Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2255/P	Gillian Mosely	08/06/2022 12:17:24	COMNOT	Gillian Mosely, 36a Lambs Conduit Street, London WC1N 3LD 8 June, 2022 Dear Jonathan and Patrick, This letter lays out my extremely strong objections to the submitted Construction Management Plans for the GOSH phase 4 construction. The plan appears to take no consideration of the health, well-being, business impact on, or indeed good will, of those who live and work in the neighbourhood. This includes hundreds of local children. All our lives will be severely impacted for up to five years by the build, but this construction management plan more or less doubles this impact, needlessly. Why none of this occurred to those at GOSH while they were first laying out their order of works is beyond me. I fear it speaks volumes about their attitude to GOSH neighbours. Hours: these are extremely open-ended and leave the community vulnerable to works being carried on at any hour and on any day with almost no protections. “p.17 - 4.4 Permitted Working Hours Permitted site working hours: Mon – Fri: 0800 - 1800 Sat: 0800 - 1300 Not on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays When required to work outside the above hours the Local Authority and local residents will be informed where necessary prior to the works commencing. Planned out of hours works will be required to facilitate operations. The list below included phases where out of hours works are potentially required: ¿ enabling works; ¿ works to Great Ormond Street one way, removal of parking; ¿ site hoarding erection; ¿ existing services isolation and diversion; ¿ site welfare setup; ¿ tower crane erection and dismantle; ¿ reinforced concrete frame construction; ¿ steel truss installation; ¿ link bridge installation; and ¿ site decant post project completion.” “Figure 8 presents preliminary working periods where anticipated noisy and high-level vibrations work could be carried out for example, breaking of existing ground bearing Level 1 concrete slab. These arrangements are to be formalised between Sisk and the Trust during Stage 4 design works. This document will capture the outcome and be included within the final revision of the DCMP.” Community Liaison: This rings extremely hollow and I fundamentally challenge their statement that they consulted the community in time to actually have an effect on this construction management plan. (Please see my letter on their Community Statement.)

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

In addition, they say that impact has got to be assessed for undue effects on residents and local businesses – should this not have happened pre-application? It is critical this happens before permission is granted.
" 5.0 Community Liaison. It is fundamentally important to build strong relationships with the local community. This is best achieved through open and collaborative engagement, clarity in message and justification as well as. bringing forward a building of the highest design quality.
Impact from deconstruction and construction methodologies need to be assessed to ensure there is no impact to the ongoing activities at GOSH or undue effects on the surrounding businesses and residential community. Due to the high level of risk in interfering with ongoing clinical activities, Sisk has proposed implementing the role of a Project Liaison Manager to plan, manage and monitor all interfacing activities within GOSH, local residents and local businesses."

" The DCMP will document comments received from the public community and how changes have been implemented to address each comment. When
submitting the final revision of the DCMP an appendix will include the following:
¿ who was consulted;
¿ a summary of the comments received; and
¿ how the CMP has been amended / mitigated measures put in place in response to comments received, an explanation of the reasons for not making changes.
The applicant has set up a Planning Consultation Group (PCG) which will include residents. Prior to the submission of draft DCMP being submitted to LBC, Sisk and GOSH have arranged and carried out a number of consultation events, these include face to face PCG / presentations and virtual meetings. It is proposed that PCG seminars will be carried out every yearly quarter and prior to the commencement of specific construction work phases. At the consultation events, presentations will 19 be delivered to all attending parties on logistical arrangements and proposed environmental controls pertaining to the specific PCG agenda."

In discussing how complaints about construction will be made they explain how they will dialogue with the local community. To date such dialogue has consisted of local residents being told what GOSH plan to do and not listening to, or indeed adapting to, any concerns or suggestions from the local community. If GOSH believe they have listened/are listening please supply examples of this. If it turns out that this is not the case, how will Camden ensure this process is carried out meaningfully going forward?

"5.2 Neighbouring Sites
Due to the commencement date of deconstruction and construction activities for GOSH CCC works being June 2023 Sisk will monitor the LBC planning portal to identify planned and upcoming construction works within the vicinity of GOSH.
The LBC planning portal has identified the Tybalds regeneration scheme to be in conjunction with programme works for GOSH CCC. Following the meeting on 17 February 2022 the Camden Planning Committee granted planning permission. The project is split over two phases with phase one programme for completion Autumn 2024. Information relating to the regeneration scheme can be location within the link below: Tybalds regeneration programme - Information page - We Are Camden - Citizen Space. Sisk will liaise with the contractor delivering this works to coordinate our activities within Great Ormond Street. Any works that might impact either project will be identified by means of scheduled meetings and addressed by the site management team."

The Tybalds scheme has been on the books for a while now. Is it not a little late for GOSH to be thinking

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

about this coordination? Have they consulted a local map which makes the concept of handling both builds in tandem without severely compromising the lives of most residents and businesses locally – seem oxymoronic? How is Camden going to guarantee the pairing does not make the neighbourhood unliveable?

Transport Management:

Where is the full transport assessment?

They state there will be minimal impact on residents and local businesses but historic discussions, and indeed common sense, say otherwise. How will Camden protect local businesses and residents from this looming nightmare?

Why are plans described below still being developed? How can they be assessed if they are not yet complete? Surely, this must happen before any planning permission is granted?

“highways labelled will incur construction traffic movements.
An existing green travel plan has been issued to Sisk by Trust Management. We will work with the Trust to integrate its new Travel Plan within our Construction Method Statement. The Trust has been developing a brief and vision for a safer, healthier more child-friendly environment on Great Ormond Street and is preparing to develop it further over the coming year. The Trust has also been working closely with Camden on short-term traffic calming solutions to improve the air quality and safety on the street. Working with appointed consultants a revised Travel Plan will be implemented by the Trust which will provide safe alternative travel options for GOSH staff, patients, and local residents businesses. To ensure compliance the approved Green Travel Plan will be displayed on site noticeboards and distributed to all relevant stakeholders.

Cycle Lane Disruption:

What route do they suggest cyclists use? Is this actually realistic given the level of construction/construction vehicles? How does any of this safeguard very local cyclists?
“Sisk has investigated the opportunity of introducing designated cycle lanes within close proximity of site. Currently there are no segregated cycle routes within the immediate proximity of site. Existing Quietway cycle link travelling north and south through Lambs Conduit Street and Guilford Place on to Guilford Street. As a result of the hoarding line within Great Ormond Street, logistic plans currently propose a 4.4m wide lane on Great Ormond Street for public use. This proposed width exceeds current highway legislation. The current logistics plan supports recent highway code amendments implemented on 29/01/22, whereby cyclists positioning is recommended to be in the centre of the road where traffic is regulated to 30mph. The Sisk logistics plan proposes that Guilford Place up to Great Ormond Street will be adapted to become a temporary one-way street during construction phase traveling north – south. Due to existing parking, clear road width is insufficient to accommodate a safe segregated two-way cycle path of 3m. As a result of the loss of existing cycle route travelling south-north on Guilford Place Sisk propose redirection of Quietway cycle link to be on Great Ormond Street and Millan Street. To capture predicted cycle traffic towards the west of site cyclists Sisk propose to extend the quiet cycle link on Russell Square

Traffic management:
What happens if traffic/road congestion delays their pre-booked truck delivery slots? How will they then deal

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

with resulting local congestion?

With zebra crossings closed and Great Ormond Street given over to construction traffic; indeed, simultaneous to the Tybalds build, how does GOSH anticipate that local children will walk to school? And indeed, what will the impact be on local businesses – surely a business impact survey will need to be done? And how will Camden protect local resident's right to quiet enjoyment?

How do GOSH and or Camden plan to exercise their duty of care to locals, and indeed to compensate locals for loss of business? For instance, numerous restaurants and cafes will lose their outdoor seating and businesses like the funeral director which rely on being able to drive north, will be severely compromised. This as a direct result of this construction management plan.

"7.8, 7.9 Expected Construction Traffic
It is expected that existing surrounding highways will experience an increase to heavy goods vehicles during the deconstruction and construction period. Based on the current proposed design Sisk has carried out calculations to identify anticipated vehicular needs, these consist of:
¿ demolition:
o general quantities – 3,000m3 3 wagons per hour @ 8m3/wagon = 375 wagons
¿ general rate - 15wagons/day (removing120m3);-
¿ substructure:
o General quantities - Excavation 17,640m3
¿ general rate - 30wagons/day;-
¿ superstructure
o general quantities - 108m3 concrete per week = 22trucks, +5 rebar, +2 formwork
¿ general rate – peak concrete on a pour day = 30wagons: 720 muck away
vehicles over a 20wk period;-
¿ envelope
o general quantities – weekly delivery, 2 glazing, 2 SFS, 10 precast; and-
¿ fitout
o weekly delivery, 4 M&E, 4 plasterboard, 2 joinery, 4 others.
To enable the commencement of specific construction activities a number of exceptional deliveries are required. These include:
¿ delivery and removal of heavy demolition plant and machinery i.e. crawler cranes;
¿ delivery and removal of site welfare and accommodation
* d elivery and removal of piling rigs;
¿ 2no tower crane reception and dismantling and
¿ possible additional cranage for any heavy plant delivery, clinical equipment etc."

Lost residents parking bays:

How are GOSH suggesting that 70-odd such bays in an area which already has too few residents parking bays to permits issued (data available) be re-supplied? A handful of PD or CAD bays added in Queens Square will not be adequate.

"8.2 Parking Bay Suspension and Temporary Traffic Orders TTO

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

To facilitate safe continuous public travel throughout the construction phase temporary highway alterations are required, these include the following:
¿ Guilford Place & Great Ormond Street two-way traffic to be amended to one-way traffic traveling east – west throughout the entirety of the construction phase; and-
¿ suspension of existing parking throughout construction period.
¿ Guilford Street;-
¿ suspension of existing zebra crossing; and-
¿ potential relocation / conversion of existing pedestrian crossing into zebra crossing.
¿ Guilford Place:-
¿ partial suspension of loading (double yellow lines) at the southern end.
¿ Great Ormond Street:-
¿ suspension 1no disabled parking space;
¿ suspension of 13no Resident permit holders parking;
¿ suspension of 4no single yellow line loading and unloading spaces;
¿ Suspension of 1no location of double yellow highway provision;
¿ suspension of 12no pay and display parking; and
¿ suspension of 5no ambulance drop off locations.
¿ Boswell street:-
¿ suspension of all single yellow line loading and unloading spaces;
¿ suspension of 10no resident permit holders parking; and-
¿ suspension of 4no pay and display parking.
¿ implementation of temporary road signs and markings in accordance with DCMP and TMP;
¿ installation of new temporary pedestrian crossing at Powis Place street junction on Great Ormond Street; and
¿ establish designated ambulance patient transfer parking and taxi drop off points throughout the entirety of the construction phase.Sisk has performed transport and traffic assessments of the surrounding traffic network. Using secondary data gathered from transport assessments carried out in 2011 & 2018 we are able to ascertain an accurate understanding of the existing logistics at GOSH. Over a seven year period there has been a slight shift in public transport use, identifying an increase demand of public transport. This trend is predicted to maintain throughout the future years and result in a lesser need for public vehicular movement on Great Ormond Street. The table below provides a summary of vehicle numbers traveling within close proximity of the site.Results from the assessment indicate the construction logistical plan replicates the preferred existing route for public travel, whilst not impacting routes from Old Gloucester Street.
Summary of parking displacement analysis has identified the following:
¿ loss of ambulance parking bays can be catered for within the retained bays on Great Ormond Street and Powis Place;
¿ the reallocation of pay-by-phone bays on Boswell Street and Great Ormond Street can be catered for in Queens Square. During weekday, occupancy rates did not exceed 35% and did not exceed 80% during weekend; and-
39
¿ full residential occupancy rates are forecast to occur within the area as shown in image on the left. There is capacity in the immediate vicinity, should some pay-by-phone bays of Queens Square be converted temporarily into residential parking bays.
8. .3 Road Closures

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

Scheduled temporary road closures are required to facilitate specific works during the construction phase.
Work activities that will require temporary road closures include:
¿ site mobilisation & hoarding erection and dismantle. Anticipated duration 7days;
¿ site welfare accommodation setup and dismantle. Anticipated duration 9days;
¿ existing service diversion and termination. Anticipated duration 14days;
¿ enabling works i.e existing Great Ormond Street footpath protection. Anticipated duration 9days;
¿ Level 6-10 steel truss installation. Anticipated duration 7days; and
¿ bridge link installation. Anticipated duration 5days.
To mitigate temporary loss of access through Great Ormond Street Sisk has developed a plan to continue to provide clinical access and egress within Powis Place. As illustrated below clinical vehicles are to follow the existing one-way travel around Queen Square whereby all vehicles will turn left heading eastbound onto Great Ormond Street and into Powis Place. As shown in swept path analysis Powis Place can permit turning of vehicles up to a maximum of 10t rigid artic.
All clinical vehicles can proceed to vacate GOSH realm via Boswell Street.
8.4 4 Occupation of Public Highway During the construction phase our hoarding line will encompass the entire northern pedestrian footpath and half of the existing Great Ormond Street.To enable construction traffic to travel within the redline boundary the following alterations to the existing realm are required: Figure 37 - GOSH CCC – Proposed Road Closure Diversion Route”

TREES:
Such damage to and or loss of mature trees, an extremely valuable community asset, never seems to be granted elsewhere. Why should the situation be different here? Hands off our trees please, especially as they are crucial to Camden’s environmental policies.

