:

“With a façade that emulates a style that by 1939 was very much on the wane, the building cannot be allied to any major movement stylistically, structurally, or decoratively in anything other than a cursory manner”.

36. These observations would have considerable force were the building to be considered against the backcloth of the architectural scene in England, where, understandably, the building might be thought unremarkable. However, we hold the view that different considerations apply because the Happy Landings Hotel must be assessed in the Guernsey context. In the Island environment the building is clearly a rare example of a 1930s commercial building in which the designer has applied some Art Deco touches to the main façade and the entrance lobby, presumably to give the building a sense of modernity in association with the concurrent development of the new airport. The fact that the Art Deco movement was in decline by this time does not undermine the historic importance of the building, but merely reflects a somewhat outdated aesthetic outlook, a phenomenon that is not unusual within the Channel Island communities. In our judgment, the most significant aspects of the Happy Landings Hotel in architectural terms are the entrance façade and the public lobby, and the relatively insignificant alterations that have occurred to these parts of the fabric have done little to diminish the historic significance that attaches to the building.

v. **Social, Cultural and Economic Importance:**

37. The advisory text in CN6 is extensive, and we consider the comments most relevant to this appeal to be as follows:

“Some structures may be important because of their contribution to economic development, such as former warehouses, harbour structures, or financial institutions. The most important buildings will have made a major contribution to the development of an industry or business of major importance to Guernsey”.

38. We agree with the Authority’s view that the construction of this purpose-designed hotel, erected at the same time as and close to the airport, lends the building some historic economic significance, as it provides evidence of the advent of air travel and

the growth of the tourist industry in the pre-Occupation period. While the original airport buildings have been replaced, the land use has continued. We saw that the visual connection between the airport and hotel has survived, though it is now partly obscured by surface vehicle parking associated with the new garage premises. The aeroplane motif on the front of the building, and the name of the premises, provide a tangible reminder of this historic connection.

39. Though Mr. Wright asserts in his written statement that the hotel is no longer legible as part of the airport complex, the evidence of the aerial photographs and historic maps show that there was always a physical separation between the two premises, as two intervening plots of land survived until at least the mid-1960s. The 1942 aerial photograph shows that these plots were in horticultural use and had extensive glasshouses constructed on them. Our conclusion on this point is that the physical and visual relationship between the Happy Landings Hotel and the airport facility has not been significantly eroded, though the original airport buildings have, of course, not survived.
40. There is undisputed evidence of the use of the hotel by the RAF in 1939, following which it was commandeered by the Luftwaffe as an airport headquarters for the duration of the German Occupation of Guernsey. The Authority accepts Mr. Wright's claim that many buildings in the Island were used by the German occupying forces, but the Authority could not provide us with any other examples of buildings which were used by forces on both sides of the conflict. We conclude that the military aspect of the building's use also lends the Happy Landings Hotel some historic significance.

vi. **Historic Associations:**

41. CN6 states, inter alia;

"Close associations with nationally, or internationally recognised figures such as founders of important businesses and industries, notable national and international persons, or events whose associations are well-documented, can add to the significance of a building. The buildings of named architects, designers or builders who are recognised as being the leading advocates of the architecture or design of their era will also be considered".

42. The Authority argues that the Happy Landings Hotel has significant historic associations because it was designed by architect, Mr. Arthur Durand, who was known to have worked on the Eiffel Tower and was responsible for interior design work for ships of the White Star Line, including the Titanic. The report submitted by Mr. Falla with his appeal documents provides brief biographical details of Mr. Durand, who apparently retired to Guernsey and Sark in 1926, and designed other local buildings, including the Manor Hotel, Petit Bôt, The Forest, and the lychgate at the Forest Church, both located near the Happy Landings Hotel, as well as the Royal Guernsey Golf Club Pavilion at L'Ancrese.

