

Summary of public consultation feedback

GOSH Children's Cancer Centre

October 2022

This document summarises the public consultation feedback received in relation to the planning application (Ref. 2022/2255/P) for the development of a new Children's Cancer Centre at Great Ormond Street Hospital (GOSH). It does not include responses from statutory consultees, which are considered separately.

In response to the feedback to the London Borough of Camden's (LBC) consultation on the application as well through the ongoing engagement GOSH has had directly with residents and other stakeholders since the planning application was submitted in May 2022, a number of changes have been made. These changes are focused on minimising the impact of construction on the site's neighbours:

- Introducing a temporary main entrance on Guilford Street and the redirection of much of the existing travel movements during construction, which results in better flow of pedestrians and traffic around Great Ormond Street Hospital and the reduces the pressure on Great Ormond Street;
- Maximising the road space on Great Ormond Street by reducing the proposed extent of the hoarding line so that this is as close to the site as possible;
- Changing the location and size of the construction site accommodation on Great Ormond Street; and
- Amending the proposed vertical lifting strategy during the construction whereby the proposed tower cranes have been relocated within the building footprint which has reduced their impact on the public realm.

GOSH have also thoroughly explored different options for construction vehicle access routes to ensure optimum route during the demolition and construction phase.

To date, 155 consultation responses from 127 local residents, community groups and other stakeholders have been recorded on LBC's online planning portal, with a number of people making multiple comments. Responses were submitted by the following community groups:

- Queen Square Gardens Trustees
- Residents and Business Liaison Group

- Bevan House Management Company
- Bloomsbury Residents Action Group
- Great Ormond Street Group

Table 1 below sets out a summary of the comments received by theme along with the applicant’s response. We have reviewed all comments and have worked hard to address the matters raised.

Within Appendix 1 is a separate responses schedule prepared by Avison Young in response to specific comments on daylight and sunlight.

Table 1: Summary of feedback

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT		
	<p>There was support for the principle of development and recognition of the work undertaken by Great Ormond Street Hospital (GOSH) and its role in delivering highly specialised healthcare for children with rare and complex conditions.</p> <p>A number of organisations, institutions, charities and individuals submitted their support for the development. They said the plans would enable more patients to be treated, provide the best facilities for children, and allow GOSH and partners to pioneer research. The current location of the site was considered crucial in order for GOSH and partners to continue providing high-quality care.</p>	<p>GOSH is grateful for the support it has received for the Children’s Cancer Centre.</p> <p>GOSH particularly appreciates the support of its neighbours. GOSH recognises that living near an institution like GOSH is not always easy and it is hoped that the community recognises the positive contribution that GOSH, alongside their research and other partners in the area, makes, not only to individual patients and families, but also to health care and health research more widely.</p>

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Need for development		
	<p>One respondent stated that it was unclear how the proposal reflects the hospital's needs statement. It has been suggested that the proposed 500% increase in building volume is motivated by a desire to consolidate services into a single building rather than necessity.</p>	<p>A 500% increase in building volume is incorrect.</p> <p>The CCC is larger than the current Frontage Building. This reflects the GOSH brief and the existing surrounding context. The GOSH design team have worked with officers at the London Borough of Camden (LBC) and the Greater London Authority (GLA) on the design of the building so that the clinical need can be met in a sensitive way. The project has been informed by demand and capacity modelling, together with the analysis of emerging treatments and therapies, in order to provide space to meet current and future needs and continue to provide safe and comfortable care.</p> <p>Assessments carried out by the design team at the GLA and Camden design review panel (DRP) both assessed the building design as suitable for the site and will make a positive contribution to the immediate area, including to the Conservation Area. The DRP and GLA both confirmed that the height and massing of the scheme is appropriate within its context.</p>
LOGISTICS AND CONSTRUCTION		
Traffic	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the impact of construction traffic on nearby homes, businesses and road surfaces.</p> <p>One respondent questioned the omission of a structural impact assessment on Great Ormond Street's lower ground level properties.</p>	<p>The construction process will be managed by John Sisk & Son Ltd (Sisk), and the whole programme is scheduled to take three years. During those three years there will be different demolition and construction elements with significantly different levels of traffic generation.</p> <p>A breakdown of estimated construction vehicle attendance has been provided within the submitted Demolition & Construction Management Plan (DCMP).</p>

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>It was questioned whether local residents would be compensated for construction-related damage.</p>	<p>All of Sisk's suppliers and subcontractors will agree to follow the obligations of the project delivery management system. The pre-booking system will allocate sufficient times slots based on vehicle travel distances, loading, and unloading durations and type of vehicle attending site to prevent construction logistics exceeding site capacity.</p>
<p>Construction vehicles</p>	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the impact of construction vehicle emissions on patients and schoolchildren in the surrounding area. It was queried whether electric vehicles would be used and how this would be tracked.</p> <p>It was questioned how congestion resulting from pre-booked construction delivery slots would be mitigated.</p> <p>The number of construction vehicles proposed during construction was questioned by a number of respondents.</p> <p>One respondent suggested that additional deliveries of construction supplies were not adequately considered in the waste management strategy, resulting in deliveries after hours and during the night.</p> <p>The Bevan House Management Company raised concerns about construction vehicles using Boswell Street which has a high concentration of residential properties and businesses.</p>	<p>Sisk and its supply chain are continuously investigating the opportunities surrounding reduction of CO2 emissions. All construction vehicles attending site will adopt Green D+HVO fuels. The opportunity of incorporating electrical plant and construction vehicles is being investigated. Subject to industry availability Sisk will implement use of EV within the construction management plan.</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of demolition and construction activities Sisk will produce and publish an approved Site Waste Management Plan in accordance with ISO14001:2015.</p> <p>Construction delivery and site operations will be restricted to normal working site hours 08:00 – 18:00 Mon – Friday 08:00 – 13:00 Saturday as stipulated by London Borough of Camden. Planned works scheduled to be carried out outside normal working hours will be approved by the appropriate authorities and notices provided to neighbours and relevant stakeholders.</p>

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Construction Management Plan	<p>The proposed construction hours were questioned, and it was suggested that local residents and businesses would be impacted at all hours.</p> <p>The proposed community liaison strategy was questioned, as was how it would operate. It was suggested that the impact of construction on residents and local businesses should have been considered during pre-application consultation.</p>	<p>A DCMP has been produced (and submitted) to demonstrate how deconstruction and construction activities are proposed to be undertaken whilst ensuring safety and minimising the disruption to the public realm.</p> <p>The DCMP sets out the proposed mitigation measures during the construction period in relation to logistics, traffic management, access and operating hours to minimise the impact on local residents and businesses during the works.</p> <p>Sisk have developed the DCMP in detail with LBC with the intention to reduce impact on the local area over the course of the 3-year construction period.</p>
Traffic flow	<p>It was suggested that the traffic flow assessment ignored eastbound traffic and disregarded how residents navigated the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Respondents requested that construction vehicles be rerouted to avoid Lambs Conduit Street and to take into account nearby schools.</p>	<p>Sisk have appointed a transport consultant to carry out tracking assessments to determine the most direct, safe and least impacting access and egress route for construction vehicles.</p> <p>2-way movement is retained on Great Ormond Street to the west of Powis Place to facilitate emergency ambulances for GOSH and UCHL.</p>
Deliveries	The proposed delivery route was questioned and the impact this would have on neighbouring businesses.	Sisk have developed a logistical plan to ensure the majority of works are maintained within the construction hoarding line. Certain construction phase activities must be carried out outside the approved, this will be undertaken following approval from relevant authorities and ensuring continuous safe segregation of construction operations and public realm.
Local employment	It was suggested that local businesses would suffer the consequences of the long-term construction period, resulting in job losses.	GOSH will be engaging with their neighbours throughout the construction period and residents will have a direct point of contact in the construction team to raise any queries or concerns.
Well-being	It was suggested that the scheme would have a negative impact on the well-being and daily lives of nearby residents.	

