

From: Jane Richardson
Sent: 26 January 2023 11:33
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application 2022/2255P

With reference to GOSH's "Clarification", I agree with Rob Lewis's comments.

The "clarification" is mere repetition.

While I can see that the status quo, plus the proposed new building, would be more convenient, less disruptive, and less costly than moving, but it is far from clear to me why new partnerships cannot be developed. The cost and inconvenience of a move would have been reduced if the trustees had been more far sighted, and had considered all options before deciding on the proposed one.

The clarification is notably silent on the issue of future development of the hospital. It is clear that there is no vacant land on the current site, and any new facilities for a different speciality would involve demolition of an existing building and ever higher new buildings, which would further damage a heritage environment, the lives of local residents, and local businesses. It is obvious from the clarification that GOSH intends to continue to develop on the current site regardless of the damage caused.

Moreover the issue of damage to the environment, residents and businesses, which would be caused by the proposed building, is totally ignored.

Jane Richardson
Apt 204 9B Clerkenwell Road EC1M 5PY