

**From:** Gillian Mosely

**Sent:** 07 November 2022 12:12

**To:** Patrick Marfleet

**Cc:** Julian Fulbrook (Cllr); Awale Olad (Cllr); Michael Pountney; Jonathan McClue; Planning Obligations; Planning

**Subject:** Objection to GOSH responses

Dear Patrick, Jonathan and planning department, please find my objection to GOSH planning responses below. Apologies but again I have not been able to load this directly.

We await your comments.

My very best, Gillian

7 November, 2022

Re GOSH frontage building/re-build-response to their new documentation

Dear Camden Planners,

I have read through the further submissions from GOSH, currently online, and am pleased to see that a few things have been addressed.

However, I remain overwhelmingly despairing of the attitude of GOSH folks to the local community/heritage environment in which the hospital sits.

I note that responses to large and powerful organisations such as Thames Water, have been fulsome. However there has only been one issue raised by the local community that has received anything more than a cursory glance. Overall, the tone of these submissions remains, "this is so because we say it is so." This brooks no argument and leaves no opportunity at all for constructive collaboration to ensure that the needs of both GOSH and of the local community can be met. GOSH continually asserts that they are engaging with the local community, but as long as this continues to happen on their terms, and in peremptory tones, I'm afraid this is simply not the case. Engagement is a two-way street. So, I continue to object to their assertion that they are engaging in meaningful fashion with us locals, and suggest that nothing should be built until this has happened.

I also remain extremely concerned that there are still a large number of places, for example in the Thames Water response, where solutions are 'being worked on'. If details are not part of the planning process who will police these? It's unacceptable.

Likewise, I am extremely concerned that refurbishment rather than demolish and rebuild, has not been looked at properly. (All our eyes are on the current M & S/Westminster Council case.)

The plans they have put forward do indeed need more space, but there is no attempt to explain why these services need to be offered in this precise location. They do not seem to have considered at all whether relocation would serve the hospital better in the long-run.

I also wish to object, most strenuously, to the numerous places across the submission where the usability and convenience for GOSH workers and patients are constantly assessed while the local community have received no such consideration. Indeed, the language throughout these submissions remains broad-brush and often unverifiable. This is unacceptable.

Turning to a few specific submissions:

Construction Management –

I thank GOSH for looking at the archway proposal but question any idea that this was done in the spirit of problem-solving. When we walked the site with Julian Fulbrook and the GOSH folks, Julian suggested that Camden would likely be helpful in moving some of the larger units currently parked in Powis Place, and an impediment to any arch, to the other side of the neurology hospital. This was not mentioned and does not seem to have been explored.

Further, in this day and age I would have thought that dropping off and collecting all materials on Guildford Street, and then transporting these across the site via a high-tech, environmentally sound conveyor belt system, would be a far simpler solution than trying to run trucks into any yard created. This does not seem to be looked at. At the very least this could vastly diminish the number of trucks needing to fully enter the site.

Also in this submission was the idea that things housed under Powis Place are delicate and need protecting. Julian suggested that the road can be re-enforced to protect these. Again, this has not been mentioned in their submission and the delicacy of these units is used as a key

argument as to why they cannot use Guildford Street/Powis Place more fulsomely in their construction plans.

I also wondered whether anyone has run any route simulations for either option? What they propose will endanger our children and likely create unmanageable vying for space between cyclists and pedestrians. Further, this plan will be a disaster for anyone of limited mobility. It would be wonderful if we can test this before permission is granted.

Other questions-where are the ambulances going for the Neurology Hospital; and I did not understand why four stories of accommodation would be lost? Particularly if the conveyor belt system is adopted.

Overall, this report seems to have tinkered round the edges without offering anything substantially new. Again, I object.

Daylight – this continues to make for chilling reading in terms of its lack of any sensitivity towards extreme loss of amenity for the hundred-odd folks who live across the road from the hospital. This is completely unacceptable.

Heritage – dismissing the opinions of experts and indeed of every local I have spoken to, many of them qualified in this area, that the building is too large and out of keeping with the environment, is again chilling, and completely unacceptable. And the Morgan Stanley building in a completely different setting is an unacceptable comparable. Further, the Turley assessment that really the plans will only impact on St Paul's protected views a tiny bit (Historic England report,) are farcical. Either they do or they do not and any incremental infringement in this context matters. I object again.

In terms of transport and day to day amenity, again reports fail to address things like the 100-odd children who use Great Ormond Street to get to their assemblies; cyclists safety suggestions are laughable; transport disruption for locals is not considered, nor are we considered in things like audio and vibrations reports. There is not a word on how GOSH will liaise with the Tybalds Construction project or indeed the St Martin's re-development, both of which will impact our neighbourhood hugely.

Nor have they said anything at all on increasing the amenity of the neighbourhood for locals during this phase of construction. I had understood that this was a requirement of this planning phase?

It is also worth noting that whole-hearted support for the GOSH plans seem to be coming from people who do not live in the immediate neighbourhood. This needs to be looked at.

Finally, I am begging Camden to urgently commission the following reports on behalf of the borough and indeed of the local community: business impact study for Lambs Conduit Street and businesses nearby/on the proposed construction route; an environmental study; a health impact study; a study on the health and well-being of our local children

With thanks for reading this.

Yours, Gillian