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	One respondent suggested that during the construction period, members of the local community would be unable to socialise and children would be unable to play outside on their own.	Sisk have performed a noise and vibration impact assessment. The results of this assessment have been reviewed and mitigation methods are to be considered prior to the commencement of construction.
Health	Respondents suggested that the proposals would have a negative impact on the elderly and vulnerable residents.	In accordance with 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 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.
Vibrations	The impact of vibrations during construction on neighbouring properties, including heritage buildings, was highlighted, and a vibrational assessment for the construction management plan was recommended. One respondent specifically mentioned the impact of construction vehicles on Boswell Street and the negative impact on properties.	
Construction timings	Other local developments, such as the Tybald regeneration scheme, were suggested to coincide with the proposed construction timings, rendering the neighbourhood unliveable. The length of the construction process was questioned, with several respondents objecting to the 5-year construction period.	
Acoustics	One respondent suggested that construction noise would have a negative impact on the quality of life enjoyed by local residents, particularly children and the elderly.	GOSH recognises the need to mitigate acoustic impacts from construction operations. The process will be carefully managed throughout by Sisk to ensure as little disruption to the local community as possible. A full noise impact assessment in accordance with regulatory requirements has been undertaken, and Sisk will also implement the following measures to minimise disruption from demolition and construction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management and operational controls

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of noise and dust levels undertaken prior to and throughout work Air quality management to limit the emissions of air pollution. <p>Throughout the construction phase Sisk will follow the agreed construction methodologies and controls of acoustic emissions as stipulated within the Deconstruction and Construction Management Plan (DCMP).</p>
TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL		
Parking	<p>It was requested that EV charging points be installed on Great Ormond Street.</p> <p>One respondent suggested that free parking be provided for patients and their families at GOSH and the National Hospital, and that kerbs be dropped to allow wheelchair access.</p> <p>The removal of residential and disabled parking bays was called into question, and it was asked if this would be mitigated.</p>	<p>This phase of the GOSH masterplan is related to the construction of the Children’s Cancer Centre only, however a future phase will focus on the public realm of Great Ormond Street and revised drop off and parking arrangements, including the potential for EV charging points.</p> <p>GOSH benefits from special dispensation for free parking along Guilford Street for patients and families attending the hospital on a first come first served basis. However, it is not possible to expand this to existing pay-by-phone parking bays.</p> <p>The temporary suspension of parking bays along Great Ormond Street will displace existing demand to other locations in the local vicinity where existing capacity is available, demonstrated through parking surveys. The existing disabled bay on Great Ormond Street will be relocated further west, therefore resulting in no loss of disabled provision. This is to be agreed with LBC.</p>
Road safety	The volume of construction traffic entering narrow streets was highlighted, raising concerns about road safety.	The low volume of construction traffic equates to around 36 deliveries per day at peak, or around 4 per hour. The streets being utilised are proposed to be kept clear of parked vehicles to minimise risks of collisions or damage to vehicles.

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>The temporary removal of zebra crossings on Great Ormond Street was questioned and the impact this would have on local school children.</p> <p>It was suggested that the proximity of site traffic to Coram’s fields would be hazardous for young children.</p> <p>Access to and from Queen Square was questioned, and it was suggested that one-way traffic would be detrimental to residents and patients.</p>	<p>Pedestrian crossings will be retained wherever possible or relocated a short distance to ensure that the safety of pedestrians is maintained. The safety of all road users, including school children, is of high importance when considering changes to the road network.</p> <p>Following the consultation feedback, during construction, patients travelling to GOSH will enter the building from a temporary entrance on Guilford Street and therefore will avoid having to use Great Ormond Street. This will reduce operational traffic movements on Guilford Place, Lambs Conduit Street, Great Ormond Street and Boswell Street during construction.</p> <p>Sisk recognise that to ensure the safety of public highway and realm several alterations are required to facilitate construction vehicles. To ensure all highway alterations are designed in accordance with Highway guidance and regulations a Road Safety Audit will be produced prior to commencement of demolition and construction works.</p>
Transport Management Plan	<p>One respondent suggested that the proposed Transport Management Plan contravened a number of LBC policies relating to promoting active travel and providing efficient, well-maintained highways.</p> <p>It was questioned why transport management assessments were still being carried out and whether they would be completed before planning permission was granted.</p>	<p>GOSH promotes active travel for its staff, patients and visitors travelling to the hospital and will continue to provide for these modes of travel during construction. The temporary entrance on Guilford Street will remove a large number of pedestrians from the construction activities on Great Ormond Street.</p> <p>It is standard practice for a DCMP or similar management plan to be submitted as an outline or draft document with the planning application. It would be developed if permission is granted and before commencement of construction. The level of detail currently being included is far greater than normal due to the complexities and effects on existing users and travel patterns.</p>

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Emergency vehicles	<p>Respondents questioned why emergency vehicles could gain access to the site via alternative routes such as Guilford Street, but not construction vehicles.</p> <p>It was stated that a high-volume patient entrance on Powis Place would conflict with the emergency route used by NHNN and GOSH.</p> <p>One respondent suggested that ambulance parking be removed from the north side of Great Ormond Street so that the pavement on this side could be widened. This was suggested as a way to improve the public realm and possibly provide a smoking kiosk.</p> <p>It was suggested that the proposed area for ambulances during construction would not be large enough to accommodate the volume of traffic, resulting in delays for GOSH and UCLH patients.</p>	<p>Following consultation feedback a new temporary entrance on Guilford Street is proposed, ensuring that emergency vehicles and patients are separated from the construction activities on Great Ormond Street. This will include conversion of existing parking bays into ambulance bays to accommodate the expected demand.</p>
Cycle Lane impact	<p>It was suggested that the construction plans would be detrimental to local cyclists, and it was questioned where the proposed route for cyclists would be located.</p> <p>One respondent group mentioned that Lambs Conduit Street is on a critical N-S cycle route that would be severely impacted by construction vehicles. The proposed diversionary routes were highlighted, and it was</p>	<p>Safety of all road users is of paramount importance and so eastbound movements along Great Ormond Street east of Powis Place will not be possible for motor vehicles or cyclists as the movement of HGVs into the compound against oncoming cyclists is considered to be a risk. Cyclists will therefore be diverted either through the north end of Queen Square and along Guilford Street or along Theobalds Road and Lambs Conduit Street. There will be no restriction on cyclists using Lambs Conduit Street in both directions during construction.</p>

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	suggested that the routes would lead to road safety issues.	
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT		
Acoustics once the building is operational	<p>It was suggested that the geographical assessment of acoustics was insufficient, and that the noise impact on the entire neighbourhood has not been considered.</p> <p>The impact of the proposed plant on the top level was questioned in terms of noise emissions and it was suggested that it be located underground</p>	<p>An Acoustic Assessment has been submitted with the application which includes an assessment of the existing baseline acoustic context and recommendations to enable the proposals to meet acceptable levels for nearby residents within the wider geographical area.</p> <p>It is standard practice for the Council to secure specific acoustic standards for new buildings and this will be the case with this planning application.</p>
Contamination and Remediation	It was suggested that assessments had not taken into account land contaminant removal and treatment.	<p>Sisk have produced a number of survey reports which identify land contamination risks. These include but are not limited to; Basement Impact Assessment, Geotechnical and Geo-environmental Design report, Geotechnical Desktop Survey, Site Investigation Factual Report and UXO Assessment.</p> <p>All survey investigations have been carried out in accordance with Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) guidance, published on the UK Government website.</p> <p>Potential site contaminants, recommended removal methods are listed within supporting planning information.</p>
Air quality & pollution	The impact of construction pollution, including dirt and noise, was queried.	Sisk recognises the risk excessive environmental emissions from construction activities may introduce to the immediate and surrounding environment. Throughout the demolition and construction phase Sisk will follow the agreed construction methodologies and management procedures to control pollutants and emissions.

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>It was suggested that the Air Quality assessment did not consider the surrounding area.</p> <p>One respondent mentioned a recent smaller local development that had an impact on the air quality of nearby homes. It was suggested that a dust management strategy be implemented, as well as a full health assessment for vulnerable locals.</p> <p>Several respondents noted that LBC has an obligation to improve Air Quality, Noise and Traffic.</p> <p>It was noted that GOSH was previously mentioned in the Mayor's clean air campaign, and that the current location of GOSH was harmful to patients due to pollution.</p> <p>It was suggested that the air conditioning units would create noise pollution and that a full technical specification for the AC system was omitted from the application.</p>	<p>Sisk has listed a number of project controls currently set out within the DCMP. The DCMP will continue to develop until commencement of specific works to ensure all reasonable controls are implemented.</p> <p>Sisk recognises the potential risk to stakeholders within close proximity of the development boundary and within 50m of construction vehicle track out route. As a result, Sisk commissioned accredited consultants to perform a full qualitative air quality impact assessment in accordance with required technical guidance (IAQM 2014 guidance). The findings of this assessment have been submitted as planning application supporting documentation. The report demonstrates that any effects can be appropriately mitigated by measures Sisk will put in place.</p> <p>The following sources of baseline information were investigated to characterise the air quality baseline (existing) and assist the development design and construction plans.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The presence of air quality management areas (AQMAs) at and around the site; 2. Air quality monitoring data from the LBC and neighbouring London Borough of Islington (LBI); and, 3. Estimated background concentrations in the LAQM support website operated by Defra. <p>As summarised within the submitted Air Quality Assessment, “if appropriate mitigation measures are implemented during the construction phase, the residual impact of air quality is likely to be “not significant”.</p> <p>Based on the findings of the dispersion modelling, the existing environment is not an area of poor air quality and the proposals would not introduce development that would have a negative effect on the existing air quality.</p>

