

**From:** Ed Sweetman

**Sent:** 26 January 2023 15:46

**To:** Planning; Patrick Marfleet

**Cc:** Julian Fulbrook; Awale Olad (Cllr); ben paul; Alec Forshaw; Michael Pountney; Rob Lewis; jane.r.1465; Gillian Mosely; Erica Brostoff; Maureen Murphy; June Holland

**Subject:** In response to NHS GOSH latest reply to recent development questions - Planning application. 2022/2255/P

In response to NHS GOSH reply to recent development questions

It is interesting, and in places on the surface compelling to read their latest lengthy breakdown response as to why the Children's Cancer Centre has to be built on the GOS site in this particular way. Not entirely convinced of their argument suggesting a serious risk to the quality of specialised interactive research with other institutions if they moved to another site, even within London. Surely demolishing the existing buildings is going to cause much more of a major negative interruption certainly in the medium term on the health care they can provide from this site.

Also nowhere within do GOSH acknowledge, or even mention the potentially profound negative impacts their current proposal, and its execution will inflict on the wider local area for several years and beyond, especially on many economically challenged young families, several living in densely overcrowded housing.

While I appreciate the specific questions being addressed here don't necessarily conjure a response to these particular issues, I wonder if GOSH are really aware or even care about the vast economic disparity that exists within the immediate community, and that subjecting an already very built up area with little narrow streets, where keeping the existing levels of noise and air pollution under control is a daily challenge, must lie in direct conflict to their mantle of Children Health 1st??

At the drop in meeting last November, when I questioned the representative more deeply on transportation and logistics, they admitted to me that most if not all of the large dirty, and noisy lorries and construction transportation will not yet be electric, so particulate pollution, especially trundling down very narrow streets like Boswell Street will shoot through the roof, daily for 6 days a week over many months and years, having a potentially detrimental impact on every single resident's physical and mental health.

Of course GOSH / NHS can keep on presenting a powerful labyrinth of the many compelling and complex medical highly specialised interconnected geo advantages, and imperatives of having the centre built in Great Ormond Street or centrally at least, but if the site itself is clearly not environmentally / dimensionally suitable for the required build then it should be imperative that an alternative site be sought, perhaps elsewhere in Central London.

Looking down Oxford Street amid the rapidly changing landscape of retail with Debenhams and House of Fraser now closed down, the former being demolished and several other growing stretches of vacant buildings, now that Westminster has started to close down some of the money scrubbing “sweetie shops”, perhaps there are other larger more logistically suitable less densely residential central sites to explore and investigate that might offer greater advantages and benefits all round.

If Camden goes ahead and approves this current proposal then at the very least an independent Public Enquiry should be conducted, as so far there appears to have been little in the way of genuinely independent evaluation and wider scrutiny conducted into this highly controversial development proposal.

Apologies for the ridiculously long sentences...

Ed Sweetman

Former TRA Development Representative / Block Rep. to Devonshire Court.