43. Although Mr. Wright acknowledged Mr. Durand's association with the notable projects cited by the Authority, he argued that any claims to fame on behalf of Mr. Durand were not as a result of his prowess as an architect, given that he is not noted for his architectural work at all. His work in Guernsey, Mr. Wright argued, shows that he changed his architectural language to suit the brief, perhaps responding to clients' demands or whims, and he cannot be considered as an advocate of Art-Deco Inspired buildings.
44. While we acknowledge the reservations expressed by Mr. Wright, we conclude that in the Guernsey context, the involvement of an architect associated with internationally iconic projects, albeit in the role of draughtsman initially and later as interior designer for the White Star Line, who had chosen to settle and practice in Guernsey, is a matter of some local significance. We have no reason to challenge the Authority's assertion that this is a rare phenomenon within the Island in architectural circles. The fact that Mr. Durand appeared willing to vary the styling of his buildings to suit the needs of individual clients does not in our minds diminish the significance of this historic association – Mr. Durand is clearly not alone in the architectural profession in yielding to such pressures.

Overall Conclusion on Historic Significance

45. Our judgment is that the cumulative historic interest of the Happy Landings Hotel, expressed in the Art Deco-influenced styling of the building, its evocation of early air travel and tourism, its association with Arthur Durand, and finally in its military associations just before and during the German Occupation, is of considerable significance when assessed in the local context. It is our view that sufficient of the original character of the building remains, primarily in the principal façade and in the interior lobby, to give meaningful physical expression of that historic interest. Our overall conclusion is that the Happy Landings Hotel has sufficient special historical interest to warrant listing.

Assessment of Architectural Interest against the Numbered Headings in Advice Note CN6

i. Style

46. Mr. Wright acknowledges the Authority's contention that the Happy Landings Hotel is an Art Deco inspired building, as he expresses eloquently in his written submission

"With its prime visual quality being concentrated on the centre of the façade and diminishing scale of the bays either side, Happy Landings, in general appearance, conveys elements of architectural style that have a lineage to the more notable and successful examples of the style termed Art Deco. In the use of the decorative motif and the recessed decorative lines, the building does express a clear relationship to the style as used for better known listed deco buildings in the UK and in particular, relates to the transport and leisure buildings of the modern movement".

47. Mr. Wright then sets out his reservations:

“However, the extent to which the building has been inspired by the style would appear to go no further than the embellishment of the façade and the geometric recesses of the parapet. In overall plan form, the building does not convey the clean lines and elegant proportions that celebrated Art Deco works are noted for, nor does the building contain any curved or streamlined elements. In essence, the only part of the building that truly expresses a relationship to the style is the façade, and even here, that relationship is expressed in a rather rudimentary manner. It would in fact, be more accurate to discuss the external appearance of Happy Landings as a very modest piece of modern architecture with an Art Deco inspired frontage”.

48. In many respects, we concur with Mr. Wright’s analysis, though we do not share the conclusions that he draws from these. The Guernsey context is again fundamentally important, as it has been earlier in our consideration of the historical interest of the building. Unlike the UK, Guernsey does not have a range of contemporary buildings against which one might make qualitative comparisons, and it would clearly be inappropriate to judge the worth of the Happy Landings Hotel against the celebrated examples referred to by Mr. Wright in his statement, which are all Grade II* listed buildings (Arnos Grove Underground Station; Midland Hotel, Morecambe; Shoreham Airport).
49. The Happy Landings Hotel was clearly constructed with utility and economy in mind, given the modest quality of finishes and details, but also with an underlying aim of creating an unusual, striking and symbolic building. As well as the south façade, Art Deco mannerisms can also be seen in the joinery and fittings of the interior lobby, but here they are executed sparingly and in a workmanlike manner. Other than in these two specific elements of the hotel, the remainder of the building seems to us to be an unremarkable example of a 1930s commercial property. In conclusion, however, we are satisfied that although the Happy Landings Hotel is undoubtedly a modest expression of the Art Deco aesthetic when considered in the UK context, it is possibly unique in Guernsey, and accordingly deserves a relatively high architectural significance.

ii. Proportion

50. CN6 states:

“Designed buildings exhibit systems of proportion both internally and externally. Consideration will be given to the inter-relationship of elements within the overall composition, both in plan and in three-dimensions, and the appropriateness to the style. The best proportioned examples will be those which display this quality most consistently”.