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Drainage	One respondent questioned the impact of underground works on drainage in the local area.	<p>To ensure there is no impact on drainage in the local area, Sisk has carried out both intrusive and non-intrusive surveys to identify below ground utility services within the proximity of the proposed development.</p> <p>In addition, throughout the construction phase, Sisk will follow the agreed construction methodologies and controls of basement excavation works as stipulated within the Deconstruction and Construction Management Plan. Sisk will carry out works in accordance with utility company best practice and guidelines.</p>
Climate change	It was suggested that LBC's Climate Action Plan had not been addressed.	<p>In March 2021 GOSH declared a climate and health emergency – the first hospital in London to do so. The declaration means GOSH wants to become a net zero carbon organisation. GOSH want to achieve this by 2030 for direct carbon emissions (target reduction of around 24%) and by 2040 for indirect emissions they can influence.</p> <p>The approach to developing the CCC reflects this commitment, as GOSH is continuing to develop and improve the site's sustainability – for example, GOSH are exploring how they can improve travel, procurement, supply chain, and local air quality for the scheme.</p> <p>GOSH are targeting BREEAM excellent for this CCC project, which means the building will be much more efficient than the existing Frontage building. BREEAM is a world-leading method for assessing construction sustainability. The plans have been designed to integrate with existing buildings and optimise clinical efficiency, resulting in a functional, modern, and future-proofed building that can be part of the local community.</p>

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
ACCESS		
Access	<p>It was suggested that alternative access routes had not been thoroughly investigated.</p> <p>Several respondents suggested that the site be accessed from the Service Yard in Guilford Street.</p> <p>It was suggested that construction traffic enter the hospital via Guilford Street or Lamb's Conduit Street rather than Great Ormond Street.</p> <p>One respondent stated that the road surface and sewerage beneath the proposed access roads would be damaged during construction.</p> <p>The perceived closure of Boswell Road and the proposed one-way system on Great Ormond were deemed detrimental to residents' access to properties and the operation of local businesses.</p> <p>It was stated that the proposed temporary hospital main entrance on Powis Place would jeopardise the safety of vulnerable patients arriving at the NHNN.</p>	<p>A number of local residents have suggested that we consider an alternative construction and access route along Powis Place from Guilford Street by constructing an archway through the operational Southwood Hospital Building, a critical piece of GOSH infrastructure.</p> <p>The Trust commissioned BDP to prepare a report ('the Powis Place Report') which considered whether it was possible to provide an access route along Powis Place.</p> <p>For multiple reasons, there is no deliverable means of using Powis Place as a construction access. These reasons include shared landownership, servicing of both GOSH and UCLH, existing clinical facilities both in the Southwood Building and in the basements next to Powis Place, and the need for Powis Place to remain the blue light access for GOSH and UCLH.</p> <p>Furthermore, even if it were, the report found that the traffic impacts on nearby residents on the site's southern side would be far worse than any proposed effects of the Demolition and Construction Management Plan route.</p> <p>Further information on the alternative Guildford Street - Powis Place construction route can be found in the submitted Powis Place Report.</p> <p>Recognising the benefit that minimising the amount of traffic on Great Ormond Street would have for residents and UCLH, GOSH has developed a new temporary entrance strategy during the works. This means that patients and their families coming to the hospital will be no longer access the hospital via Great Ormond Street but instead will use Guilford Street. The 'Temporary Access Report' which sets this out has been formally submitted to LBC.</p>

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
DESIGN		
Density	<p>The newly formed Residents and Business Liaison Group suggested that the proposed building will transform the street and overpower the older buildings across the street.</p> <p>One resident of the Tybald estate suggested that the proposed building would be out of proportion with the surrounding neighbourhood.</p> <p>It was suggested that the proposed building was too large for the site.</p>	<p>The applicant has worked with officers at LBC and the GLA on the design of the building so that the clinical need can be met in a sensitive way. The project has been informed by demand and capacity modelling, together with the analysis of emerging treatments and therapies, in order to provide space to meet current and future needs and continue to provide safe and comfortable care.</p> <p>The space required reflects the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NHS space standards requires provision of more space for clinical functions such as bedrooms, sanitary facilities, social spaces and staff support areas; • Larger medical equipment such as MRI and CT scanners that are larger than the technology previously available; • More and larger engineering plant and critical infrastructure to service and maintain the building, that was not required 40 or 50 years ago.
Height	Several respondents stated that the proposed building height was too tall for this location.	

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	It was suggested that the height of the building infringes the protected views of St Paul's Cathedral.	The GLA and the Design Review Panel agree that the design of the proposed building is suitable for the site and is appropriate in the local area, including the Conservation Area.
Overlooking	<p>It was suggested that the proposals' height and the proposed roof the garden and balconies would result in loss of privacy due to overlooking.</p> <p>One respondent suggested that the plans were lacking in detail and that a requirement for concealed drainage guttering be implemented to reduce the impact on neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>Neighbouring properties have been assessed and the roof garden and terrace/balconies have resultingly been designed to reduce unacceptable overlooking impacts.</p> <p>This has been clearly demonstrated within the Design and Access Statement submitted with the planning application.</p>
Terraces	The proposed balcony terraces were questioned, and it was suggested that they be internalised in order to lose height and mass on the building elevation.	The proposed roof terrace and balconies are considered a crucial design feature to allow patients and families easy everyday access to external amenity spaces providing valuable health and wellbeing benefits. The hospitalisation of a child, particularly a protracted stay, has a detrimental impact upon family relationships. This makes it important to provide families access to non-clinical spaces where they can play and spend time together, as they would in a public park or their own garden.
Street entrance	It was suggested that the proposed new street entrance is crude, corporate, and unsuitable for children.	
Uses		
Hospital school	<p>There was support for the new hospital school, which would provide more classroom space for students and teachers.</p> <p>The proposal to relocate the existing hospital school to the ground floor frontage of Great Ormond Street was questioned due to the need for child protection requirements to screen the rooms from overlooking. It was suggested that there are high levels of pollution at street level.</p>	<p>The new building will allow GOSH to relocate the hospital school in a much-improved environment, enabling all ages of children who are well enough to learn in an inspiring setting with access to outdoor space.</p> <p>The hospital school is located at street level to ensure that normal childhood activities are at the heart of the hospital. The position of the school at ground level makes the school visible and part of the local community. GOSH are confident the appropriate levels of privacy for educational non-clinical settings are provided by the design.</p>

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Staff accommodation	One respondent inquired whether the new building would include staff housing.	The proposals do not include staff housing.
Retail/cafe	It was suggested that the provision of new retail and café space would cause competition with local businesses. One respondent stated that the proposed café and retail uses are not required and have nothing to do with the cancer centre.	Many NHS hospitals provide affordable and healthy retail and catering facilities to make it easy for patients, families and visitors to access essential items and catering services Currently at GOSH, there is a cafeteria and small shop in the Lagoon area. The development proposals are intended to provide another option for families to meet essential needs whilst at the hospital.
The Mary Ward Centre	One respondent was concerned about the closure of The Mary Ward Centre as a result of the proposals.	The Mary Ward Centre is an educational institution that has for many years been located at 42-43 Queen Square. The freehold of 42-43 Queen Square is owned by the Royal Female School of Art and GOSH understand that the Mary Ward's lease on the building is coming to an end. GOSH understands that the Mary Ward Centre decided to relocate to East London in 2018 and has been planning the move since then. The GOSH development proposals have not influenced the Mary Ward Centre's plans regarding the lease or sale of 42-43 Queen Square. This has been confirmed by a representative of the Mary Ward Centre.
Planning		
Masterplan	It was questioned whether the existing ongoing development would be completed before the new cancer centre was built. One respondent noted the omission of public realm works which had previously been considered.	In terms of 'ongoing development work' some internal refurbishment works are currently taking place at GOSH, and there are often projects underway to maintain the fabric of the hospital buildings. These works will continue to take place. GOSH is currently working with LBC on longer term ambitions to secure public realm improvements on Great Ormond Street. As these public realm proposals develop,

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		engagement will take place the wider surrounding residential, business and hospital community.
Submission timing	One respondent suggested that GOSH was attempting to rush the application through the planning process during the summer holiday period.	The planning application was validated by LBC on the 25 May 2022. There was a statutory public consultation period until 20 June 2022. The planning application will be determined at the LBC's Planning Committee, taking into consideration the responses to the consultation comments, including those made after the statutory consultation period ended. The committee date will be set by Camden officers.
Public Realm and Landscaping		
Trees	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the proposed tree felling.</p> <p>The potential damage to the substructure of trees in Queen Square due to the impact of construction vehicles was highlighted.</p>	<p>To facilitate construction logistics, Sisk have identified the following tree works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • removal of 10 small juvenile trees (Category C) • removal of 4 False Locust trees which are an invasive species within the London Invasive Species Initiative • Pruning of 2 London Plane trees at the junction of Guilford Place and Guilford Street • protection of 1 category B1 tree on Great Ormond Street pedestrian footpath (outside Paul O’Gorman Building) <p>All construction traffic will be following existing highways and not disturb existing trees in Queen Square.</p>
Public realm	<p>One respondent suggested that the Play Street initiatives for Great Ormond Street should be integrated into a public realm scheme.</p> <p>The absence of community spaces which had been discussed during earlier stages, was emphasised.</p>	GOSH is working with LBC on longer term ambitions to secure public realm improvements on Great Ormond Street.

