

| <b>Application No:</b> | <b>Consultees Name:</b> | <b>Received:</b>    | <b>Comment:</b> | <b>Response:</b>  |
|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---|
| 2022/2255/P            | Vivien Conacher         | 07/06/2022 16:19:49 | COMMNT          | <p>The Sunlight &amp; Daylight Report has published numerous assumptions about our building (31-35 Great Ormond Street).</p> <p>I would like to clarify the report's "assumed internal arrangement" for our flats - our narrow galley kitchens, bathrooms, and communal internal stairway have windows on the other side of the building. The main floor space of our flats (the rooms where we sit/work/live) are lit by the windows facing the hospital. The fact is that if the huge GOSH building is constructed, NONE of these windows will meet BRE standards for daylight and this will require supplementary electric lighting during the day, driving our electricity costs up. The scale of the proposed building is completely out of proportion to this area and will dwarf our homes, steal our daylight, and diminish the well-being we experience as we live/work opposite!</p> <p>This report also incorrectly states that "the ground floor windows are believed to serve commercial space and have therefore been scoped out of the assessment" - Flat 1 of 31-35 Great Ormond Street is a residential ground floor flat! A site visit following direct communication with the residents or owner of this building would have been a simple way to attain this information!</p> |

---

| <b>Application No:</b> | <b>Consultees Name:</b> | <b>Received:</b>    | <b>Comment:</b> | <b>Response:</b>   |
|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| 2022/2255/P            | Gillian Mosely          | 07/06/2022 19:37:15 | COMNOT          | Gillian Mosely, 36a Lambs Conduit Street, London, WC1N 3LD |

7 June, 2022

Dear Patrick and Jonathan,

I will be writing several letters of opposition to the Great Ormond Street planning application just received, each dealing with different aspects of their planning application.

This first one is about their 'Community Engagement' submission.

Timing and Nature of the Consultation:

They conclude: 6.1 The applicant and the Trust have undertaken a comprehensive process of pre-application consultation with stakeholders and the local community lasting years.

6.6 The applicant considers that the pre-application engagement undertaken with the local community and stakeholders has been timely and effective.

Your guidance states: 2.4 Paragraph 39 specifically promotes early pre-application engagement and the front-loading of consultation and explains that applications that can demonstrate effective pre-application engagement should be favoured over those that cannot. The purpose is to better coordinate public and private resources and help identify issues that can be resolved at the pre-application stage.

As one of the community members attempting to engage with them from 2017, this felt always, like they had made up their minds already and that discussions were a tick-box exercise. Indeed, on several occasions various members of the GOSH team admitted that once they set the order of their works schedule in 2015 (without consultation with any members of the local community) they were unable to change the order of works. This has had the direct affect that their construction management plan has been non-negotiable throughout. For this reason, I do not believe that the specified consultation took place in timely fashion, let alone early. In short, they did not engage with the community at all when they were making the key decisions about the order in which their build will be conducted.

For clarity, we have long argued that the work to the Southwood Building on Guildford Street should happen before the GOSH frontage is re-built. We were told several times they'd decided order of works in 2015 and could not switch phases four and five of their planned build.

This matters because under any circumstances the demolition and re-building of the GOSH main building will be extremely disruptive to the neighbourhood; however, their persistent refusal to alter their traffic management plan, will probably almost double the amount of pain and disruption that those in the neighbourhood are being asked to endure. This is all the more frustrating because it is needless and would not be the situation had they consulted us when they were actually making their decisions on order of works phases rather than after the fact. (More on construction management in another letter.)

They state that they engaged with us as follows: They mention the following meetings – in a way that makes it clear that the phases of construction had already been decided pre-consultation.

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

3.41 The Phase 4 redevelopment project was on the RLG agenda for discussion in these meetings:

- 13th September 2016
- 27th October 2016
- 13th December 2016
- 20th February 2017
- 25th April 2017
- 25th July 2017
- 25th October 2017
- 23rd January 2018
- 24th April 2018
- 31st July 2018
- 23rd October 2018
- 29th January 2019
- 23rd April 2019
- 23rd July 2019
- 29th October 2019
- 28th January 2020
- 27th October 2020

\*\*\*Consultation on the order of delivery which is what is causing all this heart-break never took place.

A handful of points raised at their consultation groups:

Construction Management

"3.42 Whilst many areas of the redevelopment were presented including logistics, design and operations, the main conversation that recurred related to a suggestion that a route to service the GOSHCCC could be created from the main service yard to Powis Place. The Redevelopment Team communicated repeatedly to the RLG that this would not be possible due to the impact on clinical buildings, third party land, and the demolition of key functional areas of the hospital.