51. In Mr. Wright’s written submission he states that,

“... the façade retains its symmetry and in the step backs on the parapet line does display a proportional element that is pleasing aesthetically and which mirrors, to some extent, the building’s plan form, with the larger central spaces and smaller rooms to the wings.”

He goes on to say that,

“... the changes to the other elevations of the building have been wholesale”, asserting that “the rear extensions have altered the building’s proportions extensively, both vertically and horizontally, and damaged the legibility of the building’s massing and scale.”

52. Mr. Wright’s conclusion is that the proportions of the Happy Landings Hotel building have been significantly altered since the original construction and this has detrimentally affected any claims to special interest through the survival of the architect’s original intentions for the proportions of the building. Mr. White disputed this interpretation, stating that the front and eastern elevations are unaltered, while the alterations to the west and north elevations have retained the proportions of the building.
53. We saw for ourselves during our site visit that the proportions of the south and east façades remain unaltered. The piecemeal replacement of windows and doors generally appears to have been carried out within the original structural openings. We are aware of only one significant change to the proportions of the building and this results from the later addition of the first floor over the west wing. A small extension on the east side of the ballroom appears to us to be an original feature, while we consider the small barbeque addition to be insignificant in this context.
54. Given Mr. Wright’s contentions, we have considered the question of whether it is possible to discern Mr. Durand’s original intention for the proportions and massing of the building. The south façade has clearly been given carefully thought, but there is little evidence that the same consideration was given to the subsidiary elevations.
55. Seen from the north, the absence of an east wing of accommodation to match that on the west side suggests that symmetry in massing was not a major concern to Durand. The placing of the ballroom slightly off the central north-south axis of the building and the presence of the small utility room on the east flank of the ballroom supports this notion. The varying heights of the original rear elements of the building and the resulting rather ad-hoc appearance suggest that the proportions of the rear parts of the building were the direct and unmodulated result of functions occurring within the building, rather than the result of refinement so as to satisfy an overarching design vision. Such disparity in approach in the treatment of principal and lesser facades is of course commonplace throughout all historical periods.

56. With the above considerations in mind, we conclude that the changes to the proportions of the west and north elevations resulting from later alteration to the building have not fatally harmed the architectural proportions of the building.

iii. **Ornamentation**

57. The advice in CN 6 states:

“This should be appropriate to the style and nature of the building under consideration. It will vary from architectural styles that include rich ornamentation to those that deliberately avoided such decoration. The quality of such ornamentation and detailing will also be considered. Buildings will be significant because of both of these attributes or because the quality of their detail, or of particular features, stands out from those of others of similar style or date. They may also be significant because they have features of high artistic quality, such as an original Guille carved door or decorative bargeboards”.

58. Mr. Wright argues:

“The ornamentation of Happy Landings is at best rudimentary. Expressed through some simple geometric lines to the parapet and the central relief panel of an aircraft. Neither of these elements can be said to be of high quality either materially or artistically, nor are they the work of any notable designer. It cannot be considered therefore that Happy Landings survives with enough of its proportional qualities intact to make this an important factor in the designation”.

59. Within the Authority’s written response it is stated,

“Happy Landings is an Art Deco style building and therefore would not have been designed to have ornamentation. The Authority does not, therefore contend that the building has “rudimentary” ornamentation, but the lack of ornamentation is not a reason to conclude the building should not be protected”.

60. The above comments suggest to us a lack of understanding on the Authority’s part of the significance of decoration or ornamentation within the Art Deco movement, and the nature of its application to building design. Whilst some deco influenced buildings are relatively austere and rely solely on form, proportions and materials to achieve the desired effect, others celebrate the decorative opportunities that can be expressed in ironwork, joinery or plasterwork, as can be seen in the illustration of Shoreham Airport provided by Mr. Wright.