“43
¿ removal of 14no existing trees on Great Ormond Street pedestrian walkway;
¿ removal of 19no existing bicycle hoops: 11no belonging to GOSH and 8no belonging to Camden Council;
¿ removal of 3no street corner vehicle bollards;
¿ removal of 1no public telephone box;
¿ removal of 2no public general waste bins;
¿ removal of 3no street light lamp posts;
¿ removal of 3no street signposts; and
¿ removal of 2no public seating benches.
To enable construction traffic to safely navigate outside the hoarding boundary the following enabling works has been currently identified as required:
¿ pruning to 4no London plane trees on northern junction on Guilford Place;
¿ adjustment to existing southern pedestrian footpath and curb line on Guildford Street; and
¿ relocation of existing pedestrian crossing on Guildford Street
Sisk has commissioned a full arboriculture assessment of the existing trees within and in close proximity of the site boundary. This assessment identified 22no trees being potentially affected by proposed construction works.
Through logistical development Sisk has eliminated any potential risk construction will cause to 4no of the assessed trees. These include all 3no assessed trees within Powis Place and 1no Category B tree on the west

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

of Great Ormond St (T4). To permit construction activities the removal of 10no existing Category C trees is to be undertaken. Our completed arboriculture assessment concludes these specific trees are immature specimens of limited landscape value. To permit proposed construction site welfare, accommodation and site access the removal of 4no existing False Locust trees is required. The individual trees have been noted as Category B with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20years. It is however noted that all False Locust trees are of a species which is identified as invasive within the London Invasive Species Initiative, as such it is not considered that its loss should be seen as a significant constraint to development. There are 4no mature London Plane trees on the corner of Guildford Place. Preconstruction analysis has identified a potential risk of construction vehicles clashing with existing overhanging branches. It is proposed that required pruning to existing trees is carried out to prevent damage during construction. Sisk is committed and willing to follow advice and recommendations from LBC with regards to a replantation scheme. Regardless of additional agreements, upon completion of CCC works it is proposed that Sisk is to reinstate new trees of identical value."

(Environmental (incl. noise) and heritage issues to be addressed separately.)

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours Sincerely, Gillian

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2255/P	Gillian Mosely	10/06/2022 11:09:19	COMNOT	36a Lambs Conduit Street, London, WC1N 3LD

10 June, 2022

Dear Patrick, Jonathan, and Camden planners,

I am writing to object to the GOSH phase 4 construction plans on a number of environmental fronts:

Acoustics:
The geographical assessment only covers the most immediate area and therefore seems completely inadequate. Sound travels. How far will all of below travel? Can they assess this please? Will we be subjected to noise throughout the entire neighbourhood day and night as the huge list of exemptions for normal working hours seems to imply?

It seems the 'key potential effects associated with exposure to noise are; activity disturbance, annoyance, and interference with processes or commercial activities.' How will this damage be compensated for? Can impact reports please be prepared as follows? Impact on the health and well-being of locals; impact on local businesses?

'Due to the location of the site within close proximity of adjacent clinical buildings of GOSH which are to remain operational during the construction phase, agreed quiet times throughout the working day are to be established prior to the commencement of deconstruction and construction.' Will such courtesy be extended to the community surrounding GOSH? It's a stretch to believe GOSH care about the local community it exists within as we are rarely mentioned throughout these reports, except when adhering to legislation.

Were any of the following included in their assessment? Emergency backup generators, construction vehicles, construction noise – eg wrecking balls; workers noise. If not why not? And can this be addressed please?

"9.1 Site Acoustics
Construction activities are likely to give rise to airborne, ground borne and structure borne noise levels. The main activities that are associated with this particular project will be:
¿ demolition works – concrete breaking and grinding;
¿ piling works – CFA & secant piling wall operations;
¿ ground works – reduced level dig to form Level 0 basement;
Figure 44 - GOSH Existing Underground Services
54
¿ CFA pile cropping;
¿ reinforced concrete frame formwork installation;
¿ reinforced concrete slab scabbling; and
¿ plant and construction vehicle movement.
9.1.1 Acoustic Survey
Sisk has completed a full impact noise assessment during August 2021 in accordance National Policy Framework (NPPF), BS 4142:2014+A1:2019, BS6472-1:2008, BS6472-1:2008, BS7445-1:2003, Pollution Act 1974, Environmental Protection Act 1990 and any specific LBC requirements. Baseline noise monitoring was carried out to establish daytime and night time noise levels through

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

the use of attended and unattended monitoring. As illustrated in image below long term unattended measurements was taken in two locations:
¿ roof level of existing Frontage Building; and
¿ roof level of Premier Inn Clinical Building PICB.
Unattended monitor stations recorded noise levels for a minimum of 4days and included at least one full weekend and two full weekdays / nights.
As illustrated in image below short term attended measurements was taken in six locations:
¿ street level on Powis Place;
¿ street level of Great Ormond Street west;
¿ street level of Great Ormond Street east;
¿ roof level of Octav Botnar Building OBW;
¿ roof level of Premier Inn Clinical Building PICB; and
¿ roof level of Variety Club Building VCB.
Attended monitor stations recorded noise levels for a minimum 20mINS.
The key potential effects associated with exposure to noise are; activity disturbance, annoyance, and interference with processes or commercial activities.
9.1.2 Guidance on Acoustic Standards during Demolition and Construction
Management and operational controls will be implemented in order to minimise adverse effects from noise arising from demolition and construction activities, if they occur. The timing and duration of mitigation measures, as described below, have all been designed to minimise impact on sensitive receptors. There will be monitoring of noise, both on-site to protect employees, and off-site, to minimise potential disturbance to the sensitive receptors and comply with noise control limits. This will occur prior to and throughout the main demolition and construction works. This document addresses off-site impacts.
Noise and its emission will be controlled in accordance with the recommendations established in BS 5228-1:2009 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. 9.1.3 Evaluation of Acoustic Impacts. The calculation of noise levels emitted by conventional plant and stationary machinery systems will be determined using procedures described in British Standards 5228. During the development of pre-construction activities predictions of noise and vibration levels will be generated using 3D modelling exercises.
To understand the noise environment before works commenced onsite, it was necessary to assess the existing situation. Noise measurements will be taken to determine the baseline situation prior to construction works proceeding.
Noise levels arising from demolition and construction at sensitive receptors will not exceed the maximum noise levels given in Figure 46, below. Where the measured ambient background noise levels, excluding construction noise, is >75 dB(A), the maximum permitted resultant noise level will be the cumulative effect of the measured ambient background noise level, plus the maximum permitted construction noise stated below.
If, via the monitoring of noise elevated levels are encountered, the source of noise will be identified, and alternative methods or additional control measures will be implemented. These will be agreed with Trust Management Team, as necessary.
55
The key potential effects associated with exposure to noise are; activity disturbance, annoyance, and interference with processes or commercial activities.
9.1.2 Guidance on Acoustic Standards during Demolition and Construction
Management and operational controls will be implemented in order to minimise adverse effects from noise arising from demolition and construction activities, if they occur. The timing and duration of mitigation

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

measures, as described below, have all been designed to minimise impact on sensitive receptors.
There will be monitoring of noise, both on-site to protect employees, and off-site, to minimise potential disturbance to the sensitive receptors and comply with noise control limits. This will occur prior to and throughout the main demolition and construction works. This document addresses off- site impacts.
Noise and its emission will be controlled in accordance with the recommendations established in BS 5228-1:2009 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites.
9.1.3 Evaluation of Acoustic Impacts
The calculation of noise levels emitted by conventional plant and stationary machinery systems will be determined using procedures described in British Standards 5228. During the development of pre-construction activities predictions of noise and vibration levels will be generated using 3D modelling exercises.
To understand the noise environment before works commenced onsite, it was necessary to assess the existing situation.
Noise measurements will be taken to determine the baseline situation prior to construction works proceeding.
Noise levels arising from demolition and construction at sensitive receptors will not exceed the maximum noise levels given in Figure 46, below. Where the measured ambient background noise levels, excluding construction noise, is >75 dB(A), the maximum permitted resultant noise level will
be the cumulative effect of the measured ambient background noise level, plus the maximum permitted construction noise stated below. If, via the monitoring of noise elevated levels are encountered, the source of noise will be identified, and alternative methods or additional control
measures will be implemented. These will be agreed with Trust Management Team, as necessary.
Due to the location of the site within close proximity of adjacent clinical buildings of GOSH which are to remain operational during the construction phase, agreed quiet times throughout the working day are to be established prior to the commencement of deconstruction and construction. Figure 47 below suggests such quiet time which will have to be adhered to. Subject to GOSH clinical activities certain works may be prohibited during certain working hours. Listed in Figure 47 below are
anticipated working hours in accordance with GOSH contractor working policy. These working hours
Day of week Time of Day SPL, DB LAeq. 1hr
Monday – Friday 08:00 – 18:00hrs 75
Saturday 08:00 – 13:00hrs 75
Figure 46- GOSH CCC Maximum Acceptable Acoustic Levels of Construction Activities at Sensitive Receptors
56 are subject to review and agreement during design development. Specific SPL, DB LAeq. 1hr levels for each time-period of a day is to be agreed with Trust Management Team
BASELINE NOISE:
Page | 19 Great Ormond Street Hospital Children's Cancer Centre (GOSHCCC)
Noise Measurement Results Report 297154-RSK-RP-002-(03)/3 // 16 May 2022
Noise Measurement Results
16 Long Term Measurements
16.1 The baseline noise survey was conducted over a five-day period between 20 and 25 August 2021 to quantify the existing noise levels throughout daytime and night-time periods.
16.2 Analysis of the dataset accounting for the 16-hour daytime period (07:00 – 23:00) and 8-hour night-time period (23:00 – 07:00) is provided to quantify the noise fluctuations at those
positions during a representative period.
16.3 A summary of the measured noise levels at position UL1 and UL2 are presented in Table 16.1 and Table 16.2.
Measured Noise Levels (b)

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

Date Time period (T) Average
LAeq,T dB
LAFmax,T dB
Average
LA90,T dB
Average
LA10,T dB
20.08.21 (a) 14:00 – 23:00 58 81 57 59
20.08.21 23:00 – 07:00 58 66 57 58
21.08.21 07:00 – 23:00 60 81 57 59
21.08.21 23:00 – 07:00 58 72 57 59
22.08.21 07:00 – 23:00 59 77 58 59
22.08.21 23:00 – 07:00 57 64 57 58
23.08.21 07:00 – 23:00 59 89 57 60
23.08.21 23:00 – 07:00 57 62 57 58
24.08.21 07:00 – 23:00 59 75 57 59
24.08.21 23:00 – 07:00 57 72 56 58
(a) Measurements not taken throughout full 16hr period
(b) LAeq,T values are the logarithmic average of LAeq,15min samples, and the LA10,T and LA90,T are the arithmetic average PLANT LIMIT – 53 DAY; 52 NIGHT
21.5 7-11PM 89; 11PM-7AM 88”

Vibrations:

This is particularly concerning given that by their own admission, a number of heritage buildings will be subjected to significant vibrations. Additionally, I do not see any vibrational assessment for the construction management plan which would pass by a huge number of listed properties. Can they please provide this?

