

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2928/P	Frank Dulson	27/08/2023 14:07:48	COMMNT	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I live directly opposite with my family from the Egyptian Society in 28 doughty Mews. We have two objections to the planning application.</p> <p>1) The EES has not made any efforts to preserve the two large Plane Trees as per the Panning Officers recommendation 30/03/23 in line with the councils and government's environmental, biodiversity and amenity policies.</p> <p>2) Haven't spent some time looking through the plans the proposed roof terrace will look directly over and down into the bathroom and our main living space and therefore maybe in breach of Camden's guidelines on overlooking other properties. In particular this is not neighbour to neighbour (in a residential context) but the use of a large double width terrace to be used by EES /non residents would be intrusive.</p> <p>Best regards Frank Dulson 28 Doughty Mews London WC1N 2PF RIBA Parts 1 & 2</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2928/P	Catherine Slessor	03/09/2023 21:36:05	OBJ	REF: 2023/2928/P

I am writing to object to the proposal for the redevelopment of 2-4 Doughty Mews for the Egypt Exploration Society (EES).

My main objection concerns the fact that the proposal has failed to consider ways of preserving and incorporating the two plane trees in the garden of no. 8 Doughty Street, as per Planning Officer Nick Bell's recommendation in a Delegated Report dated 30 March 2022, summarised as follows:

'It is recommended that the One Housing Group, whom the council understands to be the owner of the trees, works with the affected property owner to find a solution that allows for the retention of the trees and that a full assessment be undertaken to ascertain what impact, if any, the removal of the trees would have on the surrounding properties.'

The trees are veteran specimens, estimated to be between 200-250 years old and in good health. At six storeys tall, they can be seen from flats in Doughty Street, Doughty Mews, Guilford Street, Millman Street and Northington Street, and by the public walking through Doughty Mews and John's Mews. I also have excellent views of the trees from my garden.

To remove such magnificent specimens would be to irrevocably alter a deeply cherished local landscape. Section 5.64 of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011 states that: 'The mature trees across the Conservation Area are a valuable part of the streetscape and make a positive contribution to its character and appearance.' Removing trees of such size and vintage also goes against the tenets of the Mayor's London Plan, which aims to increase tree canopy cover by 5% by 2025 to mitigate the effects of climate change. It also notes that: 'Individual veteran trees should be given protection as once lost they can never be replaced.'

The trunk of one tree is physically pressing into the rear wall of no. 4 Doughty Mews, one the EES's three properties, causing minor cracks described by structural engineer Price & Myers as 'aesthetic' rather than 'structural'. This situation has persisted for many years. On this basis, the EES has applied twice to have both trees removed. Firstly, in December 2020 (2020/5587/T), which attracted over 70 objections from councillors and local residents on ecological and quality-of-life grounds. At that time, Camden Council rejected the application and made both trees the subject of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO).

Secondly, in February 2022 (2022/0419/T), which attracted over 250 objections, including a petition signed by 94 people. This time, despite noting that 'the council shares the view of those who have submitted objections with regard to the significance of the trees', Camden removed the TPOs, mindful of potential liability. To assist it in its decision-making process, the council commissioned its own independent assessment by engineers CampbellReith. This took the form of an evaluation of structural engineers' reports previously supplied by the EES and a group of objectors. CampbellReith concluded that the tree trunk was indeed causing limited cosmetic damage, but that a simple, cost effective solution could be adopted to repair the wall by creating a recess, so the tree was no longer impacting on it. It also noted that 'The tree has not cause structural damage and there is a risk that removing the tree might undermine the overall stability of the structure.'

The proposed redevelopment of the Doughty Mews site provides an opportunity to consolidate and improve

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

the relationship between the trees and the EES properties for the long term, benefitting both the neighbourhood and the EES, as it plans for the future. The most obvious solution is to rebuild the affected wall to incorporate a recess, as has been suggested, which could be easily accomplished in the course of the development works. However, the proposals outlined in planning submission 2023/2928/P do not explore this or any other options for retaining the trees. The only reference to them is on drawing EES_SB_DE_AL_110, the demolition schedule for the first floor, on which it is noted 'rear wall to be rebuilt once trees have been removed'.

To date, the EES has proved reluctant to engage with a local group of construction professionals committed to reaching a viable solution that would retain the trees. Instead, it has consistently and vexatiously lobbied for the trees' removal. As outlined in this latest planning submission, the assumption is that these veteran specimens will be swept away, to be replaced by 'Nile-themed' planting on a new roof terrace, supposedly designed to 'increase the biodiversity of the site', a prospect both preposterous and depressing.