61. Our opinion on the external decoration on the front of the Happy Landings Hotel is that this can fairly be described as subtle and restrained rather than rudimentary, and it should be acknowledged in this context that the designer was working with a very limited palette of materials, i.e. render wall finishes, metal windows and timber doors, and presumably with a limited budget at his disposal. In such circumstances, we

conclude that the character of the modeling that Durand achieved in the render details is appropriate to the period, is out of the ordinary for a local 1930s commercial building, and even these restrained decorative touches lend the building its distinctive character.

iv. **Plan Form**

62. We consider that the first section of the guidance within this section of CN6 is most relevant and this states:

“The plan form of the building can be as carefully designed as its façade and may be of equal significance. Plan forms which are intact and display the intentions of the designer are of greater significance than those which do not. The most significant plans will be those which clearly contribute to the interest of the building. The planned spatial organisation of the plan form, or three-dimensional relationship of the plan with its proportions, may also be of significance”.

63. Mr. Wright made the following written assessment:

“The plan form of Happy Landings has been significantly altered and is not in any way an expression of a rare or unique type of building in this regard. Designed as a hotel, with a central lobby area and rooms on flanking wings, the circular plan form of the ground floor is consistent with many other hotel buildings of the period. The central spaces do remain intact in plan including the ballroom. As an expression of the plan form of a 1930s hotel building, therefore, Happy Landings has some degree of survival but it has been hugely altered by the extensions to the rear and this has detrimentally impacted its claims to special interest in this regard”.

64. In its written response to the appeal submission the Authority,

“... acknowledges that there have been alterations to the plan form and that it is not rare or unique. However, plan form does not have to be rare or unique to be considered under this criterion. For the author [Mr. Wright] to state that the alterations to the rear have ‘hugely altered’ and ‘significantly altered’ the plan form is an overstatement. It must be noted that extensions to the rear of Happy Landings are not as extensive as the author suggests. The Authority considers that the plan form of the building survives to such an extent that it contributes to the special interest of the building”.

65. Having carefully inspected the building and reviewed the survey drawings, our considered impression is that the floor plans have not been altered to any significant degree. No evidence was presented to us of major structural alterations of the original fabric. The original ground floor plan, which appears to be thoughtfully organised, remains clearly legible with its symmetrical light-wells providing light and ventilation to some of the inner rooms. The recent subdivision of the former ballroom by Mr. Opie is

easily reversible. At first floor level the circular corridor arrangement remains intact, but has been interrupted in two places, by a fire door and a partition. The bedrooms have been modified so as to provide en-suite bathrooms, but such alterations are inevitable within older hotels and this work has not compromised the essence of the underlying floor plan.

66. The only significant alteration at the rear of the building is the addition of the first floor bedroom accommodation over the west wing. This has simply involved an extension to the existing corridor arrangement, leaving the plan form of the original building unchanged.
67. In respect of Mr. Wright's assertion that, "*the plan form of Happy Landings ... is not in any way an expression of a rare or unique type of building*", we heard no supporting evidence on this subject. When it was constructed the Happy Landings Hotel was a small hotel, with around twenty bedrooms, and we consider that it cannot be fairly compared with the better known but much larger and more prestigious UK hotels of this period, such as the Midland Hotel in Morecambe, or the Grand Ocean Hotel at Saltdean. What is clear to us is that the Happy Landings Hotel is a very rare kind of building in the Guernsey context, and that its plan form, which is largely intact, makes a positive contribution to its special interest.

v. **Innovatory Qualities**

68. The Authority does not claim any innovatory qualities for the Happy Landings Hotel, and we agree with this assessment.

vi. **Quality and Survival of Interiors**

69. We consider that the relevant part of CN6 is as follows,

"Buildings can be given added significance because of the quality and survival of their interiors. Sometimes the interior of a building can be more important than the exterior. Interiors may be regarded as significant if they are largely intact or if they add to or reinforce the character of the building".

