

From: Gillian Mosely
Sent: 12 January 2023 08:28
To: Planning
Subject: Planning objection 2022/2255/P

12 January, 2023

Ref: 2022/2255/P

Dear Camden Planners,

I am writing to respond to the recent submission - **Why does GOSH continue to develop the Gt Ormond St Site.**

Despite the fact that there is clearly an issue with severe space restriction at the current site, with several hospitals now competing for what space there is, GOSH are attempting to justify why they have not considered moving their hospital.

Their considerations are the same as those faced by many other hospitals in recent years:

Moorfields including the very new 'Children's Eye Centre,' the Royal Free, and Charing Cross Hospital have all faced similar issues over the

need for more space to improve and modernise. In each of these other cases, despite the length of time they'd been at their then current locations, and indeed, moneys invested in their existing sites over the years, they chose to move. This seems to fly in the face of the argument that GOSH cannot move because they have been at their current site for 170 years and have invested heavily there over the years.

Instead, they are suggesting they build ever-upwards. As ever-increasing amounts of space will be needed for any further renovation of a clinical facility where will this end? Will they eventually take over the entire neighbourhood?

In terms of Camden Planning issues, it is clear that the ability for the area to have both a thriving residential and business neighbourhood, and this many hospitals with GOSH constantly expanding and rebuilding for at least the past 20 years, and 10 years + into the future, is untenable.

And yet the trustees appear to be totally oblivious to the needs and interests of other occupants of the area – threatening heritage, liveability, business viability, and, most ironically, the physical and mental health of the entire local population including our children, due to 30 years plus of constant local construction work.

While no one doubts the excellent work the hospital does, what are we to make of the argument that the CCC is necessary when the plans for hospital expansion were tabled before it was decided that the new space would expand cancer care? Such retro-fitting is suspect. What is the evidence of immediate clinical need for the CCC in terms of children not being able to access appropriate care at any other hospital in the UK? Particularly in light of the levelling up agenda.

In terms of the very controversial size/massing of the development, no evidence is provided showing that all the space in the proposed new building is absolutely essential. Indeed, the much-vaunted newly-built Zayed Centre is extremely under-used with very little activity visible on its lower-two floors. How do we know that this will not happen on Great Ormond Street itself? Why can the hospital not make a plan to re-configure what they have so that their available space is efficiently used?

In terms of transport infrastructure, it's clear from this, and indeed from discussions with GOSH management, that the convenience of the site is more for staff than for patients. Yet, centres of excellence outside London, such as Addenbrooke and Alderhay, do manage to attract, both world-class Doctors and indeed, more local patients.

Their “new front entrance on the street after which it is named”, providing “an appropriate, confident, and outward physical representation of GOSH's value, brand and place in the world,” will give rise to even more ambulances clogging up Gt Ormond Street, exacerbated dangers for pedestrians and cyclists, increased traffic, pollution and noise affecting patients, staff and carers as well as residents, local businesses and other road users. It's difficult to understand how any of this is helpful transport infrastructure-wise.

The fundamental question is whether any improvement in the facilities to be provided at the site in Gt Ormond St justifies significant damage and harm to neighbours and to a heritage environment. For us locals who face virtual extinction, it's a clear no.

Yours, Gillian Mosely