Were there to be damage to these buildings, will there be a rectification/compensation scheme in place?

“9.2 Site Vibration (Structure-borne Noise)
Current design dictates that construction works are to be carried out within close proximity of adjacent clinical buildings. Further consideration through supply chain engagement will be carried out to consider construction methods that limit vibration levels and not undermine adjacent building structural integrity and operational clinical plant.
In accordance with London Borough of Camden (LBC) requirements, wherever possible to prevent unnecessary vibration arising from above/underground reinforced concrete superstructures should be demolished using equipment fitted with pulveriser/munching attachments. In the case of vibration, measured vibration levels shall be compared with the criteria in BS 5228: 2009 part 2 (i.e.1mms¿¹ PPV for potential disturbance in residential and using a suggested trigger criteria of 2mms¿¹
59 for commercial). Lower limits are to be agreed with the LBC if there is a risk that vibration levels may interfere with vibration sensitive equipment or other vibration sensitive objects. Construction activities are likely to give rise to increased vibration levels. The main activities that are
associated with this particular project will be:

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

¿ demolition works – concrete breaking and grinding;
¿ piling works – CFA & secant piling wall operations;
¿ ground works – reduced level dig to form Level 0 basement;
¿ continuous flight auger CFA pile cropping;
¿ reinforced concrete frame formwork installation;
¿ reinforced concrete slab scabbling; and
¿ plant and construction vehicle movement.
In the event that any complaint is received regarding vibration during demolition and construction activities, the matter will be discussed with the Trust Management Team and LBC and if appropriate a measuring exercise will be undertaken. If vibration is encountered then remedial measures will be proposed, agreed, and implemented.
9.2.1 Vibration Survey
Sisk are to undertake a baseline vibration assessment during the pre-construction phase. Ground born vibration levels will be measured at suitable locations on site by installing a vibration meter on the ground for a period of 24hours. Levels will be measured using accelerometers, adhering to the requirements of BS 6472-1:2008 “Guide to Evaluation of human exposure to vibration in buildings – Part 1: Vibration for sources other than blasting”. The vibration meter would be capable of applying appropriate frequency weightings to the measured acceleration levels in the horizontal axis (X- and Y-axis) and vertical axis (Z-axis) in order to calculate the Vibration Dose Values (VDV) m/s1.75.
The results from of the vibration monitoring will be compared to the criteria set out in the aforementioned BS6472-1:2008 which provides the calculation methodology and criteria for the assessment of ground vibration on humans within buildings using VDVs. The assessment determines the likelihood of adverse comment from future inhabitants.
9.2.2 Evaluation of Vibration Impacts Any measurement of vibration will be conducted in accordance with the principles of BS 5228:"Noise Control on Construction sites, Part 4", BS 7385: "Evaluation and measurement for vibration inBuildings" or BS 6472: 'Guide to evaluation of Human Exposure to Vibration in Buildings'. Vibration
dose values (VDVs) from BS 6472:1992 may be used for the assessment of subjective reaction to ground born vibration as shown in Table 2 below Where PPV values exceed the recommended values in BS 5228: Part 4 or BS 7385, activities causing vibration hazard will be suspended pending further investigation.”

Air Quality:

Dust

GOSH intentions here are extremely confusing. In their circular economy statement, they say they intend to recycle 90% of materials yet this does not seem to be reflected in other reports dealing with the demolition phase such as below. How will they tally? Is recycling concrete even possible to such a high extent? Again, their baseline assessment seems geographically way too narrow. Dust travels. In a recent local build, there was an issue with mitigation measures one day and I could see dust in the air inside my house with all the windows closed. What would happen with the GOSH build in similar circumstances? It's at least eight times larger than the example build.

They say that ‘the proposed development is considered as having potential negative effect on local air quality and future ambient air quality at the site.’ How do they intend to mitigate this?

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

They say they will produce a dust management plan prior to construction – surely this needs to be seen and assessed now?

"9.3 Air Quality Management. Air quality management will carried out in such a way as to limit the emissions of air pollution by employing best practical means. Throughout the deconstruction and construction phase Sisk will beresponsible for air quality management. The proposed development is considered as having potential negative effect on local air quality and future ambient air quality at the site.
9.3.1 Air Quality Assessment
Sisk has carried out an air quality assessment of existing/baseline conditions and potential air quality impacts during the construction and operational phases of the GOSH CCC Project. Included within the assessment the published report contains an air quality neutral assessment and recommends mitigation measures as appropriate.
9.3.2 Construction Phase Air Quality Control and Mitigation Methods
The air quality assessment concluded that emissions of dust (and particulate matter) will increase locally during the construction period, but the residual effect will be minor, with appropriate mitigation in the form of dust control at source, as set out below:
61• Design, implement and monitor philosophy of prevention of dust formation in the first place by utilising dust hierarchy; prevention, suppression and containment;
• hoarding of the site prior to any demolition and construction activities being carried out;
• demolition works of the Frontage Building will be undertaken using primarily non-percussive techniques such as hydraulic crushing with the use of water sprays as necessary to control dust generation. Percussive demolition techniques will be utilised where unavoidable and steps taken to minimise dust generation including the use of water sprays or mists to suppress airborne dust;
• the inclusion of suitable measures for the containment of dust, such as the use of debris screens and sheets; suitable and sufficient water sprays; and enclosed chutes for dropping waste materials to ground level;
• any debris dropped by site traffic will be cleaned away by the relevant sub-contractors before the end every working day or by close of business;
• concrete arisings will be removed from site for crushing at a local plan;
• all waste to be removed from site, materials not to be stockpiled unless it is to be reused in the site development. Any material that is stockpiled on site is to be contained within the hoardings and controlled using water sprays and sheeting to reduce dust generation;
• storage sites, equipment, temporary buildings and fixed plant and machinery etc. will be located to limit adverse environmental effects to sensitive receptors. All reasonable precautions will be taken for the operation of plant and equipment, to avoid nuisance. In common with storage of all waste, controls will be used to prevent release of airborne dust from spoil heaps and roads such as the use of covers or by damping down;
• burning of materials on site will be prohibited. All work areas will be kept clean and tidy and rubbish will be removed at frequent intervals;
• materials handling and storage areas will be sited as far away as reasonably practicable from public/residential areas. These areas will be actively managed where practicable. Prolonged storage of debris on site will be avoided;
• where necessary, other dusty materials will be dampened down using water sprays in dry weather;

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

• site plant and equipment will be kept in good repair and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications;
• where practicable, low emission fuels will be employed for demolition plant;
• No plant will be left running when not in use/operation;
• plant with dust arrestment equipment (such as particle traps) will be used where practicable;
• use of vehicle and plant with raised exhausts to minimise dust generation;
• the speed limit on site will be restricted to 10 mph for all site traffic;
• effective wheel cleaning will be undertaken for traffic leaving the site onto haul/public highways by the use of pressure washers. Cleaning of the underside of the vehicle will also be required. Where practical, delivery vehicles will only stand on hard surfaces rather than soil;
• vehicles transporting material capable of generating dust are to be suitably sheeted on each journey, to prevent release of materials and particulate matter. The sheeting material will be 62 maintained in good order and free from excessive rips and tears. Vehicles will be checked before they leave the site to ensure they are properly sheeted and/or washed;
• a mechanical road sweeper is to be used on-site as necessary to supplement manual cleaning and washing of carriageway footpaths, exit haulage routes and hard standing;
• all site vehicles will be kept in a good state of repair and maintenance;
• pile arisings will be cleared on a daily basis to reduce the propagation of dust;
• during prolonged dry periods or as directed by the Sisk Site Manager, haul roads will be dampened down where practicable. If necessary, during excavation works the site will be damped down to suppress dust propagation, using a water spray. The need for and frequency of such damping down operations will be reviewed in line with the prevailing weather conditions;
• exposed dust generating surfaces will be sealed off as quickly as practicable. This applies in particular to the excavation phase when the contractors will work from the existing hard standing in the clearing from east to west and will continue in general throughout the project;
• pre-mixed versions of cementations materials will be used where possible;
• any stockpiles to be screened and covered to minimise dust arising. Demolition sub-contractors will be required to provide detailed screening and covering measures;
• the orientation, shape and location of any stockpiles to be controlled to minimise risk of dust arising through wind action;
• the handling operations to minimise risk of dust rising, and the materials put onto stockpiles will be dropped from minimal practical height to minimise dust rising;
• spraying of water at work faces or during loading operations to be undertaken to mitigate dust;”

NO2:

Has any attempt been made to understand how many residents in the immediate area are already severely lung compromised?

Has any attempt been made to address the fact that hundreds of children walk past the hospital on their way to school each week and that their alternatives will be to pass by another building site (Tybalds) or along the very busy main road – Theobolds Road? Children are obviously also extremely susceptible. Are we to understand that the health of the children in the community is to be compromised by the children’s hospital build?

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

They say where practical green vehicles and machinery will be used. Who will monitor this? Is there any way to make this less open-ended?

• where practical, electrically operated machinery will be used in preference to petrol or diesel powered equipment. Operators will be instructed to switch off their plant instead of leaving it idling; and
• NO2 particle filters will be installed to all plant and machinery exhausts onsite.
The measures proposed for dust control set out in this section are consistent with those that will apply across the site as a whole and are based upon good practice developed during the deconstruction and construction phase. The monitoring proposals build upon the baseline established during pre-construction stage and construction works on other similar John Sisk and Son projects.

Air Quality Impacts:
Will there be a mandatory time limit for GOSH to fix any such reported problems?

They say there will be medium potential impacts on human health – what does this mean? It sounds pretty ominous to me and I object. Can we please have a full health impact assessment for vulnerable locals please?

9.3.4 Evaluation of Air Quality Impacts
Criteria were established with the Trust Management Team, for the construction works carried out on the other Land Parcels.
9.3.5 Reporting and Mitigation
If dust or particulate levels exceed standards agreed with the Trust Management Team and LBC, the findings will be reported, and the source of dust emission investigated with corrective action implemented as required.
The air quality management and monitoring plan will be co-ordinated by the Sisk Environmental Manager for the project and will be subject to periodic review, on an annual basis. This review will cover the scope, requirement and type of monitoring undertaken on an ongoing basis and any necessary changes will be submitted.

Further section on vehicles:

Please note that when residents raised extreme concerns about pollution from vehicles on a proposed delivery route that runs straight through the heart of our neighbourhood (during the consultation phase), we were told that vehicles would be green. This does not seem to be reflected here. Please see above for basic air pollution concerns. Is it possible to commission an independent air quality impact study?

“6.1.1 Exhaust Emissions from Plant and Vehicles
The operation of plant, goods vehicles, and vehicles used by site personnel, will result in the emission of exhaust gases containing the pollutants NOx, PM10, volatile organic compounds, and carbon monoxide (CO). The quantities emitted depend on factors such as engine type, service history, pattern of usage and fuel composition.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

Vehicle and plant movements will result in emissions to atmosphere of exhaust gases, but vehicle movements to and from the site will be on a temporary basis and can be mitigated following the implementation of construction phase travel plans and construction logistics plans, and plant emissions are unlikely to be significant when compared to background NO2 and PM10 concentrations. Further details are provided"

Air Quality Effects:

Are they saying here that they will not put receptors in because the air quality on various bases already exceeds the annual mean? If this is the case it is unacceptable. If this is not what they are saying can someone please translate?

And are they saying because increase in things like Carbon Monoxide levels will come from construction traffic that this does not matter? Again, unacceptable.

How will section 7.2 be enforceable?