70. Although Mr. Wright's written submission on this matter was prepared without the benefit of a visit to the property, and was based on information provided by Mr. Falla, it was clear from the views he expressed during the Hearing that his subsequent inspection had done little to alter his earlier assessment:

"The level of survival of interior fittings and fixtures is partial at best, and much has been lost and replaced as the building has been modernised throughout the late twentieth century and early twenty first. The quality of the interiors, moreover, was never high and the interiors were designed as utilitarian from the start. The building was not designed with the ornate interiors one would associate with buildings associated with the Art Deco movement and consequently, the quality

and survival of the interiors are not sufficient to warrant designation”.

The Authority points out that the building retains many interior features that reflect its period and architectural style, such as coving, doors, fireplaces, flooring, and the staircase.

71. We agree with Mr. Wright that the survival of interior detail is only partial, that the quality of the interiors was never high, and that the interiors were, for the most part, utilitarian. However, we do not agree that buildings associated with the Art Deco movement would necessarily be expected to have ornate interiors, and we believe that such expectations are probably derived from a familiarity with high status buildings of the period that have lodged in the public consciousness. We believe that the quality of the lobby area is higher than Mr. Wright indicates, despite some alteration, and that the present interior décor, with its dark colouring, has had a negative effect on the character of this space, which Durand presumably intended to be light and airy. Nevertheless, we conclude that it is only the lobby area at the ground and first floor levels that have any significance in architectural terms, and the remaining interior spaces are of little intrinsic interest.

vii. **Use**

72. CN6 states that where a building maintains its original use it may be more likely to have a higher architectural interest. Where there has been significant change to the building as a result of its change of use, the architectural interest of the building is likely to be lower. The impact of any change of use on the building will form part of the consideration as whether to protect it.
73. Mr. Wright acknowledges that although the building has undergone periods of military use, it subsequently returned to its intended use and some importance attaches to the building because of this. We agree with this assessment.

viii. **Alterations**

74. CN6 states that buildings may have additional interest where they have been added to over the years and illustrate an historic development. Conversely, inappropriate extensions and alterations can damage a building's architectural interest.
75. Mr. Wright concedes that the façade of the Happy Landings Hotel remains largely intact and concludes that this is the only part of the exterior that remains. However, as we have indicated earlier, we saw during our site visit that the eastern elevation of the building is also unchanged, though it is largely hidden from view.
76. Mr. Wright goes on to say that the first floor over the rear west wing was added in the early 1970s and though we have no reason to doubt this statement, no evidence was provided to support this suggested date. We saw that this addition was carried out in a sympathetic manner utilising matching materials and components. It could be said

that this construction of this additional bedroom accommodation is a direct reflection of the booming tourism industry and need not be regarded in a negative light.

77. Mr. Wright continues,

*“... piecemeal extensions to the rear continued from the 1960s onwards”
and,
“... there are several smaller alterations to the eastern end of the rear elevation that appear to be very recent.”*

Other than the brick barbeque area, which Mr. Opie, the manager, explained that he had constructed himself, we neither saw, nor were made aware of, any other piecemeal extensions at the rear of the building subsequent to the primary construction in 1938/1939. We were not provided with any dating evidence to demonstrate anything to the contrary. That a number of doors and windows have been replaced is not, of course, a matter in dispute. Our overall impression is that the extent of external alterations and the negative effect they are said to have had on the importance or legibility of the historic building is overstated.

78. In terms of the interior, we have already reached the conclusion that the only area of significance is the central entrance, lobby and staircase area and we are satisfied that the degree of alteration that has occurred here has not materially damaged the architectural interest of this part of the building.

ix. **Appearance**

79. CN6 states:

“Importance is attached to the external appearance of a building and its setting, the more indicative of the date of building the more important the building will be. The older the building the more likely it is to have been altered or changed, therefore those buildings which maintain their original appearance are of greater importance. More recent buildings whose appearance has been significantly altered or changed will be less important”.

80. We consider that other than the question of the building’s setting, which we deal with below, the issues raised in this assessment criterion duplicate matters that we have already dealt with under the earlier headings. Further comment would not, therefore, be beneficial.