Some sense of the EES mindset could be apprehended at the 'public consultation' on 7 December 2022, which was styled as a Christmas drinks evening, with a chance to 'hear about our exciting plans to redevelop our premises'. At that gathering, the deeply felt concerns of local residents in respect of the removal of the trees were treated with disdain. Attempts to discuss the prospect of a solution that might retain the trees were abruptly brushed aside. The pervading impression was that the EES has no interest in the ecological and amenity arguments for their retention. Rather, the trees are perceived as a costly nuisance; reference was made to the challenge of roof and gutter maintenance, allegedly made more onerous and expensive by the presence of the trees. (I would also question whether such a brief and dismissive encounter with residents constitutes an appropriate level of public consultation.)

Turning to the development proposal itself, the size of the proposed roof terrace is also concerning. Doughty Mews is fundamentally a quiet, residential street. The ramping up of public-facing activity through the EES redevelopment and the potential noise, disruption and intrusive overlooking into the mews properties, breaching Camden's own guidelines on overlooking private houses, must surely be considered unacceptable. While there are two private roof terraces along the mews, the application proposes a large, double-width public roof terrace, for which there is no precedent. This terrace would impact on the privacy of the residential mews houses opposite by enabling EES staff, visitors and potentially outside-event attendees to overlook those houses and look directly into their private rooms during the day and any evenings when the terrace is in use.

It is worth bearing in mind that despite well publicised commitments to remaining in its 'historic home' in Doughty Mews, at one point the EES was intent on moving out. In 2017 it put its properties up for sale and only when it became apparent that this would be problematic because of the tree issue, did it then change tack. The EES now assumes that the trees will come down and planning permission will be granted for its redevelopment.

Yet it still needs to raise the necessary funds for the project, estimated between £2 and £3 million, a considerable sum for a small organisation in these financially challenging times. If it fails to achieve this, then it might just decide to move out after all. But this time, it is quite possible the trees will have been removed and planning permission granted for an extra storey and roof terrace, thus establishing a precedent. Both these factors would be attractive to potential developers in facilitating a sale. If this were to be the case, then short

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

term profit will have prevailed over long term amenity.

It seems to suit the EES to see the removal of the trees and its proposed redevelopment as entirely separate issues. But it is obvious that in this case, buildings and trees are connected - physically, structurally, historically and civically - and a solution needs to be found that reconciles both. It also raises the question of effective civic oversight and how local councils are supposed to provide it, balancing the needs of individual institutions to pursue development ambitions while maintaining the quality of neighbourhood and city life.

Camden Council should not be subject to the prospect of legal manoeuvres by the EES simply for taking action to safeguard two outstanding historic trees, a move supported by the overwhelming majority of local residents, councillors and the public. It is quite shocking to think that a charitable cultural organisation, dedicated to exploring and preserving history, has displayed such a dismaying lack of concern for living history and the environment in the context of a global climate emergency.

Therefore, I urge the council to make planning permission for this development contingent on the EES and its architect devising a solution that retains the trees - a solution that seems to be easily within reach.

Catherine Slessor

2023/2928/P	Daniel Sands	03/09/2023 21:31:31	COMMNT	As with my neighbors, I too have concerns about the public roof terrace. It seems that such a terrace may create issues around privacy in overlooking the houses opposite the site.
2023/2928/P	Dennis H	27/08/2023 18:10:54	OBJ	<p>As a resident of Doughty Mews I wish to object on two grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Egyptian Exploration Society have not satisfactorily explored all options to carry out work/improvements to their property that do not require the removal of the 250-year-old Plane trees at the rear of the property, as was recommended by Camden Council previously. The loss of the trees would have significant environmental impact on the neighbourhood- please see my previous objection to the removal of the trees. - I cannot understand why the Egyptian Exploration Society would require a roof terrace of the size proposed. This threatens the privacy of neighbouring properties. The acoustics of the mews (small narrow street, no traffic) are such that it would be unwelcome to have a commercial property with such a large outside space on the street which would have the potential to create noise pollution on an otherwise very quiet residential street.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2928/P	Andrew Sommerlad	03/09/2023 11:01:54	OBJ	<p>We lived for a year in Doughty Mews opposite the Egyptian Exploration Society and have been informed that there is planning permission being sought for a rebuild of the facade and extension upwards with a large terrace. EES is not a particularly attractive building in a mews of very attractive houses but the plans are completely inappropriate. The terrace, which will obviously be used for events, will look into the small terrace of 25 and 28 Doughty Mews and the living areas of 24, 25,26 and 27. There will also be noise and artifice lights to contend with. There are some new houses in the mews but they are scattered among the t radio so houses and don't look out of place like the proposed new EES will.</p> <p>There is also the issue of the London plane trees behind the EES which will not be preserved despite the wishes of residents and the council to find a way to keep them. Professional opinion is that it can be done.</p>
2023/2928/P	Andrew Sommerlad	03/09/2023 11:01:52	OBJ	<p>We lived for a year in Doughty Mews opposite the Egyptian Exploration Society and have been informed that there is planning permission being sought for a rebuild of the facade and extension upwards with a large terrace. EES is not a particularly attractive building in a mews of very attractive houses but the plans are completely inappropriate. The terrace, which will obviously be used for events, will look into the small terrace of 25 and 28 Doughty Mews and the living areas of 24, 25,26 and 27. There will also be noise and artifice lights to contend with. There are some new houses in the mews but they are scattered among the t radio so houses and don't look out of place like the proposed new EES will.</p> <p>There is also the issue of the London plane trees behind the EES which will not be preserved despite the wishes of residents and the council to find a way to keep them. Professional opinion is that it can be done.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
------------------------	-------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