"G6.4 Significance of Air Quality Effects
This assessment has identified that the development is not expected to introduce proposed development receptors into an area where ambient air quality exceeds the annual mean NO2, PM10 and PM2.5 AQSs, the daily mean PM10 AQS or the hourly mean NO2 AQS during the development opening year (2026), unless it is assumed that there are no reductions in annual mean NO2 background concentrations from 2018 and no reduction in background concentrations with height (both of which are considered unrealistic). Therefore, future ambient air quality is not expected to have a significant adverse effect on future site users.
The proposed development is also expected to have a negligible impact on annual mean PM10 and PM2.5 concentrations at the modelled existing receptor locations, and is not predicted to lead to exceedances of the daily mean PM10 or hourly mean NO2 AQS. Whilst some moderate adverse effects were predicted on annual mean NO2 concentrations in both S3 and S3a (as well as a substantial adverse effect in S3a), these are expected to be derived from the likely overestimated increase in traffic at the Grey's Inn Road/ Theobald's Road junction, as well as (for S3a) assuming no reduction in background concentrations and vehicle emissions factors. In both instances, the development did not contribute to a significant increase in emissions from vehicles, as the impacts were identified were predominantly driven by the already high baseline annual mean NO2 concentrations.
Therefore, on balance and in light of the fact that the development of the new Hospital building itself is not expected to increase car usage and has no on-site car parking, it is considered that the proposed development is unlikely to have significant adverse effect on local air quality. However, rerouting traffic can reasonably be expected to have some adverse effects on air quality. For this reason, mitigation measures which could be adopted to reduce the residual air quality impacts have been recommended within Section 7.2. It is recommended that plant used on-site comply with the NOx, PM and CO emissions

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

standards specified in the EU Directive 97/68/EC (as replicated in the MOL SPG) and subsequent amendments as a minimum, where they have net power of between 37kW and 560kW. The emissions standards vary depending on the net power the engine produces. It is recommended that these emissions standards are also applied on site.
The following actions can be taken to enable compliance:
• Reorganising the fleet;
• Replacing equipment if required;
• Installing retrofit abatement technology (such as by diesel particulate filters in existing NRMM); and,
• 'Re-engining'

Building Ground Movement:

We are not just talking about one or two buildings here but 95 buildings, most of them heritage buildings – how can this be acceptable? Can an independent report on this be commissioned?

If the situation alters and they need to reassess as stated near the bottom, how will this be monitored and accountability derived?

"4.2. Impact Assessment
4.2.1. General The potential impact/damage induced on primary façade/wall elements of the buildings surrounding the proposed scheme have been evaluated on the basis of the calculated ground movement fields. The masonry walls of concern are shown in Figure 4.6, including the wall nomenclature/reference system adopted. The arrangement is based on the currently available survey information and presents an array of masonry façades running both perpendicular and parallel to the proposed basements (covering the key
deformation mechanisms). In total, 95 façades of the neighbouring buildings were considered for the current study and these are grouped in the following manner:
• GH.1.1 – GH.1.7: Paul O'Gorman Building
• GH.2.1 – GH.2.16: Variety Club Building
• GH.3.1 – GH.3.6: Premier Inn Clinical Building
• GH.4.1 – GH.4.8: Octav Botnar Wing
• 47.GS.1 – 47.GS.3: 47 Great Ormond Street
• 29.OS.1 – 29.OS.4: 29 Orde Hall
Great Ormond Street Hospital Children's Cancer Centre (GOSHCCC) - Building Damage Ground Movement Assessment 12 of 23 1226-A2S-XX-XX-RP-Y-0004-02
After Burland et al. 1977, Boscardin and Cording 1989, and Burland 2001.
Figure 4.8 Building damage classification – relationship between category of damage and limiting strain ¿¿lim
4.2.2. Results The results of the assessment indicate that four façades will experience damage
Category 1 – Very Slight throughout the construction works. The affected façades are presented in Table 4.2. The remaining façades are not expected to exceed damageCategory 0 – Negligible and are omitted from the table below. Figure 4.11 and Figure 4.12 depict the vertical and horizontal displacements, respectively, induced by the secant wall installation and excavation calculated using CIRIA C760 datasets
REVERBERATIONS STUDY P. 23 ON; FIGS: 4.10, 4.12-4.14 INGRESS ON GOSH TERRACES
5. Conclusions & Closing Remarks The interaction between the proposed GOSHCCC development and the

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

neighbouring properties within the zone of influence of the schemes has been reviewed as part of the GMA study presented herein. The proposed development comprises the demolition of demolition of the existing building and erection of a replacement 8 storey hospital building (Class C2 Use) together with 2 basement floors, roof top, balcony and ground floor landscaped amenity spaces, cycle storage, refuse storage and other ancillary and associated works pursuant to the development. The impact of the various construction stages has been reviewed on the basis of two alternative methods, i.e. evaluating the effects of unloading / overburden removal using Pdisp and simulating the excavation-induced ground movement fields using empirical
CIRIA curves in Xdisp. In the latter case, a propped embedded retaining wall solution (during the temporary works stage) has been considered, utilising the CIRIA C760 ground movement curves for excavation in front of
high stiffness walls in stiff clay. These two different scenarios have been considered in order to bind the potential ground movements arising from excavation operations (i.e. maximum potential heave and settlement respectively). This strategy ensures a robust evaluation of potential impact in light of the bespoke, intricate and workmanship-dependent construction methodology. Both short-term (undrained) and long-term
(drained) conditions have been assessed by adopting the relevant soil stiffness parameters for each case.
In order to best limit ground movements in proximity to movement sensitive neighbouring buildings, due consideration may be given to suitable means and methods of construction. For example, reducing the extent of temporary excavations during earth removal operations in close proximity to buildings considered to be at most risk of damage. The results from the GMA (denoting the evaluated damage categorisation in accordance with the Burland criteria described herein) considering neighbouring properties are presented in Table 4.2. It is observed that the maximum damage classification for the neighbouring properties is
Category 1 – Very Slight.
It is noted that the predicted ground movements, the associated wall tensile strains, and the level of damage categorisation are considered to be moderately conservative in view of the relatively cautious data selection and
greenfield nature of the assessment undertaken. It is also noted that the GMA will be supplemented by a project-specific monitoring regime and Action Plan, which will delineate lines of responsibility, trigger levels in accordance with those presented in this GMA, and appropriate mitigation measures. The assessment presented herein is dependent and reliant on the works being undertaken by an experienced contractor, high quality
workmanship and appropriate supervision of construction means and methods by experienced personnel.
It is recommended that this report is reviewed and understood in full by the project team and relevant stakeholders. Where significant changes are made to items such as construction sequencing, temporary propping arrangements and scheme design, the engineer should thoroughly review the change and evaluate any potential impacts on ground movement and building damage. If necessary, the building damage categories should be re-evaluated. During the design of the secant walls and temporary propping measures, deflection performance criteria for these design elements should be derived on the basis of the results presented herein to ensure that the maximum damage classification of Category 1 –
Very Slight is not breached. It is critical that the permanent and temporary works designs are carried out in a coordinated manner between performance specified elements and substructure contractors, with the aim to ensure that such design elements are in alignment with the assumptions / findings of the GMA and overall design intent”

Transport management plan:

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

I believe that the following Camden Council Policies will be severely breached during the likely four-five years this building will take to complete. Objective 1: To transform our streets and places to enable an increase in walking
and cycling'; Objective 6: To deliver an efficient, well-maintained highways network and kerb- side space that prioritises the sustainable movement of goods and people
How does Camden intend to mitigate these effects?

Unless I am reading this wrong this is yet another instance in the GOSH submission where GOSH are suggesting they address these issues at some unspecified time in the future. I have noticed a fair bit of can-kicking in this planning application which is fairly horrifying. How will Camden ensure the interests of the local community in this arena are safeguarded? And that these reports are all delivered, adhere to ideal standards, and are enforced?

I don't think they have adequately represented the current restrictions in Lambs Conduit Street which might in turn affect the validity of their entire report.

This plan does not seem to mention strictures on cycling in the area during the construction phase.

They say they are in the process of updating their travel plan. Surely this should be a completed portion of this application? I have lost count of how many plans they are still preparing, but this is not impressive.

What they do talk about appears to be a plan for how patients will reach the hospital. I see absolutely nothing on how locals will be able to move around their neighbourhood, or indeed, local businesses will be able to operate. This must be addressed.

"Paragraph 112 of the NPPF states that plans for new development should:
• give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;
• address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;
• create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards;
• allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and
• be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.
This assessment will consider the sustainability of the site in relation to the above
Lamb's Conduit Street/ Guilford Place
Lamb's Conduit Street connects the A401 at its southern end with Guilford Street (B502) at its northern end. The southern section is initially two-way, turning one-way northbound

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

through a semi-pedestrianised retail area to meet Great Ormond Street at a give-way. The priority movement is from Great Ormond Street as the western arm to Lamb's Conduit Street as the northern arm, passing further retail premises, and turns into Guilford Place at its northern junction with Guilford Street. Great Ormond Street continues eastwards from Lamb's Conduit Street serving residential properties as minor road.

3.2.4 cycling

"Great Ormond Street Hospital, Children's Cancer Centre (GOSHCCC), Transport Assessment 111057-TA (4.1)

Figure 3.7 Patient and visitor travel survey results

The Trust are currently in the process of updating the Travel Plan,

The Trust are currently in the process of updating the Travel Plan, taking into account changes that may have occurred as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, either through different travel patterns or operational purposes, such as video appointments and some staff being able to work from home for part of their duties.

The Trust has launched a travel survey in March 2022 that will feed into the new travel plan and seek to understand these changes. the Trust has also created a Safe, Active & Sustainable Travel working group that has made multiple interventions across GOSH:

• Created cycling champions,
• Supported groups/resources
• Introduced cycle repair and training
• Achieved a 'Cycle Friendly Employer' Gold Award.

The travel plan will provide a strategy for The Trust that brings together these existing groups and initiatives under a single umbrella. It will incorporate joint working, such as the support and advocacy of active travel in Camden and The Play Street Programme (in partnership with the London Borough of Camden) which has demonstrated how Great Ormond Street could evolve in the future alongside the hospital. This potential future public realm work could provide wide-ranging benefits to users of the site, easing the transition between the north and south side of Great Ormond Street; improving air quality; and increasing the overall amenity of the street.

The travel plan will also have links to associated strategies such as the Clean Air Hospital Framework and consider how measures can be introduced and monitored to meet objectives surrounding air quality.

4.1 Construction stage

To assist the construction of the new building, there will be the requirement for site offices, welfare unit and storage space for equipment and materials, as well as space to load and offload vehicles.

The northern half of Great Ormond Street including the footway alongside, will be closed to traffic and pedestrians with hoarding and appropriate vehicle protection. Gates will be provided at either end for vehicles to enter and exit in forward gear and loaded / offloaded in between. This will also require a temporary one-way (westbound) order to be implemented on Great Ormond Street and suspend parking on both sides between the junctions of Lamb's Conduit Street and Queen Square. The impact of the one-way order on traffic flows has been assessed in chapter 5.

As a result of the temporary suspension, a Traffic & Pedestrian Survey Report (WSP, 2019) outlines how parking will be reallocated. In summary, this describes that

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

ambulance bays on Great Ormond Street will be relocated to Powis Place and that pay-by-phone bays would be accommodated within existing provision around Queen Square.
The main pedestrian entrance to GOSH will be temporarily relocated to Powis Place, which runs along the western side of the hospital and emergency access will be retained.
For those approaching from Lamb's Conduit Street during construction, the footway on the southern side of Great Ormond Street will remain available with the exception of any full road closure events.
To provide sufficient segregation between construction phase operations and ongoing GOSH operations Sisk site project offices will be erected on the eastern corner of Great Ormond Street and remain there throughout the duration of the project. Further details of the construction stage proposals can be found within Sisk Demolition and Construction Management Plan submitted with the planning application.
EASTBOUND TRAFFIC FLOW HIGHER – TABLE 5.1"

Traffic Flow:

There does not seem to be any mention in their 'traffic flowing eastbound…'section at all of traffic coming up Orde Hall Street. This is a huge and extremely objectionable oversite. Once again, suggesting a lack of u understanding/interest/care of community life.