Overall Conclusion on Architectural Significance

81. In the section in Mr. Wright’s written submission dealing with architectural significance, his conclusion is as follows,

“Art Deco was primarily an applied Art and at Happy Landings, the inclusion of the style to an unprepossessing architecture gave the building a faint relationship to a rather basic modern building. The primary architectural significance rests on the façade, that should be considered to have High Significance comparatively to the rest of the building. All the other elevations are therefore judged to be of only Medium Significance and all later elements are Intrusive”.

The conclusion is supported by coded significance drawings which indicate four categories of significance - High, Medium, Low, and Intrusive.

82. Mr. White pointed out that the elevational drawings submitted by Mr. Wright that portray the relative significance of various parts of the building contain a number of anomalies. We noted that on the north elevation, the ballroom and the flat roofed extension attached on its east side, as well as the spiral fire escape and projecting porch adjacent to it, are all shown to be Intrusive elements whereas in our judgment these are either likely to be or certain to be original features, and should therefore be accorded Medium Significance. On the west elevation the upper floor of the front range of the building is shown to be of Low Significance, whereas the equivalent section on the east elevation is shown to be of Medium Significance, despite these elevations being in virtually identical condition. Our conclusion is that Mr. Wright’s assessment of architectural significance overstates the effect of intrusive features, and underestimates the value of original features.
83. We have concluded in earlier parts of this decision that when considered in the Guernsey context, and in light of the apparent rarity of Art Deco influenced buildings in the Island, the Happy Landings Hotel does possess a significant degree of architectural interest. We consider that this interest resides primarily in the south façade and also in the return elevations of the front range on its eastern and western flanks, as these are unaltered and maintain a consistency of architectural treatment. We have also concluded that the architectural interest extends to the interior lobby area, including the corridors to the former ballroom and the upper staircase landing. A key question then is whether the building satisfies the requirements of the first criterion of CN6, i.e. whether the building can be said to be of significant definite high quality and character, whether it is the work of an important architect, or is an exceptional example representing stylistic development in Guernsey.
84. Our judgment on this point is that whilst the Happy Landings Hotel is self-evidently not a building of very high architectural quality when considered in a wider context, it does have a distinctive character and architectural significance in the Island context as it was designed by an architect of some renown who is notable in Guernsey terms, and it is a rare, albeit modest, example of an under-represented stylistic movement in Guernsey – Art Deco. While Mr. Wright’s final assessment was that in architectural terms the Happy Landings Hotel falls just below the minimum threshold to warrant listing, our overall conclusion is that the building lies just above that threshold, and has sufficient special architectural interest to warrant listing, especially in combination with the associated special historical interest of the building.

Other Interests under s.33(2) of the 2005 Law

85. The Authority claims that the ‘other interest’ that applies in this case relates to the setting of the building, which is described in the relevant section of CN6 in the following terms:

“A building’s setting can have a very important bearing on its architectural or traditional interest. Consideration will be given to any planned or fortuitous setting. Settings can be important to the special interest of a building even if they were not part of the original design – for example the wider landscape setting of a traditional house. Even if not a significant influence on special interest, the loss of setting can have an adverse influence on the character and significance of a protected building. When assessing individual or groups of buildings their relationship to the land form and landscape or townscape will be considered”.