2023/2928/P	Genevieve Poirier	02/09/2023 23:12:16	OBJ	
-------------	-------------------	---------------------	-----	--

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I write to object to Application 2023/2928/P. In summary, (i) there has been a failure to consult; (ii) the second storey with roof terrace is objected to on the basis of access to light and on the basis that no needs case has been demonstrated. Further where the application fails to take into account Camden Planning's recommendation on related application 2022T/0419/T it should be rejected.

As to the duty to consult: There was no compliant community consultation in respect of this application. It is patent from the letter at appendix 1 to the Statement of Community Involvement that the applicant deliberately disguised this necessary consultation as "an evening of mulled wine and mince pies" to be held on 7 December 2022 – a festive holiday drink. It was not at all clear that such a serious application would be tabled. Indeed, anecdotal reports are that few community members were in attendance – which was clearly the aim of the applicant. It knew that, if informed, residents would object. The reports of community support therefore are entirely misleading and overstated. The so-called 'second consultation' has nothing to do with community involvement as it was (admittedly) a consultation with the applicant's own members – who are not members of the community. Unsurprisingly the applicant's own members support the applicant's application.

As to right to light: My property (both windows and garden) will be affected by the proposed additional storey, should the application be permitted. Without question an additional storey will entirely block sunlight later in the day. As to the light assessment included with the proposal, this is deficient and defective in at least the following respects: it mis-describes the affected properties on page 8 of the assessment; is based on a 2D model provided by the 'design team' but the dimensions of the additional storey are not disclosed. The pre-planning assessment prepared by Camden is also unclear on the dimensions of the additional storey. Without this information, no accurate assessment as to the effects on light can be made.

As to alleged necessity and positive effect of the application. Nothing about the application or the applicant supports or promotes Policy E1 'creating the conditions for economic growth' or Policy C3 'culture and leisure facilities'. As noted above, the applicant organisation provides no tangible benefit to the local community, which it treats with contempt. The applicant's Planning Statement refers to the proposed terrace as "much needed outdoor amenity space" (paragraph 1.6) but no such space is needed for a two storey building that already opens directly on to a pedestrian mews for 'outdoor amenity'. There is no need for an additional storey or roof terrace either for the business of EES (which has few employees) or the sitting tenant.

The application cynically suggests that the proposal will "both improve urban green/landscaping as well as the biodiversity of the Site" (applicant's Planning Statement para 6.40) and makes various statements as to intention to plant "a roof garden with exotic grasses from the Nile Delta" (see pages 21 and 23 of Design statement). In reality, however, the application variously assumes or ignores the applicant's intended removal of two enormous carbon sinks in the two, 250 year old plane trees at 8 Doughty Street. The applicant has made no attempt to comply with Camden Planning's recommendation in application 2022T/0419/T - which was to make efforts to preserve those trees in any future application. Indeed 2022T/0419/T was granted based on deficient and defective submissions, including as to 'heave' if the trees are removed. The geotechnical analysis included with that earlier application was, admittedly and on its face, incomplete. Certain of that information (avoiding reference to heave) is included in the Archaeological Assessment at page 4. Reference is also made to the fact that felling of the trees is "subject to further ground investigations" at paragraph 6.40 of applicant's Planning Statement. If the trees are removed and the inevitable heave is