They go on to say that traffic flowing westward will be unaffected by proposed restrictions. This shows how little they know about the neighbourhood and how locals navigate it. This lack of understanding must be addressed and mitigated. They also do not take into account the northwards flowing restrictions the construction management plan will inflict which is perhaps the most serious of all, particularly for certain Lambs Conduit Street businesses. They say there will be an effect without offering any solutions…unacceptable. And to suggest all of this will create a nicer cycling environment is laughable to anyone who actually knows these streets well.

Finally, once again, this is a plan for patients and those who work at the hospital, but I can see nothing at all about locals and how they are meant to navigate all of this.

"Traffic flowing eastbound along Great Ormond Street has the potential to be generated through a number of routes, all of which would be affected by the proposed restriction, as follows:
A. Visitors to Queen Square, exiting to the east
B. Visitors to GOSH, exiting to the east
C. People travelling to eastern section of Great Ormond Street
D. General through traffic between A40 and Guilford Street.
Each of these routes will be affected in a different way and will result in a diversion that will lead to either a reduction or an increase in traffic on other routes. Traffic flowing in a westbound direction will be unaffected by the proposals. The diverted routes are expected to be as follows, as illustrated in Figure 5.2 below:
A. Exit to A401 via Boswell Street
B. Enter Great Ormond Street via Guilford Street and Lamb's Conduit Street, exit to A401 via Boswell Street
C. Re-route via Guilford Street and Millman Street

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

D. Re-route in local area
The above diversion routes are therefore likely to result in an increase in traffic on Boswell Street, while reducing traffic on Old Gloucester Street. The net change on Lamb's Conduit Street will be a reduction in northbound flow and an increase in southbound flow.
Using broad assumptions around the origin and destination of traffic using Great Ormond Street, the total traffic flows along Great Ormond Street and Lamb's Conduit Street is expected to reduce by around 25% while the net change on a combination of Old Gloucester Street and Boswell Street will also lead to a reduction in traffic volumes. The equivalent hourly change in traffic volumes on Great Ormond Street will be around 45 vehicles an hour, which is less than one additional westbound vehicle per minute.
Although the westbound traffic flow along Great Ormond Street will increase, this is comfortably within the capacity of the road and will be travelling in a single direction without conflict of oncoming traffic. Therefore, the traffic will flow more consistently along the road, reducing congestion and therefore improving air quality in the area, while creating a more attractive environment for pedestrians and cyclists.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
RSK has been commissioned by John Sisk & Son (Holdings) Ltd to prepare a Transport Assessment in support of a planning application on behalf of the Applicant, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust for a new Children's Cancer Centre. The current proposals represent Phase 4 of their long-term Masterplan.
The proposed development includes the demolition of the existing Frontage Building fronting onto Great Ormond Street. A new eight storey building (together with two basement levels) will be constructed to provide a dedicated Children's Cancer Centre and new main entrance to GOSH to give the hospital a greater sense of identity and more welcoming arrival.
The proposals include the promotion of a one-way order along the site frontage in a westbound direction, reducing the congestion that currently occurs and minimise the risk of delays to emergency services. The order will initially be temporary during construction to ensure that delivery vehicles do not cause congestion on the approach routes and facilitate an offloading area. Following completion of the project, all temporary highway adjustments are to revert back to the environment as was prior to commencement of the construction phase. As the design develops there is the potential possibility of maintaining the temporary one-way route through Great Ormond Street as a permanent solution.
WEREN'T THEY TOUTING HEALTHY STREETS ABOVE?
The proposed temporary one-way order for Great Ormond Street is predicted to reduce total traffic flows on local roads by around 25% with some directional increases offset by significant reductions in the opposite direction. However, removing eastbound traffic travelling along Great Ormond Street will reduce conflict and congestion while minimising the risk of obstructing the emergency access route during construction.
6.2 Conclusion
The proposed development is not expected to affect the trip volumes or travel patterns of existing staff and patient visits to the hospital. The proposals will provide much needed improvements to the facilities and their co-location within GOSH to maintain the high standards of treatment and care of children.
The site is already highly accessible by public transport across London and via main line

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

rail stations for access beyond. The provision for pedestrians and cyclists is adequate for staff and visitors and commensurate with the local setting, making active travel attractive even as part of a longer journey by public transport. Notwithstanding, future public realm proposals for Great Ormond Street will deliver an improved environment with a wider route for those accessing the site on foot or by bike.
Overall, the proposed development is acceptable from a transport perspective."

Whole Life Carbon Statement:

Once again, they do not seem to have addressed contaminated land removal and treatment yet. How can an application come in with so many studies still to be done?

Likewise, specialist groundworks. And FFE. And all of these: 8.4 Fencing, railings and walls Excluded from the assessment due to lack of available data
8.5 External fixtures Excluded from the assessment due to lack of available data
8.6 External drainage Excluded from the assessment due to lack of available data
8.7 External services Excluded from the assessment due to lack of available data
8.8 Minor building works and ancillary
buildings
No allowance was considered for minor building works and ancillary buildings

What are there conclusions here? I couldn't tell…how will Camden mitigate and protect the local community?

"3.2 Embodied Carbon
The table below lists the building elements covered by the assessment,
in line with the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) Professional
Statement: Whole Life Carbon assessment for the built environment.
Inputs
Building Element Group Building Element (NRM level 2) Basis of Information
Demolition 0.1 Toxic/hazardous/contaminated
material treatment
An allowance for contaminated land removal and treatment has not been included for the Proposed Development at this stage of the design
0.2 Major demolition works Pre Demolition audit
0 Facilitating works 0.3 & 0.5 Temporary/enabling works Due to the early stage of the design (mid RIBA Stage 3) this information is not yet available and as such has not been included in the assessment
0.4 Specialist groundworks No specialist ground works were included; individual ground works accounted for in the relevant substructure / external landscaping sections
1 Substructure 1.1 Substructure OCLCA, using EPDs was used to model the substructure. BIM model and drawings used to determine quantities of materials
2 Superstructure 2.1 Frame OCLCA, using EPDs was used to model the structural steel and concrete frames. BIM model and drawings used to determine quantities of materials
2.2 Upper Floors OCLCA, using EPDs was used to model the precast and insitu concrete upper floors. BIM model and drawings used to determine quantities of materials
2.3 Roof OCLCA, using EPDs was used to model the precast concrete and green roofs. BIM model and

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

drawings used to determine quantities of materials
2.4 Stairs and Ramps OCLCA, using EPDs was used to model the insitu concrete stairs. Material quantities were estimated from drawings and BIM model
2.5 External Walls OCLCA, using EPDs was used to model the precast concrete facade. BIM model and drawings used to determine quantities of materials
2.6 Windows and external doors This was included in the Facade calculation. External doors were included in the glazing component
2.7 Internal walls and partitions OCLCA, using EPDs was used to model the internal partitions. BIM model and drawings used to determine quantities of materials
2.8 Internal doors OCLCA, using EPDs was used to model the internal partitions. Estimations on the area doors was made from the BIM model and drawings
3 Finishes 3.1 Wall finishes Wall finishes were included in the preset internal wall build-ups from the EPDs in OCLCA
3.2 Floor finishes OCLCA, using EPDs was used to model the vinyl flooring. BIM model and drawings used to determine quantities of materials
3.3 Ceiling finishes OCLCA, using EPDs was used to model the general and theatre ceilings. BIM model and drawings used to determine quantities of materials
4 FF&E 4.1 Fittings, furnishings & equipment Due to a lack of data and EPDs at this stage FFE was excluded from the assessment
5 Building services/MEP 5.1–5.14 Services incl. building-related
and non-building-related
Building services data uses data provided from the Energy strategy, which align with the proposed services strategy for the project.
The lengths of duct's, electrical distribution and water distribution were calculated on a m2 GIA basis using in-built EPD within OCLCA
6 Prefabricated Buildings
and Building Units
6.1 Prefabricated buildings and
building units
Not applicable
7 Work to Existing Building 7.1 Minor demolition/alteration works OCLCA tool used to estimate embodied carbon associated with demolition works.
8 External works 8.1 Site preparation works Due to the early stage of the design (mid RIBA Stage 3) this information is not yet available and as such has not been included in the assessment
8.2 Roads, paths, paving and surfacing Modelled in OCLCA using best estimated EPDs. Data for roads, paths, paving and surfacing is based on architectural drawings and cost plans
8.3 Soft landscaping, planting and
irrigation systems
Modelled in OCLCA using best estimated EPDs. Data is based on architectural drawings and cost plans
8.4 Fencing, railings and walls Excluded from the assessment due to lack of available data
8.5 External fixtures Excluded from the assessment due to lack of available data
8.6 External drainage Excluded from the assessment due to lack of available data
8.7 External services Excluded from the assessment due to lack of available data
8.8 Minor building works and ancillary
buildings