86. We saw that the most important immediate setting of the Happy Landings Hotel is provided by the entrance forecourt on the south side of the building, which lies adjacent to the road and is used predominantly for parking. Our assessment is that this immediate environment to the principal façade has not been significantly altered since the 1930s and the slight raising of the forecourt surface has not, in our judgment, resulted in a significant harm to the setting.
87. The southern boundary of the land is defined by low, rendered boundary walls which allow direct views of the building façade from the road, and it is the open visual connection with Rue des Landes that brings the building’s wider setting into play and enables the building to engage with its surroundings. The siting and orientation of the Happy Landings Hotel at the transition point between the two sinuous curves followed by Rue des Landes as it passes through the historic settlement can be regarded as fortuitous, as this positioning enables the building to dominate the kinetic views experienced by drivers as they enter and leave the western edge of the hamlet.
88. For drivers travelling westwards, the building is not revealed until the observer has passed the entrance to St. Mary’s Church and turned towards the north-west, when the elongated façade of the Happy Landings Hotel gradually dominates the outlook to the north until Rue des Landes turns again to the south west. A sense of enclosure is created on this bend by an historic property directly opposite the Happy Landings Hotel, and beyond this point the sense of enclosure dissipates. For drivers travelling eastwards, the placement of the Happy Landings Hotel on the outside of the curve, coupled with the enclosing effect of roadside structures on the inside of the bend, tend to concentrate the view directly on the central entrance bay of the hotel.
89. This combination of siting and topography greatly increases the visual presence of the Happy Landings Hotel, notwithstanding the presence of the adjacent Jackson’s Garage premises and its attendant parking. This characteristic of high visibility on one of the busiest roads in the Island is a circumstance which seems to us to enhance the significance of this building.

90. In commenting on the wider setting of the Happy Landings Hotel, Mr. Wright expressed the view in his written statement,

“... the loss of historic context with the airport has affected its authenticity substantially”.

We do not share this view, and the fact that the original 1930s airport building has not survived does not, in our judgment, alter the intrinsic interest or authenticity of the Happy Landings Hotel itself. The visual connection between the hotel and the airport terminal does survive, and although the Jackson’s Garage development intrudes to some degree on the environment of the Happy Landings Hotel, we do not consider this to seriously undermine the setting of its principal frontage.

Additional rounds of Appeal

91. A claim is made by Mr. Le Gallez on behalf of the appellants on the ground under s.18(b) of the Special Controls Ordinance that the land included in the listing entry is more than is necessary as the character of the land is not special in any way. Section 18(b) deals specifically with (i) any man-made object or structure forming part of the land in the vicinity of the building, or (b) an object not forming part of the building. As the extent of listing follows the perimeter of the building, and all land beyond the external building face is excluded, we conclude that s.18(b) has no relevance in this case and the appeal under this ground accordingly fails.
92. A further claim is made on the ground under s.18(c) that the entry is materially incorrect given the discrepancies between the Authority’s assessment and the Report. These arguments were not advanced by Mr. Le Gallez at the Hearing and as we found no evidence ourselves of discrepancies between the Authority’s Building Survey Report and the entry we conclude that the appeal under this ground also fails.
93. The final claim made on the ground under s.18(d) of the Special Controls Ordinance is that the entry is ultra vires or unreasonable as the architectural accreditations are uncertain and the Property is not one of continuous age. Having carefully assessed the written and oral submissions from both parties we are satisfied that the quality of the evidence presented was at a high level and is entirely consistent with the standards than can reasonably be expected in dealing with historic building matters, where experience and interpretation must, of necessity, often substitute for hard facts and certainty. The question of the different phases and ages of the building’s construction and alteration were dealt with in detail during the Hearing. Our conclusion is that there is no substance in this ground of appeal, which accordingly fails.
94. We have considered all other matters raised in the written submissions, heard in evidence during the Hearing and seen during the site visit. The fact that the Happy Landings Hotel lies within the Forest Church Conservation Area does not seem to us to have a direct bearing on the key issues that arise in this appeal, which relate to the intrinsic historic and architectural merits of the building.

95. We conclude that the appeals on grounds (a) to (d) of s.18 of the Special Controls Ordinance do not succeed and the addition of the Happy Landings Hotel into to the Protected Buildings List is justified.
96. We have indicated in this decision that in our judgment the special historic and architectural interest of the Happy Landings Hotel is most clearly expressed in the external form of the front range of the building, and in the interior lobby, while the other parts of the building are of lesser significance. Notwithstanding this, we conclude that the extent of listing is appropriately defined so that the whole building is protected, enabling the Authority to use its judgment as it sees fit as and when proposals affecting the building arise.

Stuart Fell DipArch RIBA IHBC
Presiding Member

Date of Issue: 6th July 2017