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Daylight and Sunlight impact		
Daylight and Sunlight Report	<p>Residents on Great Ormond Street suggested that the Daylight and Sunlight Report suggested that homes would suffer as a result of reduced light levels, failure to meet BRE guidelines, and the need for electric lights to be used during the day, resulting in higher utility bills.</p> <p>It was suggested that the proposed building's height would cause light loss in neighbouring properties and businesses.</p>	<p>We have undertaken onsite daylight surveys in direct response to resident feedback and the results of this were considered as part of the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment which was submitted as part of the planning application.</p> <p>A supplementary note has since been produced and submitted due to resident requests to undertake further modelling of their homes. This provides a commentary with respect to the updated BRE Guidance and a revised assessment of a neighbouring flat with Avison and Young were able to access on the request of the resident.</p>
Consultation		
Pre-application public consultation	<p>Respondents suggested that the planning application was submitted without adequate consultation, and residents' objections were ignored.</p> <p>The minimal feedback received during the consultation was highlighted.</p> <p>One respondent stated that they were only made aware of the proposals from a poster in a local shop window.</p> <p>The Residents and Business Liaison Group suggested that should any amendments be made to the plan, a new planning application should be submitted and consulted on.</p>	<p>GOSH understands the importance of maintaining an open and ongoing dialogue with its neighbours, users, and staff members, and over the past five years, the project team has delivered a programme of stakeholder engagement with a variety of groups in order to introduce the project and gain input as early as possible in the process.</p> <p>During the pre-application public consultation in April 2022, over 5000 leaflets were distributed by Royal Mail, and a social media campaign was launched to direct people towards the consultation website and register for the live webinars.</p> <p>We will continue to create opportunities for the community to be involved at every stage of the project. Since the application has been submitted, the CCC redevelopment team have met with a number of individual residents and stakeholders. GOSH will also hold meetings of the Planning Consultation Group (PCG) as appropriate, which was established for those purposes.</p>

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>One respondent suggested that there had been insufficient consultation with the Tybalds Residents Association and that additional consultation be undertaken as a result.</p> <p>The Great Ormond Street Group stated that the pre-application consultation was inadequate and that local residents and key stakeholders were unaware of the plans. LBC's consultation was also deemed to be insufficient.</p>	<p>The full report on our response to the consultation process has been submitted to LBC. A post-submission addendum report has also been submitted.</p> <p>Submission documents for the planning application are published for public viewing and comments on LBC's online planning portal.</p>
Local stakeholders	<p>Respondents suggested that GOSH's withdrawal from the Residents Liaison Group was unnecessary and that it could have continued digitally.</p> <p>It was claimed that the proposed phasing of redevelopment in 2015 was made without adequate consultation with the Residents Liaison Group, and that GOSH stated that they would be unable to change the order of works without consulting local people.</p> <p>The consultation of local groups and ward councillors over a number of years was questioned, and it was suggested that residents and interest groups had not been adequately engaged.</p>	

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Impact on neighbours		
Vaults	One respondent mentioned the vaults beneath Boswell Street, which run from Bevan House's lightwell several feet out under the road and have recently been reinforced for normal traffic. It was suggested that HGVs may cause damage to the vaults during construction.	As part of the DCMP process a series of road and ground surveys will be procured and undertaken to understand the scope of any infrastructure constraints and how to mitigate and manage them. These will inform the final DMCP that will be worked up for approval with LBC.
Character of the area	Respondents stated that the proposals would change the character of the local neighbourhood. It was suggested that small independent businesses would cease to exist if GOSH continued to expand.	<p>We have worked with officers at LBC and the GLA on the design of the building so that the hospital's clinical need can be met in a sensitive way. The design assessment of the GLA is that the proposed building is suitable for the site and will make a positive contribution to the area.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the <i>Design and Access Statement</i> as well as in the <i>Heritage Response to Statutory Consultees</i> document produced by Turley Heritage.</p> <p>GOSH also works to make a positive contribution to the local neighbourhood through activities such as outreach by our GOSH Arts team, Play Street, apprenticeship schemes and other employment opportunities. GOSH are continuing with these initiatives to help further integrated GOSH into the local community and play its part as a neighbour.</p> <p>With respect to small independent businesses, staff and visitors to the hospital are likely to be an important source of revenue to local businesses and it is unclear how any further expansion of the hospital would impact on the success of these businesses.</p>
Local businesses	Respondents questioned if local businesses would be compensated for business lost during construction as a result of traffic diversions.	Nearly 6,000 people work at GOSH. Jobs vary from hospital consultants, cleaners, porters, nurses, administrators as well as engineers, teachers and many other varied functions. GOSH staff live across London, with some in the Bloomsbury area while others live outside London. GOSH staff, visiting patients and families use the local

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>The impact on outdoor seating used by local restaurants and cafes was highlighted.</p> <p>Businesses in the surrounding area expressed concern that the construction process would have an indirect impact on them.</p>	<p>facilities and enjoy the amenities on Lamb Conduits Street, the Brunswick Centre and beyond. They will continue to use the convenience stores and business in the area which would be very different without them travelling to the site every day.</p> <p>The Deconstruction and Construction Management Plan prepared by SISK which has been updated following consultation responses sets out the intended management of deconstruction and construction activities in order to minimise impacts on surrounding businesses and those which use outdoor seating.</p>
Short term accommodation	One respondent suggested that the influx of hospital patients would increase demand for short-term rental housing in the surrounding area, driving locals out of the community.	An increase in patient numbers would not impact on rental accommodation in the surrounding area. This is because most parents stay with their child in the hospital, or in hospital-provided short-stay accommodation and this will remain the case.
Heritage		
Impact on 18 th century buildings	<p>The historical significance of the Georgian houses on Great Ormond Street was highlighted, and it was suggested that the scale of the proposals would threaten to overwhelm the setting of houses on the south side of the street and constrain their use, particularly in relation to sunlight.</p> <p>The TVIA's conclusion that the proposals would have a low magnitude neutral effect on early 18th century properties was questioned, and it was suggested that the scale does not conform to the conservation area's requirement to preserve the scale of the streets and surrounding buildings.</p>	<p>The built heritage assets included in the heritage impact assessment within the Built Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact Appraisal (HTVIA) were determined by on-site visual surveys, desk-based research, and the production of a zone of theoretical visibility. The scope of built heritage assets requiring assessment was agreed with Council officers during pre-application discussions and included the heritage assets at the eastern end of Great Ormond Street. This work also concluded that there would be no potential visibility or likelihood of heritage impact of the completed development on the significance of listed buildings on Lambs Conduit Street.</p> <p>It is standard practice in preparing heritage impact assessments for development of this scale and character (i.e., not EIA development) that only the permanent impacts of the completed development on the significance of the relevant built heritage assets are assessed, rather than temporary construction effects.</p>

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Bloomsbury Conservation Area	<p>It was suggested that the proposed development would overwhelm the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Georgian Group expressed concern about the proposed structure's impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings within the Conservation Area, and suggested that the proposals be more in keeping with the historic surroundings.</p> <p>The Bloomsbury Conservation Areas Advisory Committee expressed concern about the proposed development's scale and massing in the residential context, as well as its proximity to the Georgian terraces opposite. The Paul O'Gorman building was suggested as a useful baseline for scale of development.</p> <p>The Great Ormond Street Group noted that the design is not appropriate for the Bloomsbury Conservation Area and contrary to LVMF- scheduled London Panorama view from Primrose Hill.</p>	<p>Additional commentary on impacts of the proposed development on relevant LVMF views is included in the HTVIA Addendum document.</p> <p>Further assessment and commentary on the perceived impact of the scale of the proposed development on the overall heritage significance of the listed buildings along Great Ormond Street and the Bloomsbury Conservation Area is set out in 'Heritage Response to Statutory Consultees' Note which is appended to this response. It finds the impact of the proposals on the designated heritage assets to be acceptable in heritage terms.</p> <p>Additional commentary on the design of the proposed development, and its relationship to the relevant heritage context, is provided by BDP architects in the above Design section of this document.</p>
Heritage Statement	<p>The comparative locations cited in the heritage report were questioned, and the omission of Great Ormond Street East and Lambs Conduit Street. It was suggested that an independent study be commissioned to address this in order to establish the potential damage to heritage buildings.</p>	
Archaeology review	<p>The Archaeological Report was questioned, and it was stated that the construction management plan area had not been considered.</p>	<p>A revised Archaeology Desktop Assessment has been prepared since the submission of the planning application. This has been submitted to LBC and the Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service (GLAAS) who have confirmed this updated report responds in full to their earlier comments.</p>

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	It was queried whether the reverberations studies had been included in the evaluation.	<p>They have also recommended conditions be attached to any consent to require approval of an archaeological monitoring brief.</p> <p>As part of the DCMP vibration effects as a result of deconstruction and construction activities will be monitored on a daily basis.</p>
Sustainability		
Embodied Carbon Savings	The justification for not retaining the existing building and thus saving embodied carbon was questioned.	<p>The rationale for removal of the existing "Frontage" building is set out in two documents submitted with the planning application. (These two documents are noted below).</p> <p>In summary, the existing building is not big enough, meaning it does not provide sufficient floorspace to meet the hospitals future needs. The existing structure does not allow for adaptation or extension to increase available space or floor area. The existing structure is also not able to bear additional loading associated with the cancer centre facilities.</p> <p><i>1. Circular Economy Study (GOSHCCC-BDP-ZZ-ZZ-RP-A-2000-0044) - page 7 summarises key issues with retention under the heading "reasons for demolition"</i></p> <p><i>2. Frontage Building Feasibility Study (GOSHCCC-BDP-ZZ-ZZ-RP-A-2000-0048) - provides a complete assessment of the frontage building, including architectural and structural assessment of retention options. Page 31 summarises the study, concluding demolition is necessary to meet the clinical needs of the children's cancer centre.</i></p>
Recycled materials	It was stated that the proposed demolition methodology, which claims large-scale recycling of existing materials, is exaggerated.	The numbers for recycling in the Circular Economy Assessment have been provided by the Sustainability Contractor and are based on a pre-demolition audit and their extensive experience on similar large-scale projects.