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				No allowance was considered for minor building works and ancillary buildings” Local Environment: Finally, they do not include this but I am going to. There is no impact assessment on the effects of all of this on the character and well-being of our very precious neighbourhood. This should be rectified. The more I read of their planning application, the more underwhelmed I become in terms of any demonstrated care towards the neighbourhood in which GOSH is situated, or indeed its neighbours. I trust that the Camden will take due notice of this. Yours Sincerely, Gillian
2022/2255/P	Dr Robyn Lotto	09/06/2022 11:33:00	COMMNT	Our property is on the lower ground floor of Bevan House. This means the windows and access are on/ slightly below road level. In addition to the flat, we own an annex which is directly below the road. Our concerns are two fold: Annex - we have just spend an inordinate amount of money repairing our annex due to long term damage by heavy vehicles overhead. This included partial collapse of the roofing area of the annex. Heavy traffic, daily, over a five year period is likely to cause further extensive damage to our property. This has not been considered, and GOSH has not undertaken any structural survey to determine the risk to our property. At the least, this should be done before considering using Boswell Street to transport large volumes of heavy materials, as the small road was not originally designed for this purpose. Flat - noise and air pollution - our bedroom is on the road side, and a significant increase in heavy traffic will have a negative impact on the noise levels within our flat. This is particularly pertinent to our home as it is below road level, with vibrations of heavy traffic worsening noise pollution, as well as quality of air (windows are at exhaust level). Keeping windows closed throughout the summer in order to reduce pollution is untenable due to temperatures. This will also have a significant impact on dust and dirt. My husband is asthmatic, and the increase in pollution will likely worsen his condition (even with windows closed!). The situation of our flats with windows at/below street level, makes our flat particularly susceptible to problems. Working nights on occasions will also become difficult with the increased noise and traffic. I am unable to find any risk assessment for pollution and noise undertaken by GOSH in relation to our specific high risk flat locations.
2022/2255/P	Renata Zaprazna	09/06/2022 09:17:58	COMMNT	Our flat is already very dark and completely shaded from the south. Our main light comes through the windows facing the hospital side. Building the hospital any taller than it is now would completely block all of our skyline and light in all of our living areas leaving our home unhealthy and pretty much uninhabitable for us. I have been in the area for almost two decades, we depend on our home, it means the world to us. The proposed works, should they be approved as proposed will completely ruin our lives. We believe the hospital should not be allowed to expand at the expense of local residents. The proposed height of the building and the extension towards the road is not acceptable.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2255/P	C Gubb	13/06/2022 20:40:43	COMMNT	I am a resident of Boswell st and myself and my family have great concerns about the development. We understand the need for the hospital to grow and improve but feel the true impact on the local community has not been addressed. The increased traffic flow is going to effect air quality, I have a son who suffers from asthma and adding traffic flow to our street certainly will not help. My daughter plays in the childrens playground in Old Gloucester Street, these works will increase traffic there again adding to air pollution and adding extra risk to young children playing very close to the road. My husband drives for a living, working for the NHS. He brings his van home and we pay for residents parking. The works will reduce residents parking spaces meaning they could be times when he cannot park in the local area. Also if Great ormond St is made one way it will lead to traffic chaos in Lambs Conduit street , Boswell st, Queens square and Orde Hall st. GOSH need to look at alternatives such as using Powis place to take some of the traffic away from an already congested Gt Ormond Stret. Finally I comment on behalf of my parents who live at the bottom of Orde Hall Street and can see the hospital from their windows. 5 yrs of noise will take its toll on their well being.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2255/P	Rob Lewis	08/06/2022 19:47:49	OBJ	The ‘Community Engagement’ submission states, “The applicant and the Trust have undertaken a comprehensive process of pre-application consultation with stakeholders and the local community lasting years”. This is a false statement. I am a resident living metres away in Queen Square for over ten years - and have had NO notification of this proposed development whatsoever - not a single leaflet, letter or email, from either GOSH or the council. if the consultation was "comprehensive"" I would have been consulted, and so would my many neighbours and so would Queen Square Gardens Society, a body of which I am a Trustee. There has been no notification whatsoever of this to any of us - at any time - not even since the application was made. I have written to the Planning Department at the council to ask why the council has not even written to us residents now, but no reply. The development is clearly totally out of proportion for a small residential street with heritage buildings - the residents will never seen any light again. Using small residential streets for a huge amount of lorries carrying demolition material for years is not good either - children play on these streets all the time - if they are hit by one of the many lorries passing by a tragedy will take place for sure. Local children's lives matter too. However, to return to the initial issue regarding a lack of consultation, the development should not even be considered until the local community have been properly consulted. Not wanting to make light of it, to claim the consultation has been "comprehensive" over a period of "years" is as true as Boris Johnson saying he's never been to a party. It is simply not true at all. I respectfully request the council suspend any decision until a proper public consultation has taken place across all residents and community groups - and ideally, the designs changed in a manner which means GOSH and local tax paying residents all support a revised application. I have previously worked on Wind Farm planning applications, and I would never even consider the strategy GOSH seem to have progressed here which is - don't talk to the residents, claim you have, hope you get it through anyway, and then build it and destroy the lives of the local community. GOSH (and the council) can do better and should not be ruining their relationships with the local community.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2255/P	Daniel Adiego Gonzalez	12/06/2022 13:36:17	COMMNT	I am very concerned about this development. My natural light is going to be severely restricted, meaning I have to use electric lights during the day (according to the daylight report). I am a garden designer and often work from home on detailed designs. Doing this without adequate natural light is going to be very problematic and expensive. I am also concerned about the impact of the works on our quality of life. There is going to be a lot of noise and dust. The impact on access and parking is going to be especially problematic: we have only a few residents' parking places on Great Ormond Street, which are already frequently closed when the hospital does building works - which it appears to have been doing almost continuously for some years now. The area already suffers from the fact that the hospital provides inadequate parking and access for patients, meaning the street is often blocked during the day, often leading to impatient drivers sounding their horns. It is not clear why the hospital is insisting on expanding a site that is already too big for the local amenities, rather than looking to create a new site in a more accessible area.
2022/2255/P	C Gubb	13/06/2022 20:40:38	COMMNT	I am a resident of Boswell st and myself and my family have great concerns about the development. We understand the need for the hospital to grow and improve but feel the true impact on the local community has not been addressed. The increased traffic flow is going to effect air quality, I have a son who suffers from asthma and adding traffic flow to our street certainly will not help. My daughter plays in the childrens playground in Old Gloucester Street, these works will increase traffic there again adding to air pollution and adding extra risk to young children playing very close to the road. My husband drives for a living, working for the NHS. He brings his van home and we pay for residents parking. The works will reduce residents parking spaces meaning they could be times when he cannot park in the local area. Also if Great ormond St is made one way it will lead to traffic chaos in Lambs Conduit street , Boswell st, Queens square and Orde Hall st. GOSH need to look at alternatives such as using Powis place to take some of the traffic away from an already congested Gt Ormond Stret. Finally I comment on behalf of my parents who live at the bottom of Orde Hall Street and can see the hospital from their windows. 5 yrs of noise will take its toll on their well being.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2255/P	Renata Zaprazna	09/06/2022 08:38:20	COMMNT	I strongly object to the proposed building project above. I do not agree with the demolition of the existing building and the erection of 8 + storey building on Great Ormond Street as this would radically change the vibe of the area and block skylight in our home. I do not agree with removal of any trees in the area, I don't want balconies a roof terrace and a cafe overlooking our windows, we also oppose the dramatic increase in numbers of people staying in the area. We should have a right to uninterrupted and peaceful living in our homes. I also worry about the impact of such large underground works on subsidence and drainage in the area. I strongly object to the proposed restrictions on use of our roads and parking in Great Ormond Street, Boswell street and the surrounding area. We must be able to have access to our homes and have available parking near our homes for repairs, builders, gas & electricity maintenance, emergencies etc. at all times. It is not acceptable to restrict our access for years, the road access and parking in the area is already challenging as it is now. I also strongly object to the disruption to our lives caused by the demolition and building works of this size as we live in too close proximity to the proposed project. I believe that if GOSH wants to expand they should not do it at the expense of lives of local residents, they should find an area more suitable for this purpose somewhere where there is more space and better access for such a project. The high rise building would radically change the area and we believe this is not in keeping with the rest of the street. We are extremely distressed over the impact of this project on our lives, making our home uninhabitable for many years. We also believe this project would have catastrophic long-term impact on our livelihood and our property investments.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2255/P	Gillian Mosely	11/06/2022 12:06:27	COMMNT	Gillian Mosely, 36a Lambs Conduit Street, London, WC1N 3LD

11 June, 2022

Dear Patrick, Jonathan, and Camden Planners,

Following my previous letters about the GOSH community statement, construction management plan, and environment, I am writing to object to the GOSH planning application on heritage grounds.

Firstly, I would point out that this report was done by SISK Heritage and wondered if there can be an independent heritage survey done? Urgently, these reports do not seem to have taken into account the impact on heritage of the construction management plan including historic vaults underneath the streets. It's critical that such an independent study be created.

In their heritage statement GOSH explain that the frontage they are proposing to demolish and rebuild makes, at best, a neutral contribution to the significance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area and does not contribute positively to the special interest of the identified listed buildings. They go on to suggest that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance (i.e., sustain its heritage significance) of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area (within which the existing Frontage Building is located), as well as the special historic and architectural interest (and settings) of the relevant listed buildings. I disagree with this statement for a number of reasons.

Design:

In their report GOSH continually assert that their design plan would preserve the heritage character and appearance of the street. I strongly disagree and object.

Building Size:

The proposed building is much larger than any buildings within the immediate area and will completely overwhelm the historic houses opposite as well as those immediately abutting Great Ormond Street on Great Ormond Street (East,) Lambs Conduit Street, Orde Hall Street, and Queens Square.

This report makes a lot of statements, such as 'heritage impact' is likely to be similar. Where is their evidence? Again, an independent assessment is critical.

They make the point there are already medical buildings nearby which are larger than the Georgian Terraces, these are however, significantly smaller than the GOSH proposed building; and do not overwhelm the terraces opposite in the way the proposed build undoubtably will.

"The townscape changes would be largely limited to local townscape
character area TCA01 (in which the Site is located). The effects on the TCAs are
summarised below:
• TCA01 – Great Ormond Street 'Campus': Beneficial effect of Medium magnitude.
• TCA02 – Early Eighteenth Century Bloomsbury: Neutral effect of Low magnitude"

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

3.10 The proposals have the potential to indirectly impact the significance of the listed buildings through change in one part of their wider townscape setting. In some cases, the setting of the listed buildings identified above, and its contribution to overall heritage significance, is similar. Subsequently, the heritage impact of the proposals on overall heritage significance, will likely be similar. In light of this, the listed buildings identified have been organised into groups (see Table 4.1) and the assessment of the contribution of setting to overall heritage significance and the assessment of the heritage impacts of the proposals will be undertaken collectively.
3.49 The immediate setting of the listed buildings is now characterised by larger scale institutional development from the 19 th century onwards, including the former Royal London Homeopathic Hospital, the Great Ormond Street Hospital Variety Club Building and Southwood Building. These buildings illustrate the gradual growth of a medical/institutional 'campus' in the urban block bounded by Great Ormond Street, Lamb's Conduit Street, Guildford Street and Queen Square, which was initiated by the 1875 Barry Building. This institutional context is of a significantly contrasting scale, character, and form, which confirms an understanding of these listed buildings as a remnant of a domestic Georgian street. This later built form does not help to understand the special interest of these listed buildings, albeit the complementary uses are consistent with that of the current use of the former townhouses. In those terms, these elements of institutional context, including the Paul O' Gorman Building, do not contribute positively to an understanding of the particular significance of these listed buildings.
3.50 The alignment of Powis Place, albeit now of a fundamentally different character to its historic origins, is a contemporaneous element of townscape setting and contributes to the special interest of the listed buildings by reinforcing an understanding of their origins as part of a harmonious Georgian terrace.
3.51 The presence of an earlier form of 18 th century

Study Parameters:

Their heritage report cites a number of comparisons throughout. These are Queens Square which abuts the site, but from a certain distance; Great Ormond Street houses opposite the site, Dombey Street which is a very long block away from the site and from most of which GOSH is not visible, and Powis Place which is behind the frontage so the frontage again, will not be visible from this location. So the site will barely be visible from three out of four of the studied locations. In contrast, their study parameters do not include Great Ormond Street East or Lambs Conduit Street, both of which immediately abut the site and are heritage gems. Nor does it include the slightly later Orde Hall Street which also abuts the site. Excluding two out of three of the build's most immediate, and important in heritage terms, streets is a huge oversite. For this reason, again, an independent study must surely be commissioned.

In point 6.30 they conclude that while Susceptibility of Change to Great Ormond Street West (immediately opposite the main GOSH frontage) is medium-high, the proposed development will not adversely effect these. What is their evidence for this? How did they arrive at their conclusions?

4.29 TCA02 is a townscape receptor of Medium-High Value based on the generally good

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

quality of the townscape, the inclusion of all of the area within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area and the significant number of designated heritage assets within the 58area. The Susceptibility to Change of TCA02 is also considered to be Medium-High due to the prevalence of domestic scale eighteenth century architecture which contrasts with the type and scale of institutional building proposed. Overall, TCA02 is of Medium-high sensitivity

Building Ground Movement:

As above, can their assessment please be expanded to include at least five houses to the east of Great Ormond Street and to the South on Lambs Conduit Street? (As well as more houses on Orde Hall Street.) As is becoming a common theme throughout their application, they are ignoring most of their (heritage) neighbours here.

They do also state that within their own parameters four frontages are at risk. This is unacceptable, and again, we surely need an independent assessment.

They propose a series of monitoring and action plans. Who will hold them accountable for this? Why has more work on this not been done already?

It is urgent that such studies also assess any potential damage from their construction management plan which passes a large number of heritage buildings.