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				occasioned, both the applicant and Camden Council are on notice that the affected residents will commence actions against them for damages.
2023/2928/P	Maria Nielsen	03/09/2023 11:47:01	COMMNT	<p>As a former resident of 26a Doughty Mews, i was distressed to see the plans that the Egyptian Society have submitted .</p> <p>Firstly no plans have been included to preserve the 180 year old London Plane behind the EES in the garden of 8 Doughty Street. These provide beauty, habitat for birds and a way of absorbing carbon in an age of climate change.</p> <p>We used to live opposite EES and the proposed terrace, which will extend the width of the three Mews houses, will look into the houses on the other side of the street. In addition there will be light and noise pollution.</p> <p>This is not fair.</p> <p>The whole proposition of a row of modern properties in a street that is mainly residential is inappropriate and will destroy the traditional outlook in a conservation area.</p> <p>This application should be rejected.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2928/P	HENRY LAMPRECHT	02/09/2023 14:25:18	SUPC	<p>I want to start by stating that as a neighbour I am very proud to have the EES in our neighbourhood. It's a world leading institution and is associated with some of the greatest archeological achievements in all of human history.</p> <p>It is regrettable that the EES is not a very considerate neighbour. For a start, their consultation appears to have been very limited, I live in the same block and didn't get the invites to their consultation events (and I do know a thing or two about this...Feel free to Google me).</p> <p>I actually support the ambitions of the EES to stay on Doughty news and secure the future of their facility and to make it fit for the 21st century. I don't think the terrace would be an intrusion on privacy to neighbours and there are many terraces along Doughty Mews, so one more is unlikely to affect the street. I therefore am of the opinion that the benefits to this organisation and its many users and staff die outweigh the perceived harm.</p> <p>I do however think that the EES is choosing the easy and cheap option on the trees. There is clear evidence they they can happily co-exist with the trees. At a time when the planet is facing a climate crisis it is reckless and rather selfish of them to steam ahead with this. The affection the community feels towards the Society will be damaged by this proposed action.</p> <p>I fully recognise that they already have permission to remove the trees and I commend them for their "salami method" of achieving their ambitions. It is very clever indeed and I would expect nothing less from intelligent people like the EES. If however they want to turn their academic intelligence to some emotional intelligence, they would grant the poor old trees a reprieve. By doing that they would also be a good and beloved neighbour.</p> <p>I appreciate that this is not a material consideration but rather an appeal to their hearts. Come in guys! We want to be friends, don't be a bunch of stubborn idiots!</p> <p>Ps. I'm very happy for my comments to be published without any redactions.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2928/P	Brian and Gwyneth Sommerlad	01/09/2023 17:35:28	OBJ	<p>We wish to object to the plans by EES to extend and modernise the facade of their present property in the conservation area of Doughty Mews.</p> <p>We would be among those most directly affected by the proposed development as we live directly opposite. The large public terrace would substantially invade our privacy. It will, no doubt, be used for public events involving noise and, if used in the evenings, light pollution. Attendees will be looking directly into our very small roof terrace and bedroom. Other residences opposite this large development are occupied by renters. There are two houses for sale and buyers are proceeding. They can't give an opinion but it is difficult to imagine that they, like us, wouldn't be shattered by the loss of privacy noise pollution and light pollution.</p> <p>The planned building is totally out of character with the variety of mews dwellings, which are virtually all residential. We had asked Camden Council if we could put a discreet spiral staircase on our small terrace giving access to our roof like the ones in 5 and 6 Doughty Mews but we were told it was not in keeping- we can provide the letter from the council official. How on earth can a huge rebuild with a terrace extending the length of the three mews house be appropriate?</p> <p>There is a variety of styles in Doughty Mews but the overall impression is of a traditional mews - even the few new houses are more appropriate than the plans EES have submitted. This development is an eyesore, especially in a conservation area where the owners of these lovely historic mews houses take so much care to preserve their ancient features, where the children at the nearby primary school take so much pleasure walking down the mews under the shade of the plane trees to Coram Fields and where tourists, Londoners and locals pause to take photos of the beautiful outlook of the mews.</p> <p>Finally we have been supporting the campaign to preserve the wonderful 200 year old London Plane trees behind the EES in the garden of 8 Doughty Street. We understood that the council was also against their destruction as there were ways of making the trees and the building of EES work together as proposed by a specialist arboculturist and surveyor. This was a wonderful opportunity for the EES to provide a plan which kept the trees. However they have completely ignored the council advice to try to preserve the trees which provide beauty, help reduce pollution, provide habitat for a variety of birds and wildlife and remove carbon from the atmosphere.</p> <p>It is distressing that an organisation dedicated to the preservation and valuing of what is old and important should propose such wanton destruction.</p> <p>Please turn down this appalling retrograde development.</p>