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Sustainability Statement	One respondent suggested that the Sustainability Statement does not consider the impact of the proposals on the PV cells that cover the south-facing slope of the nearby Variety Club Building which will be overshadowed.	PV cells can operate in a wide range of conditions including on shady days. Notwithstanding the above, this has been tested and the existing PVs will continue to work effectively.
Location		
Alternative sites	<p>It was suggested that alternative locations for the new Cancer Centre be investigated locally, such as Coram Fields, Boswell Street, or by incorporating the proposals into existing buildings, such as the new Guildford Street research centre.</p> <p>It was suggested that alternative centres in other parts of the UK, such as Cambridge Addenbrooke's Children's Hospital, could be a suitable alternative, and it was noted that more than half of GOSH's patients come from outside London.</p> <p>One respondent highlighted the environmental impact of further expansion and suggested regional partnerships should be considered.</p> <p>One respondent questioned why the investment was being made here when it could instead be spent on a new hospital in a different location.</p>	<p>Gosh do not think that alternative locations for the hospital or the Children's Cancer Centre away from the current location would be in the best interests of their patients.</p> <p>The current location, close to UCLH, the UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health and the UCL Institute of Cardiovascular Science and other major research institutions, enables GOSH to make the most of partnerships to deliver complex treatments and to develop new, kinder and more effective treatments for seriously ill children.</p> <p>This central London location near multiple mainline stations as well as Russell Square and Holborn underground stations makes it easy for families to travel to receive care from across the UK or overseas.</p> <p>In addition, GOSH also provide essential services and support within the local health system in North Central London. This includes specialist care for children who may need surgery, specialist neonatal care and intensive care for older babies or children.</p> <p>The suggestion to use the Zayed Centre for Research is not feasible. The CCC has been designed to provide the appropriate clinical spaces required for inpatients, theatres, critical care and other services. The Zayed Centre for Research was designed for entirely different purposes including labs and outpatient services. The centre is also shared with UCL so it is not within the gift of GOSH to change its function.</p>

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		The central London location near to Kings Cross St Pancras and Euston main line stations as well as Russel Square and Holborn underground stations means it is easy to access via public transport for patients. Travel assistance for families who meet the relevant criteria is also available.
Impact on hospital users		
Access	It was suggested that access to the area is costly and that the congestion charge makes it difficult for patients and their families due to the location of the hospital.	The site's central London location near to Kings Cross St Pancras and Euston main line stations as well as Russell Square and Holborn underground stations mean the hospital is easy to access via public transport for patients. Travel assistance for families who meet the relevant criteria is also available.
Accommodation and amenities	<p>One respondent suggested that, due to the high cost of accommodation near the hospital, relocating the hospital to a more suitable location elsewhere could help reduce these costs.</p> <p>It was suggested that the plans omitted additional accommodation for patients and staff which should be addressed.</p>	<p>Most parents stay with their child in the hospital, or in hospital-provided short-stay accommodation.</p> <p>Staff accommodation is not provided at the GOSH site and is not included in the application.</p> <p>Information about parent and staff accommodation options is available on the GOSH website.</p>
Patient care	It was suggested that the construction would disrupt patient care and could lead to patients being transferred to other hospitals, putting additional strain on them.	GOSH are confident they can mitigate the impact of the construction on the rest of the hospital services. The DCMP provides information about the approaches we are taking to mitigate this.

THEME	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Patient wellbeing	The Unicorn Theatre was supportive of the new facilities, which would improve the environment of care and make a positive contribution to the wellbeing and recovery of patients, which is limited in existing wards.	GOSH are grateful for the support we have received throughout the planning application process and the development of these plans.

Appendix 1 Daylight and Sunlight response schedule prepared by Avison Young

Great Ormond Street

09/09/2022

Property Address	Neighbours	Objection	Daylight Related?	Response
49 Great Ormond Street and others	Business and Residents Liason Group Erica Brostoff, Alec Forshaw, Gillian Moseley, Michael Pountney	1. The bulk of the proposed new building: it would transform the street and overwhelm the older buildings opposite, many of them listed, meaning amongst other things, a major loss of natural light. These would be permanent effects. [...] The grounds on which the Planning Committee can reject an application are quite precise, and it's best to have these in mind when making objections: 1. Loss of light or overshadowing.	Yes	Upon review of this comment, it is AY's interpretation that it is not a direct objection, but rather an overall objection setting out the potential grounds on which other residents may object, should they wish to do so. AY have therefore not responded to the Residents and Business Liaisons comment and instead responded directly to all other objections relating to daylight/sunlight.
Unknown	Carol Fugler	Firstly will the works started almost 15 years ago be completed prior to this new application being granted?? The actual road surface in Great Ormond Street is cracking up. My house is opposite & is almost 300 years old. The house shakes now with the volume of traffic-will Great Ormond Street Hospital compensate me for damage to my house from the extra traffic & heavy works traffic? Will Great Ormond Street Hospital update the properties that they own opposite the planned re-development-they are in an appalling condition in general-or will Camden Council do this? By all means ¿renovate¿ the original hospital building-but why not look at doing it in Coram Fields which is very underused & certainly has the space for gardens etc etc for all patients in the hospital. The new research centre on Guildford street seems to have very few humans in too-could this not be more integrated into the hospital? Will all the charitable organisations be housed in the new building too-opening up more homes for staff/nurses homes? If not I am totally against this huge project that will totally change the community & area. While you are at it could you please tidy up Queens Square-make it more user friendly please!!!! More electric charging units on Great Ormond Street & free parking for patients & their families with simple passes issued by the hospital-& The National Hospital-drop all the kerbs too for wheelchair users & stop Camden earning a fortune from sick children by handing tickets out totally unnecessarily. Another alternative would be to demolish the awful estate on Boswell Street-re-house the tenants & use that space for the New Great Ormond Street Childrens hospital-re-generate the area not destroy it!!!!!!	No	N/A
Unknown	Noel Faucett	It seems the proposed planning and routing are being green lighted despite the reasonable concerns raised by residents. The plan has been made without consultation and when objections have been made the residents have been ignored. I own a vehicle in the area and park on great ormond street, the plans presented here will detrimentally affect me personally. Especially as the proposed route of delivery vehicle will be directly in front of my house. I am also aware of the concerns of other residents on the street regarding loss of natural light, elderly and disabled persons on the top end of lambs conduit street being affected by the proposed one way system. All this while dismissing out of hand suggestions to service the site from the rear at Guildford street without explaining why the proposal is not feasible.	Yes	AY do not know the location of Mr Faucett's property to be able to comment on the levels of daylight and sunlight he currently enjoys. However, with regard to his concerns regarding the loss of natural light to other residents' properties, AY's report discusses each property in turn that could be affected by the Proposed Development. In AY's professional opinion, any other properties which are not discussed within the report are considered to be of sufficient distance from the Proposed Development and will not be notably affected.
Unknown	Pauline Buck-Evans	I am writing to object to the above plans and in particular to the news that GOSH are insistent to keep to their original route plans for the endless trucks that will be coming and going to the site over the next FIVE years. I insist that GOSH change their route to avoid Lambs Conduit Street, Great Ormond Street and Boswell Street. These are narrow streets and cannot sustain such heavy work traffic. I and countless others live and work here and the current plans will makes all our lives UNBEARABLE. In addition to the pollution dust and dirt along the proposed route , I also oppose tree felling and the removal of residents parking bays. I understand there is a suitable alternative route along Guilford Street and Powis Place. I urge that this route is used instead.	No	N/A
1st Floor Flat of 31-35 Great Ormond Street	Simon Christmas	This application shows complete contempt for local residents – and nowhere more clearly than in the shocking Daylight and Sunlight Report. With respect to our flat on the first floor of 31-35 Great Ormond Street, where we have lived for 22 years, the report finds that: - EVERY window will experience a reduction of at least 40% in light levels – with no indication of how much longer the reduction may be in some. (6.67) - NO rooms on the side of the building that faces GOSH will meet BRE guidelines. (6.68) - ALL of these rooms will therefore require electric lights to be used during the day. (6/69) These (on top of the awful experience we will have during construction) are devastating findings for residents who, like us, often have to work from home. And yet the report chooses to dress them up with the most biased and self-serving piece of “analysis” I have ever read. The above changes, we are told, “may be noticeable” (6.70). A reduction of more than 40% is described as “relatively large” (6/67). “Direct views of the sky are maintained in all rooms” (6.68) – provided you lie on the floor next to the window, I assume. The methodology adopted by the report is to compare our flats to carefully selected worst-case flats in other parts of the area. From this rigged comparison, it concludes: “a retained VSC of c. 10% at ground and first floor is not without precedent.” So what? Slum accommodation is not without precedent in this area of London. Rats are not without precedent. Arrogant developers and councillors who refuse to listen to their communities are not without precedent. This is not a report, it is a shameless piece of PR. Yet for all their manipulation of the obvious findings, the strongest conclusion they are able to draw is: “It is possible, therefore, that notwithstanding	Yes	AY's report acknowledges that daylight reductions will occur to Mr Christmas' property. However, in an attempt to contextualise the results, AY assessed five residential properties in the local vicinity which would not be affected by the Proposed GOSHCCC. AY of course recognise that the levels of daylight will vary across the Borough, however, the properties in the contextual study have been referenced as they demonstrate comparable retained daylight values. Mr Christmas also references that AY state that residents will now require to use electric lighting in order to use and enjoy their rooms if the Proposed GOSHCCC were to be built out. In AY's report they stated that in the existing condition, all site-facing rooms within Mr Christmas' property achieve an Average Daylight Factor of 1.64% or below. According to the BRE guidelines, if an ADF is "Below 2% the room will look dull and electric lighting is likely to be turned on." Therefore, AY were highlighting that in accordance with the BRE Guidelines, it is understood that each of Mr Christmas' Site-facing rooms are likely to already require