4.2. Impact Assessment
4.2.1. General
The potential impact/damage induced on primary façade/wall elements of the buildings surrounding the proposed scheme have
been evaluated on the basis of the calculated ground movement fields. The masonry walls of concern are shown in Figure 4.6,
including the wall nomenclature/reference system adopted. The arrangement is based on the currently available survey information
and presents an array of masonry façades running both perpendicular and parallel to the proposed basements (covering the key
deformation mechanisms). In total, 95 façades of the neighbouring buildings were considered for the current study and these are
grouped in the following manner:
• GH.1.1 – GH.1.7: Paul O'Gorman Building
• GH.2.1 – GH.2.16: Variety Club Building
• GH.3.1 – GH.3.6: Premier Inn Clinical Building
• GH.4.1 – GH.4.8: Octav Botnar Wing
• 47.GS.1 – 47.GS.3: 47 Great Ormond Street
• 29.OS.1 – 29.OS.4: 29 Orde Hall
Great Ormond Street Hospital Children's Cancer Centre (GOSHCCC) - Building Damage Ground Movement Assessment 12 of 23
1226-A2S-XX-XX-RP-Y-0004-02
After Burland et al. 1977, Boscardin and Cording 1989, and Burland 2001.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

Figure 4.8 Building damage classification – relationship between category of damage and limiting strain ¿¿lim
4.2.2. Results
The results of the assessment indicate that four façades will experience damage
Category 1 – Very Slight throughout the
construction works. The affected façades are presented in Table 4.2. The remaining façades are not expected to exceed damage Category 0 – Negligible and are omitted from the table below. Figure 4.11 and Figure 4.12 depict the vertical and horizontal
displacements, respectively, induced by the secant wall installation and excavation calculated using CIRIA C760 datasets
REVERBERATIONS STUDY P. 23 ON; FIGS: 4.10, 4.12-4.14 INGRESS ON GOS TERRACES
5. Conclusions & Closing Remarks
The interaction between the proposed GOSHCCC development and the neighbouring properties within the zone of influence of the
schemes has been reviewed as part of the GMA study presented herein. The proposed development comprises the demolition of
demolition of the existing building and erection of a replacement 8 storey hospital building (Class C2 Use) together with 2 basement
floors, roof top, balcony and ground floor landscaped amenity spaces, cycle storage, refuse storage and other ancillary and
associated works pursuant to the development.
The impact of the various construction stages has been reviewed on the basis of two alternative methods, i.e. evaluating the effects
of unloading / overburden removal using Pdisp and simulating the excavation-induced ground movement fields using empirical
CIRIA curves in Xdisp. In the latter case, a propped embedded retaining wall solution (during the temporary works stage) has been
considered, utilising the CIRIA C760 ground movement curves for excavation in front of
high stiffness walls in stiff clay. These two different scenarios have been considered in order to bind the potential ground movements arising from excavation
operations (i.e. maximum potential heave and settlement respectively). This strategy ensures a robust evaluation of potential impact
in light of the bespoke, intricate and workmanship-dependent construction methodology. Both short-term (undrained) and long-term
(drained) conditions have been assessed by adopting the relevant soil stiffness parameters for each case.
In order to best limit ground movements in proximity to movement sensitive neighbouring buildings, due consideration may be
given to suitable means and methods of construction. For example, reducing the extent of temporary excavations during earth
removal operations in close proximity to buildings considered to be at most risk of damage.
The results from the GMA (denoting the evaluated damage categorisation in accordance with the Burland criteria described herein)
considering neighbouring properties are presented in Table 4.2. It is observed that the maximum damage classification for the
neighbouring properties is
Category 1 – Very Slight.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

It is noted that the predicted ground movements, the associated wall tensile strains, and the level of damage categorisation are
considered to be moderately conservative in view of the relatively cautious data selection and
greenfield nature of the assessment undertaken. It is also noted that the GMA will be supplemented by a project-specific monitoring regime and Action Plan, which will delineate
lines of responsibility, trigger levels in accordance with those presented in this GMA, and appropriate mitigation measures. The
assessment presented herein is dependent and reliant on the works being undertaken by an experienced contractor, high quality
workmanship and appropriate supervision of construction means and methods by experienced personnel.
It is recommended that this report is reviewed and understood in full by the project team and relevant stakeholders.
Wheresignificant changes are made to items such as construction sequencing, temporary propping arrangements and scheme design, the
engineer should thoroughly review the change and evaluate any potential impacts on ground movement and building damage. If
necessary, the building damage categories should be re-evaluated.
During the design of the secant walls and temporary propping measures, deflection performance criteria for these design elements
should be derived on the basis of the results presented herein to ensure that the maximum damage classification of
Category 1 –Very Slight is not breached.
It is critical that the permanent and temporary works designs are carried out in a coordinated manner between performance
specified elements and substructure contractors, with the aim to ensure that such design elements are in alignment with the
assumptions / findings of the GMA and overall design intent

Archaeology review:

Again, the reviewers do not appear to have assessed the area on the basis of the construction management plan. Can we get information on this?

Does this study include heritage buildings or not? I may be reading it wrong but there seem to be contradictory statements on this.

In 6.6 they comment on six levels including roof space. Is this up to date? If it is not, does this entire study need to be re-done?

Have they seen the reverberations studies and included this information in their assessment?

They talk about any significant archaeological sites discovered being monitored and removed. Do they mean excavated and removed?

This Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment has been prepared on behalf of the Applicant, Great Ormond

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust (referred to hereafter as the 'Applicant') in collaboration with the appointed design and build contractor John Sisk & Son (Holdings) Ltd (referred to hereafter as Sisk) to support an application to the London Borough of Camden (LBC) for full planning permission and conservation area consent for the redevelopment of the Great Ormond Street Hospital (GOSH) Frontage Building and Entrance on Great Ormond Street WC1N 3JH X (referred to hereafter as the 'site'), to provide a new Children's Cancer Centre (CCC).
Historic England records eight Grade II* Listed Buildings, 79 Grade II Listed Buildings and two Registered Parks and Gardens and the London Borough of Camden Council records the Bloomsbury Conservation Area within the Study Area. The GLHER records a total of 111 heritage assets and 47 previous archaeological events within the Study Area.
The proposed development is partially situated within the Conservation Area, including the façade of the Frontage Building. The demolition of these buildings will represent a physical change to this Conservation Area. The impact of the change on the setting of the Conservation Area and on nearby Listed Buildings has been assessed within a Heritage and Townscape Visual Impact Assessment (Turley Heritage, 2022), which should be read in conjunction with this report.
This assessment has clearly established that there will be no physical impact to any other heritage asset recorded by the GLHER as a result of groundworks associated with the proposed development.
The proposed development is located within an Archaeological Priority Area classified as a historic urban area that contains multi-period heritage assets of archaeological interest. This assessment indicates that there is potential for groundworks to impact any surviving buried remains relating to mid -17th century English Civil War defences, the early 18th century terraced properties and Powis House depictedon historic maps within the Site boundary and any subsequent extensions and alterations to these properties during the 19th century, including the expansion of the Hospital for Sick Children. Any potential buried archaeological remains relating to these earlier features or structures will only likely survive within the parts of the Site that have not been impacted by basements or truncated by modern walls and services. Any surviving evidence of these remains will be removed by groundworks within the footprint of the proposed development to formation level (c. 4 m below present street level at Great Ormond Street).
Given the results of previous archaeological events in close proximity to the proposed development, it is recommended that a programme of archaeological monitoring of intrusive groundworks during the demolition of the existing building should be undertaken. This measure will allow for the identification and recording of any potential remains relating to mid-17th century English Civil War defences and the early 18th to late 19th century development and re-development of propertiesin Great Ormond Street that might survive within the Site boundary.
It is recommended that this application should be considered under paragraph 194 of the NPPF 2021. This recommendation would be in accordance with Policy HC1 outlined in the London Plan (2021), Policy D2 outlined in the Camden Local Plan (2017), paragraphs 3.4 and 3.56 outlined in the Camden Planning Guidance: Design SPD (2021), and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
NATIONAL POLICY:
© RSK ADAS Ltd 2022 11
4.1 There is national legislation and guidance relating to the protection and treatment of the historic environment within the development process. These identify the historic environment as a non-renewable, fragile and finite resource and place a priority on its conservation. This includes the setting out of appropriate assessment to ensure that any damage or loss to the resource is permitted only where it is justified.
4.2 The key piece of legislation is the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990).

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

The application of this law and the over-arching national policy covering the effects of development on the historic environment is outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021). Elements of this legislation and guidance of relevance to the present development are summarised in Table 1 below.
STATUTES THEN 4.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021) confirms that the historic environment,
including archaeological remains, constitutes a material consideration in planning decisions, requiring applicants to describe the significance of heritage assets potentially affected by development, including any contribution made by their setting.
SUBMIT DESK BASED ASSESSMENT OR FIELD ASSESSMENT
3.3.J. RESIST PROPOSALS FOR CHANGE OF USE; APPLICANTS - will need to show how the significance of a heritage
asset, including any contribution made by their setting, has been
taken into consideration in the design of the proposed works.
© RSK ADAS Ltd 2022 22
5.1 This archaeological desk-based assessment will focus on the impacts the proposed development will have on the known and potential historic environment resource within the Site.
5.2 The assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on the setting, and therefore the significance, of designated heritage assets in a 250 m Study Area is outside the scope of this report.
© RSK ADAS Ltd 2022 23
5.7 These techniques directly relate to practical archaeological investigation in two ways:
¿ Providing a process by which to determine the likelihood of construction impacts to deposits with archaeological potential; and
¿ Providing interpretation of depositional context for archaeological remains.
5.8 A Study Area of 250 m (referred to henceforth as the ‘Study Area’) around the proposed WHAT IS THE STUDY AREA COMPRISED OF????? APPEARS ON PAGE 80 OF 85
development has been identified in order to assemble the data for this assessment (Figure 1-4). All designated and non-designated heritage assets recorded by Historic England, the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER) and the London Borough of Camden Council have been assessed within this Study Area (Figures 2-4). It is considered that information from the Study Area may inform the assessment of the sensitivity of the proposed development and the archaeological resources in the Site
WHAT IS THE STUDY AREA???
Historic England records eight Grade II* Listed Buildings (1-8) within the Study Area. The closest of these is the Great Ormond Street Hospital Children’s Cancer Centre Chapel in Central Block (3), which is located 27 m to thenorth-west and 21 m to the north-east of the Site boundary (NHLE, 2022).
6.3 Historic England records 79 Grade II Listed Buildings (9-87) within the Study Area. The closest of these is Hahnemann House (Number 2) and Number 3and Attached Railings (68), which is located 8 m to the south-west of the proposed development. There are also several Grade II Listed Buildings, listed under three distinct designations, situated along the south-east frontage of Great Ormond Street. These include Numbers 21, 23 and 25 and Attached Railings to Number 25 (17), Number 27 and Attached Railings (18) and Number 41 to 61 and Attached Railings (19), each of which is approximately 10 m to the south-east of the proposed development (NHLE, 2022).

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

6.4 Historic England records two Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens (88 and 89) within the Study Area. Coram's Fields, with Mecklenburgh and Brunswick Squares (88) is located 118m to the north and Russell Square (89) is located 235 m to the west of the proposed development (NHLE, 2022).
6.5 The London Borough of Camden Council records a single Conservation Area within the StudyArea. The GLHER records a Tier II Archaeological Priority Area (APA) (201), which covers the proposed development and the majority of the StudyArea.
8.8 SIX LEVELS INCL BASEMENT & LEVEL 6 AS ROOF SPACE – IS THIS UP TO DATE? HAVE THEY SEEN THE NOISE/PHYSICAL REVERBERATIONS REPORT AND INCLUDED THIS IN THEIR ASSESSMENT? 8.15 PHYSICAL CHANGE TO CONSERVATION AREA; 8.19 The proposed development is located within an Archaeological Priority Area classified as a historic
urban area that contains multi-period heritage assets of archaeological interest. This assessment indicates that there is potential for groundworks to impact any surviving buried remains relating to mid-17th century English Civil War defences, the early 18th century terraced properties and Powis House depicted on historic maps within the Site boundary and any subsequent extensions and alterations to these properties during the 19th century, including the expansion of the Hospital for Sick Children. Any potential buried archaeological remains relating to these earlier featu res or structures will only likely survive within the parts of the Site that have not been truncated by basements, modern walls and services. Any surviving evidence of these remains will be removed by groundworks for the creation of the new hospital building within the footprints of the new buildings down to the depth of impact (c. 4 m below present streetlevel at Great Ormond Street).
© RSK ADAS Ltd 2022 44As ever, I
9.1 Historic England records eight Grade II* Listed Buildings, 79 Grade II Listed Buildings and two Registered Parks and Gardens and the London Borough of Camden Council re cords the Bloomsbury Conservation Area within the Study Area. The GLHER records a total of 111 heritage assets and 47 previous archaeological events within the Study Area.
9.2 The proposed development is partially situated within the Conservation Area. The demolition of the Frontage Building will represent a physical change to this Conservation Area. The impact of the change on the setting of the Conservation Area and on nearby Listed Buildings is being assessed by a Heritage and Townscape Visual Impact Assessment (Turley Heritage, 2022) which should be read in conjunction with this desk-based assessment.
9.3 This assessment has clearly established that there will be no physical impact to any other heritage asset recorded by the GLHER as a result of groundworks associated with the proposed development.
9.4 The proposed development is located within an Archaeological Priority Area classified as a historic urban area that contains multi-period heritage assets of archaeological interest. This assessment indicates that there is potential for groundworks to impact any surviving buried remains relating to mid-17th century English Civil War defences, the early 18th century terraced properties and Powis House depicted on historic maps within the Site boundary and any subsequent extensions and alterations to these properties during the 19th century, including the expansion of the Hospital for Sick Children. Any potential buried archaeological remains relating to these earlier features or structures will only likely survive within the parts of the Site that have not been truncated by basements, modern walls and services. Any surviving evidence of these remains will be removed by groundworks for the creation of the new hospital buildings within the footprints of the new buildings down to the depth of impact (c. 4 m below present street level at Great Ormond Street).
9.5 Given the results of previous archaeological events in close proximity to the proposed

