

From: Michael Pountney

Sent: 31 October 2022 22:07

To: Planning

Cc: Patrick Marfleet; Julian Fulbrook (Cllr); Erica Brostoff; Alec Forshaw; Steve Johnson; Gillian Mosely; Awale Olad (Cllr); Jane Richardson

Subject: Application No: 2022/2255/P GOSH Children's Cancer Centre (CCC)

The latest documents from GOSH in answer to objections to their plans for the CCC include an extended report rejecting the proposal that access to the Frontage Building site should be via the hospitals' service yard on Guilford Street with an arch constructed through the Southwood building leading to Powis Place. I wish to object to the structure and conclusions of this report.

This report, unlike almost all reports in the application, was not prepared by an outside expert. Instead it was prepared internally. This is unsatisfactory. GOSH's antipathy to this alternative route has been very clear since the scheme was first announced in 2017: to suppose that an analysis of the route prepared by themselves would be unbiased is unrealistic. The report is an exercise in finding reasons 'why not' and shows no signs of attempting to overcome the problems this route undoubtedly has.

Three examples:

1. the report says: 'Construction vehicles would have to access the Frontage Site by turning left onto Great Ormond Street from Powis Place. This would require the entire width of Great Ormond Street, taking it out of use for other traffic at that point.'
But the south corner of Powis is not sharp and is quite far back from the Gt Ormond St carriageway. No evidence is given for the assertion that lorries would 'require the full width' of the road, nor what size of lorry is being assumed: if the biggest ones might find the turning difficult, what about smaller ones?
2. The report says 'Access from Guilford Street would require a significant demolition and construction Enabling Works programme (circa 52-65 weeks)' But no detail is given to show why enabling works for this route should take so long
3. The service yard on Guilford St is presented as an insurmountable problem because it is jointly-owned by GOSH and NHNN. But the yard was described by a senior UCH official as not fit for purpose three years ago. Presumably it is even less so now, but there's no indication of any

discussion of this being an ideal time for a joint exercise to redesign the yard so that it would be fit for purpose and could also accommodate a throughway for construction vehicles as well as ambulances and other hospital vehicles.

For people living or working near the proposed CCC, a central concern from the start been the danger, pollution and damage to our quality of life that the building would cause if the proposed way of servicing the site were permitted. We proposed an alternative route. It is unacceptable that this route should be discounted without an analysis of it by impartial experts. This parti-pris report by GOSH themselves in no way invalidates "our" route to the site.

Michael Pountney

Michael E Pountney