Property Address	Neighbours	Objection	Daylight Related?	Response
		<p>that a development might result in a noticeable reduction in light, it may be possible to conclude that the impact would nonetheless be acceptable.” (5.22)</p> <p>Possible, might, may. The conclusion of their report is that we WILL no longer be able to use the main rooms of our flat in the daytime without electric lights turned on. (The authors did not bother to check, but the rooms on the other side of the building, gleefully noted as possible mitigation in 6.66, are a kitchen, a bathroom, and a very small bathroom.)</p> <p>In 5.23, the authors state that it is “a matter of judgement and opinion” whether forcing people to use electric lights during the day is “acceptable”. We beg the planning committed to use its judgement and express an opinion on this arrogant disregard for local residents.</p>		<p>supplementary electric lighting in the current condition. Therefore, with the implementation of the Proposed GOSHCCC, some further electric lighting may be required.</p>
Lambs Conduit Street	Michael Sawdayee	<p>As a resident of Lambs Conduit Street I object to the fact that not enough has been done to examine the alternative access route via the hospitals Service Yard in Guilford St. Have you ever been to Great Ormond St at busy times of the day? The road is often gridlocked as it is. Adding HGV lorries will only make matters worse and increase noise and pollution. It's also a route that families take to St George the Martyr school and to Coram's Fields, so traffic should be kept to a minimum for the safety and well being of pedestrians. My guess is that if they go ahead with the plans, the lorries will end up sitting in a queue of cars and ambulances, and work will grind to a halt. It seems to be in everyone's interest not to fill this neighbourhood with HGVs, if there's any alternative, which I understand there is.</p>	No	N/A
No. 3 Bevan House	Mubarak patel	<p>We Chimney Investments Ltd have Elderly Tenants living at the property No 3 Bevan House and The closure of the Road will cause distress as one is a Cancer Patient. Access to the building is needed all the time and closure of Boswell Street is not practical and unfair. Other alternatives to the site has to be found as it is an issue already. Hospital need to find an Alternative Route, Loss of Access will be cause financial and difficulty to current Residents and Future Residents.</p>	No	N/A
Unknown	Renata Zaprazna	<p>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.</p>	Yes	<p>AY do not know the location of Mr Raprazna's property to be able to comment on the levels of daylight and sunlight he currently enjoys, however with regard to his concerns regarding the loss of natural light to other residents' properties, AY's report discusses each property in turn that could be affected by the Proposed Development. In AY's professional opinion, any other properties which are not discussed within the report are considered to be of sufficient distance from the Proposed Development and will not be notably affected.</p>
Unknown	Daniel Adiego Gonzalez	<p>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.</p>	Yes	<p>AY do not know the location of Mr Gonzalez's property to be able to comment on the levels of daylight and sunlight he currently enjoys. However with regard to his concerns regarding the loss of natural light to other residents' properties, AY's report discusses each property in turn that could be affected by the Proposed Development. In AY's professional opinion, any other properties which are not discussed within the report are considered to be of sufficient distance from the Proposed Development and will not be notably affected.</p>
A Flat within 37/39 Great Ormond Street	Gordon Adgey	<p>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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Yes	<p>AY attended Mr Adgey's property on 1st September 2022 and have since updated their analysis to reflect the accurate layouts of his property. The two site-facing rooms are single aspect and serve a living/kitchen/dining room and a bedroom.</p> <p>The results of AY's updated assessments show that the two windows will experience reductions beyond the BRE guidelines. However, both site facing windows will continue to enjoy a VSC of 13% with the Proposed GOSHCCC in place.</p> <p>The No Sky Line (NSL) analysis showed that each of the site-facing rooms will experience an alteration of 75%-79% to each room and all will retain a view of the sky across 19%-24% of the room areas. Whilst this is below the BRE Guidelines recommendations, direct views of the sky are partially maintained in both rooms.</p> <p>In addition to the above, AY ran supplementary Average Daylight Factor (ADF) assessments which indicates that all rooms achieve an ADF of 1.2% or below in the existing condition (prior to the development of the Proposed GOSHCCC) and according to the BRE</p>