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				development, it is recommended that a programme of archaeological monitoring of intrusive groundworks during the demolition of the existing buildings be undertaken. This measure will allow for the identification and recording of any potential remains relating to mid-17th century English Civil War defences and the early 18th to late 19th century development and re-development of properties in Great Ormond Street that might survive within the Site boundary As ever, I thank you for reading this and trust that the preservation of our common heritage and archaeology is in your safe hands. Yours Sincerely, Gillian Mosely
2022/2255/P	Mark Simmonds	09/06/2022 16:57:13	OBJ	Dear Camden Council, You the Council should refuse approval of this application for the redevelopment of Great Ormond Street Hospital. The proposed redevelopment is far too big. It will overwhelm its immediate neighborhood, which is the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, including 4 storey listed buildings immediately opposite. The proposal is 3 storeys too tall for its location. The application's Built Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact Appraisal is wrong on important points. It posits that the size of the proposal is excused by GOSH's status and clinical excellence. This is wrong. Excellent institution does not equal big building. The conclusion that the proposal would have 'Neutral effect of Low magnitude' on Early 18th Century Bloomsbury around it is wrong. It will be overbearing, being of a scale suited to a wider road and pavement with larger buildings. It does not conform with the requirement of the conservation area to preserve the scale of the streets and the buildings on them. The application calls GOSH a 'campus' with modern institutional buildings and then justifies the proposal as a positive 'mediation' between this and the Conservation Area. These words are deceptive and justification illogical. The proposed elevations looked at next to the neighboring buildings shows the true out-of-scale impact of the proposal. This application should be refused. Sincerely, Mark Simmonds

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2255/P	Gordon Adgey	13/06/2022 16:04:30	OBJ	Having had a chance to read the formal planning application Reference No. 2022/2255/P for GOSHCCC and in particular seen the computer render of the proposed new building, I am shocked by the scale of the development, in particular the height increase of the main building. I have been a resident and owner of a flat in 37/39 Great Ormond Street for over thirty years. As this development will directly affect me, I would like to make the following objections. 1. The development will have a dramatic effect on the amount of natural light entering my 3rd Floor flat, particularly to two habitable rooms, namely my living room and bedroom. This loss of light is confirmed in the applicant's 'Daylight and Sunlight Report'. This overshadowing will detrimentally affect the personal enjoyment of my home and cause me to use more electricity in order to sufficiently light these rooms during daylight hours, increasing my utilities costs in perpetuity. 2. The increased height will deprive me of the view I have enjoyed for over thirty years. Specifically, I shall no longer see the sky. This loss of existing views from properties opposite the development will adversely affect the residential amenity of all neighbouring residents and businesses. 3. Residential amenity also will suffer due to overlooking and loss of privacy. Views from windows at the height of the proposed main building across from my home will mean overlooking directly into my windows as well as down into my flat. 4. The development will be overbearing and over dominant, particularly at such height, detrimentally affecting residential amenity and the character of the neighbourhood. 5. The increased size of the hospital will bring with it an increase in vehicular traffic and pressure on access to neighbouring properties and parking - e.g., additional patients, families, doctors, consultants, nurses, staff, deliveries, ambulances, taxis, etc. There should be an independent review and analysis done in this regard, with projections of traffic and access requirements for residents, pedestrians, services to and customers of, local shops and businesses. 6. The proposed development adds nothing of real value to the public realm. There appears to be no contribution to nature and biodiversity outside the boundaries of the hospital site. 7. The proposed site traffic arrangements will have a very detrimental effect on what is already a congested area especially during the working day/week. I fully support the 'alternative plan' where traffic enters the site from Guildford Street. 8. The above effects on the area are compounded by the likely simultaneous development in the Tybold Estate. I would ask the Council fully and carefully consider the above when reviewing the application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2255/P	Gillian Mosely	13/06/2022 09:19:39	COMNOT	Gillian Mosely, 36a Lambs Conduit Street, London, WC1N 3LD

12 June, 2022

Dear Patrick, Jonathan, and Camden Planners,

I am writing as a local resident and business-owner, with a final letter of objection to the GOSH plans, including headline objections. These are either about new areas not previously addressed, or, in a few cases, an underscoring/overview of previous letters.

The government is famously 'levelling up' at the moment. With fourteen centres of childcare excellence, I have long-wondered why my Edinburgh-based god daughter regularly attended Great Ormond Street for her childhood asthma. Does it make sense, health-wise, economically, or, indeed from an environmental/travel-perspective, that more than half of the hospital's patients come from across the country? Their excellent standard of care is something the area can truly be proud of, but in this day and age, and with concerns such as the environment, and levelling up so high on our national/global agendas, does it really make sense for Great Ormond Street to continue to grow larger at the expense of other, more geographically diverse centres? Might regional partnerships be in order?

This picture is echoed by the site itself. For those of us in the neighbourhood, we are at a tipping point where the proposed new frontage building, and its associated construction management plan, are literally, about to subsume/consume the entire neighbourhood and the community it houses. This is a matter of extreme distress for myself (and my neighbours.) The site has clearly maxed out and I cannot help but wonder how soon after these ongoing building projects (which began in 2007?) we will be facing yet more demand for space on the part of GOSH. At what stage do they look at their site and decide that part if not all of its services might be better served in a location with plenty of space and room to grow? Moorfield Eye Hospital has recently taken such a decision. Their move will be of less than two miles. Perhaps GOSH can find something similar?

Westminster Council (among others, and until recently Tory,) has a refit rather than re-build policy. Why has Camden, which touts its environmental prioritisation, not adopted this policy? Also, as mentioned in a previous letter, the GOSH application promises large-scale recycling of existing materials, in a manner and to an extent, that feels unlikely. This proposal feels incredibly un-environmentally friendly. (To say nothing of the poor health-environment it will create for locals during the demolition and build.)

Overall, the tone of the GOSH application makes for rather sad reading. They state in their community engagement note that they are engaging and that this is important to them. However, I struggle to think of a single instance where those of us who have been talking to GOSH since 2016-2017 asked them to reconsider aspects of their plans to mitigate local harm, and where this has made any difference at all. Indeed, in the numerous planning submission documents I have read, GOSH explain that they need to ensure the needs of the hospital and its patients. However, the needs of the local community are copiously absent. This is the case over and over throughout their submission, and pertains to health, well-being, economic, and environmental impacts on those who live and work in the community which GOSH is meant to be a part of. Such impacts on the local community do not seem to have been considered anywhere in their submission except in terms of 'there may be a few sacrifices required of locals, but we think these are justified.' This is incredibly distressing.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

If GOSH have a duty of care towards its neighbours, their application completely fails to adhere.

There are two particularly egregious examples of this lack of care. The first is the building itself. Its size seems to have increased considerably in the last few years. In addition, in my opinion, this building design will overwhelm the neighbourhood both in terms of size and heritage. The 2022 Camden review panel was also not happy with either of these suggesting design approaches and indeed impact assessments on locals.

Finally, the GOSH lighting impact report made for particularly shocking reading. They say:

“1.8 Technical analysis of the GOSHCCC has confirmed that some of the neighbouring windows and rooms may
experience noticeable/significant daylight alterations, with reference to the standard BRE Guidelines tests of VSC
and No Sky Line (“NSL”). Whilst the GOSHCCC may have a noticeable effect to many of the neighbouring windows,
they will continue to receive levels of daylight (VSC) which are broadly in line with the alternative target values set
out within the report.
1.9 In terms of sunlight, the vast majority of windows facing the Site are north-west facing and therefore are not
considered relevant for assessment. A small minority of windows may experience a noticeable alteration, nonetheless, these are generally minor in nature and the existing levels already fall short of the BRE Guidelines recommendations.”

The standards they go on to set are a selection of the lowest standards from across the borough. Is this to be a race to the bottom? Almost every one of the houses opposite the current frontage building will see their daylight reduced by 40% +. GOSH suggest that people will need to have their lights on at all times (just as energy costs soar), and spend more time in the South-facing portions of their homes. Since GOSH did a desk-based assessment, they have not taken into account that the South-facing portions of these buildings often house things like stairwells and bathrooms. The GOSH assessment also does not take into account the impact on lighting of the back of some of these buildings, by the Tybalds Estate development build due to start soon. Below is a snippet from this report which shows that a number of the buildings due to lose much of their northern daylight access with the GOSH build, will also be losing some south-facing access to light with the Tybalds build.
“4.2.2 Firstly, the analysis confirms that 54 windows (all highlighted green in appendix 2) located at 2, 4, 6, 6a & 8 Orde Hall Street, 9 to 11 Dombey Street, 1 to 50 Blemundsbury, 1 to 42 Falcon, 1 to 14 Springwater, Boswell House, 20 to 25 Boswell Street, 1 to 56 Chancellors Court and 31 to 35 & 37 to 39 Great Ormond Street, that do not achieve an ideal standard of daylight fall only marginally short of the VSC target (windows achieve a reduction ratio of 0.7 and above against the target of 0.8).” FROM DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT STUDY done for Tybalds scheme.
To add to this callousness, GOSH also suggest that residents (dozens if not hundreds, many of whom now work from home) spend more time taking advantage of local amenities.

I also did not see any assessment of daylight infringement during the construction phase. Is there one?

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				Throughout their application documentation GOSH state that they plan to commission reports and that these will happen in due course. Surely, with a development proposal of this size, all of this planning should be transparent and available up front so it can be assessed as part of their application? This includes any meaningful assessment about how simultaneous building projects will be managed. If this goes ahead as per their construction management plan there will be construction vehicles throughout the entire neighbourhood between Theobalds Road and Guildford Street/Southhampton Row to Millman Street for three to five years. This includes our very busy commercial heartland, Lamb's Conduit Street. I struggle to understand how any level of community well-being will be safeguarded under these circumstances. It is also curious to note that advice offered by Camden during pre-consultation since 2015, has consistently included public realm works. Yet these, too, are nowhere to be seen. Additionally, your advice to integrate the ground floor with the street, does not seem to have been followed in a practicable manner (ie without breaching child protection laws.) Mixed use and affordable housing policies were also mentioned yet these are not in the plans as far as I can see. Finally, my appeal to Camden. Camden's planning policy protects local amenity, stating that modernising facilities must be balanced against impact on local amenity "balancing the needs of development with the needs and characteristics of local areas and communities". Planners have several times cautioned that the proposal exceeds limits in this arena. Why did the 2022 review panel did not reiterate this? How will you protect us from all of this? Yours Sincerely, Gillian
2022/2255/P	Caitriona Row	13/06/2022 13:56:38	COMMNT	I live very near to the hospital with my family including two children, who are now 10 and 12 and will be taking their GCSEs and A levels by the time this building work is finished. On behalf of the local community I urge you to please take our quality of life into account, in particular with regard to: a) noise - both from lorries driving past our beloved Ciao Bella many times a day and from the work itself (when the Zayed centre was being built just behind our home, the walls rattled for months on end. Pile driving was the worst offender) b) the air we breathe being polluted by dust and exhaust fumes - from site traffic and demolition / construction c) road safety for pedestrians and cyclists - the stretch of Lambs Conduit St where we live, between Gt Ormond St and Guilford Place, is a busy one for customers of Ciao Bella and the Lamb (both vital community hubs in our neighbourhood) as well as children walking from the hospital and St George the Martyr Primary school to Corams Fields. I'm not a town planner but IMHO these problems could be mitigated in two ways: by re-routing the lorries via Powys Place and using only electric vehicles. The latter in particular seems very easy to do. Thank you for taking my comments on board.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2255/P	Rob Turner	10/06/2022 06:51:21	COMMNT	There must be a better route for the large vehicles to get into Great Ormond St from Guildford St.
2022/2255/P	Rob Turner	10/06/2022 06:51:23	COMMNT	There must be a better route for the large vehicles to get into Great Ormond St from Guildford St.