Vehicular Access Respondents suggested that construction traffic access should access the site from Guilford Street or Lamb's Conduit Street as opposed to Great Ormond Street. Others suggested that traffic should access the hospital via Powis Place for the long-term for the benefit of local residents and children. It was questioned whether the proposed contraflow access route from Boswell Street via Theobalds Road would cause traffic issues. There is no route from Guilford Street to Great Ormond Street through the wider Hospital site.

Introducing a route linking into Powis Place would cause significant disruption to the running of the hospital including the loss of inpatient beds, consulting rooms, treatment rooms and the loss of fire escape rooms as well as a number significant impacts on the National Hospital. We understand how important this is to residents and have undertaken site tours for those that have raised it as a concern, to demonstrate the

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

difficulty of servicing the site in this way. We would remain open to hosting further tours if requested. During the construction process the main entrance will be closed with site hoarding. A temporary access will be located at Powis Place. The Demolition & Construction Management Plan, which has been submitted as part of the planning application, demonstrates how Great Ormond Street can safely accommodate the traffic. The introduction of temporary crossing measures are being considered. GOSH has been engaging with the adjacent University College London to ensure their entrance can operate successfully.

Meeting 1 – 29th October 2019

3.46 A PCG meeting was held in Barclay House to introduce local residents to Sisk's initial Construction Management Plan and proposed Traffic Movement Plans. During this meeting, the proposed delivery phases of the wider masterplan were also discussed.

Question 5: The construction process for the proposed Children's Cancer Centre will require us to strike the right balance between meeting the needs of our neighbours and the needs of the project. Do you feel that the construction plans achieve this?

5.7 Responses to question 5 were gathered on a Likert scale. Respondents were presented with a list of options ranking from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5). 5.8 There were 5 responses to this question and all disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

Masterplan One respondent stated that GOSH did not consult widely enough when developing the masterplan. Confirmation was sought on when the next phase of the masterplan was due to come forward. The long-term objective of the masterplan is to have a fully redeveloped main site, providing the best care to as many children as possible, with another entrance on Guilford Street. The phased approach is to all the Trust to redevelop buildings which are no longer fit for modern clinical purposes whilst maintaining as much care as possible."

I would remind the planning committee that this is the lives and livelihoods of hundreds if not several thousand people that will be often severely disrupted, yet, this is never acknowledged or discussed in their neighbourhood consultation plan.

I also wonder why they can seemingly accommodate emergency vehicles at Powis Place but not construction vehicles?

I repeat, their consultation was too late/never happened, in terms of their meaningful decision-making on construction plans. Can this be rectified?

Community Space

On several occasions the subject of shared community space has been raised both by Camden planners, and, local residents. This seems to have been lost in their planning...can it be reinstated?

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

Traffic and Parking:

"The temporary removal of parking bays to the south of Great Ormond Street and Boswell Street was questioned as was the number of resident parking spaces that would be lost during the various construction phases. One respondent suggested suspending parking along Boswell Street for the duration of the construction period.

Construction vehicles leaving the site will make their way onto Boswell Street. There are likely to be some suspension of car parking spaces and changes to current parking space layouts, but it is not yet clear how many. With regard to Lambs Conduit Street, double yellow lines are already in place on this road."

There are already far fewer residents parking bays supplied in this area than there are residents parking permits (full data available on this upon request.) How are they planning to mitigate this loss?

Neighbourhood Planning Act

Finally, I wondered whether under planning laws 'the ability for local communities to prepare their own plans for their local neighbourhood areas' we might have further and more meaningful input?

1.10 Planning is therefore fundamental to shaping the neighbourhoods in which we all live and work. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) mentions that early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential and a wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area.

Neighbourhood planning act:

2.32 The Localism Act 2011 enables local community groups, subject to specified procedures, to apply to the Council for designation as Neighbourhood Forums and for the designation of Neighbourhood Areas. Forums are responsible for preparing Neighbourhood Development Plans, Community Right to Build Orders or Neighbourhood Development Orders. 2.33 A Neighbourhood Development plan has to follow a similar process to that carried out by the Council for a Development Plan Document (but on a local scale) including public consultation and the examination process may involve a Public Hearing in some cases. However, there is an additional step of a local referendum whereby if more than half the vote is in favour, the plan must be adopted by the Council

Can we enact such a plan immediately in our area?

I look forward to your responses.

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response:             |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|
|                 |                  |           |          | My very best, Gillian |

---

**Total: 11**