Property Address	Neighbours	Objection	Daylight Related?	Response
		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		<p>Guidelines, if a room enjoys an ADF "below 2% the room will look dull and electric lighting is likely to be turned on." As such, it is AY's understanding that each of Mr Adgey's site-facing rooms are likely to already require supplementary electric lighting in the current condition and with the implementation of the Proposed GOSHCCC, some further electric lighting may be required.</p> <p>Whilst there are percentage reductions which are beyond the BRE Guidelines and which may be noticeable, the overall effect when considering the retained daylight (VSC) values can be considered reasonable for the urban location of the site in AY's professional opinion.</p>
Unknown	Vivien Conacher	<p>I am a long-time resident of Great Ormond Street with very real concerns.</p> <p>The proposed hospital redevelopment plan completely ignores the real people who live here, our right to see sunlight and the sky, to enjoy peace and well-being as we live and work in our homes. Nobody has even bothered to consult with us in our homes, to assess the REAL impact to our living and working lives, to even confirm the numerous assumptions printed in abysmal "Daylight & Sunlight Report" - where it has been deemed "acceptable" that post-renovations, no rooms in the buildings facing the hospital will meet BRE guidelines for daylight, and will need supplementary electric lighting to be usable during the day, as there are other buildings in central London where this is the case so there is "precedent". If the present hospital site is not large enough to accommodate the growing needs of their important work, how can it be a feasible solution to impose a gigantic building that dwarfs everything around it, blocking sunlight to all our homes? The proposed development is completely out of proportion with the narrow streets and buildings surrounding it, including many historical grade-listed homes. This development risks ruining our neighbourhood completely. I wish to comment that the hospital is NOT more important than the residential buildings in the area, the work undertaken inside the hospital walls is not more important than the work being undertaken in other buildings locally, and the very real, deep-rooted local community who live here MATTER! This proposal shows complete contempt for local residents, and this proposed redevelopment will make it unbearable to continue to live and work here! Specific concerns outlined below:</p> <p>1. Primary site access route via Great Ormond Street, loss of parking, & blockage of our driveway - I strongly believe that Great Ormond Street (and Lambs Conduit Street) are too narrow to allow site access to large/heavy construction vehicles without causing severe local disruption and danger to local pedestrians/cyclists and the young children living in our street and our building. I also run a not-for-profit organisation and our team regularly needs to load equipment in and out of vehicles from the back of our building - accessed via our driveway. I have huge concerns that the increase of large vehicles on-site would make our driveway a turning circle making our access incredibly difficult which will have a hugely detrimental impact on our ability to run the organisation effectively during the construction. I am also hugely concerned about the loss of parking and access for deliveries for the residents in our building (particularly disabled parking) during the redevelopment. Plus the one-way plan will add huge delays onto any car journey in the direction Kings Cross/Euston as we will have to loop around the one way roads. I do not believe there are resident driveways on the wider Guildford Street side of the hospital, and I would like to understand why this access point has not been considered as an option instead of site access via Great Ormond Street?</p> <p>2. Air & noise pollution - I work from home and Great Ormond Street is already a busy street with significant noise and pollution - this would only be worsened by multiple construction vehicles, emitting exhaust whilst waiting in the narrow street for access to the site.</p> <p>3. Damage to our lower ground business address (under street level on Great Ormond Street) - our building is an old one, and our business address is in the lower ground level - I have huge concerns that repeated access by multiple, heavy construction vehicles on Great Ormond Street will cause damage to our building, and our lower ground space. No structural/impact assessment has been undertaken for the lower ground spaces on our side of Great Ormond Street.</p> <p>4. The huge scale / height of the new design and loss of natural light for the buildings opposite. In our flat (opposite the hospital), our living / working spaces face Great Ormond Street Hospital. Our building's shared central stairway, narrow galley kitchen and bathroom face the other side and have small / clouded glass windows. When we sit in our living/working spaces - we can see the sky above the hospital building, and we have natural light from our windows - which is important when you work from home as we do. The new design will completely dwarf the entire frontage of our building, cutting out natural light, views of the sky, increasing our energy costs for running electric lights, plus we will be completely overlooked by the imposing new building so will have almost zero privacy in our homes! Must we retreat into complete darkness to live our lives? I realise the tall council building behind our block of flats is probably being used as a yardstick for the height of the proposed design, but please note that this building does not span the length of the street, or face the living spaces in our block of flats. It is only our communal stairway, kitchens and bathrooms that face this building, meaning it has minimal impact, unlike the proposed building plan.</p> <p>The Sunlight & Daylight Report has published numerous assumptions about our building (31-35 Great Ormond Street). I would like to clarify the report's "assumed internal arrangement" for our flats - our narrow galley kitchens, bathrooms, and communal internal stairway have windows on the other side of the building. The main floor space of our flats (the rooms where we sit/work/live) are lit by the windows facing the hospital. The fact is that if the huge GOSH building is constructed, NONE of these windows will meet BRE standards for daylight and this will require supplementary electric lighting during the day, driving our electricity costs up. The scale of the proposed building is completely out of proportion to this area and will dwarf our homes, steal our daylight, and diminish the well-being we experience as we live/work opposite! This report also incorrectly states that "the ground floor windows are believed to serve commercial space and have therefore been scoped out of the assessment" - Flat 1 of 31-35 Great Ormond Street is a residential ground floor flat! A site visit following direct communication with the residents or owner of this building would have been a simple way to attain this information</p>	Yes	<p>Ms Conacher states that AY have not consulted with the residents and have not confirmed the layouts of each of the properties and instead have applied assumptions. AY would like to note that it is usual practice across the industry, that access to neighbouring residential properties is not actively sought for during the planning application process. However, if Ms Conacher would like AY to attend the property then we can of course do so. In addition, AY are confident that detailed due diligence was undertaken for each of the neighbouring properties (where possible) and from this research, it was concluded that the ground floor of the property did not serve a residential ground floor flat. Therefore, AY did not discuss the results within the main body of the report. However, the ground floor windows have been included within the results which can be found in the Appendices of the report.</p>
36a Lambs Conduit Street	Gillian Moseley	<p>Finally, the GOSH lighting impact report made for particularly shocking reading. They say:</p> <p>"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.</p> <p>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."</p> <p>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.</p> <p>"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)."</p> <p>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?</p>	Yes	<p>With regard to Ms Moseley's concerns regarding the contextual study, AY assessed five residential properties in the local vicinity which would not be affected by the Proposed GOSHCCC. AY of course recognise that the levels of daylight will vary across the Borough, however, the properties in the contextual study have been referenced as they demonstrate comparable retained daylight values.</p> <p>Ms Moseley states that AY carried out desktop assessments, AY would like to note that this is standard practice across the industry, that access to neighbouring residential properties is not actively sought for during the planning application process, however if Ms Conacher would like AY to attend her property, then we can of course do so. AY's report discusses each property in turn that could be affected by the Proposed Development. Any other properties which are not discussed in the report, such as No 36a Lambs Conduit Street, are considered to be of sufficient distance from the Proposed Development, or will not be notably affected.</p> <p>In addition AY's report did not discuss the effect of the Tybald Estate scheme being proposed to the south of the Great Ormond Street properties, as the two schemes in situ, would not cause a cumulative effect. Furthermore, AY did not discuss any effects which may be experienced during the construction phases as the effects during construction would be no worse than the completed development itself.</p>

Property Address	Neighbours	Objection	Daylight Related?	Response
49 Great Ormond Street	Alec Forshaw	<p style="text-align: center;">Daylighting and sunlight</p> <p>27. The applicant's Daylighting Report by Avison Young is a highly partial piece of work, understandably aimed at supporting the proposals. Nevertheless it cannot avoid the conclusion that virtually every north-facing window of the existing buildings on the south side of Great Ormond Street, opposite the proposed development, will suffer a very serious loss of light. None, it seems, will meet BRE standards or an acceptable reduction in BRE standards. While it is understood that BRE standards need to be interpreted flexibly, as guidance rather than policy, the degree of reduction is extreme and unacceptable.</p> <p>28. The Report repeatedly states that existing habitable rooms will 'need supplementary electric lighting to facilitate use', presumably meaning at all times to achieve satisfactory lighting levels. Setting aside any other considerations of health and well-being, this will be a serious cost to residents and businesses with extra energy bills, and no help to the Climate Emergency. It should be noted that most of the principal habitable rooms face the street, with secondary room such as bathrooms and kitchens at the rear.</p> <p>29. The consultant's Report justifies such harm by picking several residential buildings elsewhere in Bloomsbury where existing daylighting levels are sub-standard, and thus concluding that equally poor conditions should therefore be acceptable in Great Ormond Street. It is an unacceptable, arrogant and very dangerous argument, and a complete abrogation of any maintenance of standards of residential amenity. It is equally outrageous to suggest (in Paragraph 5.21 of the report) that residents in Great Ormond Street enjoy other local amenities which can compensate for significant loss of light to their living accommodation. There are elderly, less mobile and other disadvantaged residents who spend most of their waking hours indoors at home. There are many others who work from home. Very few local residents have private gardens or balconies.</p> <p>30. The point made in paragraph 5.29 that the residents of GOSH's own properties on the south side of the street happen to be on short lets is not relevant. The accommodation is residential, not hotel, and needs to be assessed on that basis. If the claim that some of GOSH's residential accommodation, for example the three upper floors at No.45, are 'mainly used for meetings', then that looks like a planning breach which Camden should investigate.</p> <p>31. It is not clear what is meant by paragraph 5.28 which states that certain windows facing the site have been 'scoped out of an assessment' (excluded?). The Report does note that various existing basement rooms, for example at No.25, are uninhabitable or already below acceptable standards, because of lack of light. There is a prospect that this situation will extend to many others. The lack of a proper internal survey by the applicant's consultants means that some residential rooms have wrongly been classed as commercial.</p> <p>32. The Report's assertion that many of the properties are dual access, and have some rooms at the rear which face south, is not relevant to those north facing rooms which gain all their light from the street side. Furthermore the failure to carry out internal surveys of all the properties results in false assumptions about light received from the south because of other buildings at the rear that block light to basements and ground floors. The assertion that direct views of the sky will be maintained in most rooms affected is surely incorrect. It is certainly erroneous for No.49.</p> <p>33. It should be remembered that the recently-approved Tybalds Estate regeneration scheme also involves partial loss of daylight, and sunlight to many south-facing windows of properties along the south side of Great Ormond Street, caused by the construction of new mews housing to their rear.</p> <p>34. The Avison Young Report in paragraphs 1.9 and 1.10 discounts the relevance of sunlighting and overshadowing of public realm. The Report fails to recognise that because the buildings on the south side of Great Ormond Street face north-by-north-west, not due north, their front elevations do receive afternoon and evening sunshine from about 4 p.m. onwards. This is particularly so for the eastern end of the street, including Nos. 19-35 and Ormond Mansions east of Lamb's Conduit Street where the sun shines across the existing low buildings on the application site. For those living rooms facing the street, this is the only sunlight they receive. It will be seriously reduced, perhaps entirely, but the issue has not been considered because these windows are not within 90 degrees of due south.</p> <p>35. The popular pavement seating areas of the Perseverance public house and Tutti's café on the corners with Lamb's Conduit Street will lose their late afternoon sunshine. Contrary to the assertion in paragraph 7.9 of the Report, these are public/private amenity spaces which will be overshadowed.</p> <p>36. The Daylighting Report does not consider the temporary but nevertheless highly significant impact during the construction period of the proposed four-storey contractor's accommodation built between the Octav Botnar building and the centre line of Great Ormond Street, directly in front of Nos. 19-23 Great Ormond Street. The Construction Management Plan (CMP) suggests that this may be there for at least three years.</p>	Yes	<p>Mr Forshaw references AY states that residents will now require to use electric lighting in order to use and enjoy their rooms if the Proposed GOSHCCC were to be built out. In AY's report they stated that in the existing condition (i.e. before the Proposed GOSHCCC is built out), all site-facing rooms within Mr Forshaw's property achieve an Average Daylight Factor of 1.00% or below. According to the BRE guidelines, if an ADF is "Below 2% the room will look dull and electric lighting is likely to be turned on." Therefore, AY were highlighting that in accordance with the BRE Guidelines, it is understood that each of Mr Forshaw's' Site-facing rooms are likely to already require supplementary electric lighting in the current condition and with the implementation of the Proposed GOSHCCC, as stated within AY's report, that some further electric lighting may be required.</p> <p>In order to contextualise the results, AY assessed five residential properties in the local vicinity which would not be affected by the Proposed GOSHCCC. AY of course recognise that the levels of daylight will vary across the Borough, however, the properties in the contextual study have been referenced as they demonstrate comparable retained daylight values.</p> <p>In response to Mr Forshaw's query regarding paragraph 5.28 of AY's report, AY have reviewed the text and can confirm that a word from the sentence has been omitted. The sentence reads as the following: "In addition, the front elevations of the neighbouring properties on the other side of Great Ormond Street, which directly face the Site, are oriented north. The windows have therefore been scoped out of a [sunlight] assessment. The rear elevations face south and will not be affected by the Proposed GOSHCCC."</p> <p>Mr Forshaw's comment "The Report does note that various existing basement rooms, for example at No.25, are uninhabitable or already below acceptable standards, because of lack of light." AY would like to note that this is an incorrect interpretation of the report - AY stated for No. 25 Great Ormond Street, that based on the floor plans obtained, the basement rooms do not serve residential rooms, instead they serve store rooms which according to the BRE Guidelines do not have a heavy reliance on natural daylight, therefore assessments to these rooms were not carried out.</p> <p>Mr Forshaw goes on to state "The lack of a proper internal survey by the applicant's consultants means that some residential rooms have wrongly been classed as commercial." AY acknowledge that this may be the case, however, as is usual practice across the industry, access to neighbouring residential properties is not actively sought for during the planning application process.</p> <p>Mr Forshaw's comment "The assertion that direct views of the sky will be maintained in most rooms affected is surely incorrect. It is certainly erroneous for No.49." AY would like to confirm that this is not incorrect and that although there will be reductions, each of Mr Forshaw's site-facing rooms will be able to maintain a view of the sky across 26%-53% of their room area.</p> <p>In addition, Mr Forshaw notes that AY's report did not discuss the effect of the Tybald Estate scheme being proposed to the south of the Great Ormond Street properties. However, AY did look at the proposals for the Tybald Estate scheme and noted that the part of the scheme backing onto the Great Ormond Street properties is fairly low rise and therefore any effects are unlikely to be significant. As a result of this, there will not be any cumulative effects.</p> <p>In response to Mr Forshaw's comment regarding sunlight, AY have not undertaken sunlight assessments to these windows as the BRE guidelines state that assessments do not need to be undertaken where windows sit within 90 degrees of due north.</p> <p>Mr Forshaw raises concern over the potential overshadowing that may occur to the pavement seating areas of the Perseverance Public House and Tutti's café on the corners with Lamb's Conduit Street. AY have not undertaken overshadowing assessments as pavement seating is not usually considered as an amenity space in accordance with the BRE Guidelines. In addition, these spaces are situated to the south/south-east of the Proposed Development and therefore, if AY were to undertake overshadowing studies to these spaces, the results would show that the spaces will not experience a significant reduction, as the shadow path of the Proposed Development will unlikely extend beyond the shadow already cast by the Octav Botnar Wing.</p> <p>AY have not considered the effect of the temporary four-storey contractor's accommodation built between the Octav Botnar building and Great Ormond Street and instead have assessed the impact of the completed development, as is standard industry practice. Not only is the accommodation block temporary, it will sit in the lee of the existing Octav Botnar Building, which is taller than the temporary accommodation block.</p>
Unknown	Rebekah Staton Flanagan	The proposed massively enlarged GOSH building, will take away the little light we have, and post renovation none of the street windows will meet NRE guidelines for daylight. As I understood when the listed buildings were removed for the current hospital it was on the understanding that the buildings would not overwhelm our buildings in the unreasonable and harmful way proposed.	Yes	

Property Address	Neighbours	Objection	Daylight Related?	Response
Unknown	Jessica Norton	As well as the construction vehicles issue, I have seen the scale of the new development in images this morning, and am aware that this will completely block the light reaching my friends and colleagues on Great Ormond Street (as well as being completely out of keeping with the surrounding buildings and history). This is a special area, that needs to be preserved as such, and such a vast building blocking up all access to light in the middle of the street is unacceptable.	Yes	AY do not know the location of Ms Norton's property to be able to comment on the levels of daylight and sunlight she currently enjoys, however with regard to her concerns regarding the loss of natural light to other residents' properties, AY's report discusses each property in turn that could be affected by the Proposed Development. In AY's professional opinion, any other properties which are not discussed within the report are considered to be of sufficient distance from the Proposed Development, or will not be affected.
Unknown	Debbie Radcliffe - Bloomsbury Residents Action Group	Harm includes loss of light to the mostly four storey properties immediately opposite the hospital, impact on the listed heritage buildings, as well as the unacceptable negative impact of demolition and construction on residents' day to day existence.	Yes	AY do not know the location of Ms Radcliffe's property to be able to comment on the levels of daylight and sunlight she currently enjoys, however with regard to her concerns regarding the loss of natural light to other residents' properties, AY's report discusses each property in turn that could be affected by the Proposed Development. In AY's professional opinion, any other properties which are not discussed within the report are considered to be of sufficient distance from the Proposed Development, or will not be notably affected.
Unknown	Jane Richardson	It would exclude light from residential buildings opposite. And contrary to what it said in the application, using other rooms in your home or local cafes or pubs would not "compensate" for loss of light in your home. The loss of light would also affect local businesses such as Espresso Room, The Perseverance and Tuttis.	Yes	AY do not know the location of Ms Richardson's property to be able to comment on the levels of daylight and sunlight she currently enjoys, however with regard to her concerns regarding the loss of natural light to other residents' properties, AY's report discusses each property in turn that could be affected by the Proposed Development. In AY's professional opinion, any other properties which are not discussed within the report are considered to be of sufficient distance from the Proposed Development, or will not be notably affected.
Unknown	Stefiana	1. The design of the proposed extension: the proposed building will be too high for the street and will adversely affect the character of the neighbourhood. Additionally, the homes opposite the hospital (the home where I live) will not meet the BRE guidelines for sunlight. This is unfair and unjust. Natural light is vital for mental health of the residents. Furthermore, by eliminating the source of natural light, residents will be required to use consistent artificial light - in turn driving up the costs of electricity.	Yes	AY do not know the location of Stefiana's property to be able to comment on the levels of daylight and sunlight he currently enjoys, however with regard to his concerns regarding the loss of natural light to other residents' properties, AY's report discusses each property in turn that could be affected by the Proposed Development. In AY's professional opinion, any other properties which are not discussed within the report are considered to be of sufficient distance from the Proposed Development, or will not be notably affected.
Unknown	Crispin Burdett	1) The mass of the proposed new building is significantly too great for the site a) it will damage severely the amenity at ground level on Great Ormond St. b) The impact on light for those properties on Great Ormond st, will be severely detrimental c) many of the properties on Great Ormond St are listed and a building on this scale will damage the setting of these listed buildings inappropriately	Yes	AY do not know the location of Mr Burdett's property to be able to comment on the levels of daylight and sunlight he currently enjoys, however with regard to his concerns regarding the loss of natural light to other residents' properties, AY's report discusses each property in turn that could be affected by the Proposed Development. In AY's professional opinion, any other properties which are not discussed within the report are considered to be of sufficient distance from the Proposed Development, or will not be notably affected.
Unknown	Catherine Hill	Harm to residential amenity by reason of severe loss of daylight to habitable rooms of nearby properties	Yes	AY do not know the location of Ms Hill's property to be able to comment on the levels of daylight and sunlight she currently enjoys, however with regard to her concerns regarding the loss of natural light to other residents' properties, AY's report discusses each property in turn that could be affected by the Proposed Development. In AY's professional opinion, any other properties which are not discussed within the report are considered to be of sufficient distance from the Proposed Development, or will not be notably affected.
Unknown	Jenny Stevinson	The newbuilding will negatively impact on the lives of local residents and the livelihoods of the local businesses by: causing loss of light and privacy to nearby homes and businesses	Yes	AY do not know the location of Ms Stevinson's property to be able to comment on the levels of daylight and sunlight she currently enjoys, however with regard to her concerns regarding the loss of natural light to other residents' properties, AY's report discusses each property in turn that could be affected by the Proposed Development. In AY's professional opinion, any other properties which are not discussed within the report are considered to be of sufficient distance from the Proposed Development, or will not be notably affected.

Property Address	Neighbours	Objection	Daylight Related?	Response
Unknown	Matthew Court	The new buildings proposed would exceed the height of the Victorian façade and approach the height of the tallest buildings in the area (such as Chancellor's Court on Tybalds Estate). They would overshadow the historic houses opposite and, even at a distance of a couple of streets, block some of the light in my own home. The massive, generic frontage proposed for Great Ormond Street would be at least as visually disruptive to the surrounding conservation area as the one it would replace.	Yes	AY do not know the location of Mr Court's property to be able to comment on the levels of daylight and sunlight he currently enjoys, however with regard to his concerns regarding the loss of natural light to other residents' properties, AY's report discusses each property in turn that could be affected by the Proposed Development. In AY's professional opinion, any other properties which are not discussed within the report are considered to be of sufficient distance from the Proposed Development, or will not be notably affected.