Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Re
2022/0419/T	Robert Sakula	05/02/2022 12:27:58	OBJ	Th
				as

Response:

This is the second application in as many years to fell two beautiful mature London plane trees. I am writing, as an architect and a local resident of 40 years, to object to the proposed felling of these two trees in the garden of 8 Doughty Street, two doors away from my home. These trees are important because:

- They are old and slow growing. Replacing them will take more than 100 years.
- They are a rare survival of significantly sized trees in this corner of east Bloomsbury.
- They host wildlife.
- They counter pollution.
- · They counter climate change.
- They are beautiful and much loved by many in the neighbourhood.

It seems incredible that Camden would acquiesce in the loss of trees at a time like this. Yet the reason why it might do so is that it cannot see any alternative, given that the applicant's reason for felling is that the trees threaten an adjoining property. That property was previously on the market for some time, and it was not sold because of nervousness about the trees. One surmises that the reason for wishing to fell the trees is because they are obstructing the sale of the property in question.

However, as an architect and landscape designer with four decades of experience of co-locating buildings and trees, I can state that, with the right advice and proper management, trees and buildings can happily co-exist for decades and even centuries.

A nearby example is the Coram Campus. Twenty years ago Coram wished to demolish the buildings there, which had cracking caused, it was said, by the large nearby plane trees. They had an engineers' report saying that there was no alternative. In the end, partly helped by local protest, wiser counsel prevailed and today trees and buildings are both doing fine.

In the present case, a strategy could be developed for enabling the trees to exist side by side with the adjacent building. It would be an engineering solution enabling the trees to continue to grow without further impinging on the building's structure, while stabilising the building from further movement. Probably it would involve some rebuilding of the property's rear wall.

Therefore we recommend that Camden refuse this application pending the following:

1. Further investigation and monitoring of structural movement, if any.

2. Reports from an independent engineer and aboriculturalist, assessing options for retaining the trees and stabilising the building.

It would be a failure of governance if these two fine trees were sacrificed simply to expedite the sale of a property. Their importance is wider than the two ownerships involved. These owners should be tasked as stewards to successfully nurture the trees in the decades to come.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response: 07/02/2022	09:10:18
2022/0419/T	Henry Lamprecht	04/02/2022 15:37:40	INT	I am not unsympathetic to the very serious problems faced by the Egypt Exploration Society, indeed one of our very important and historic Societies with a long and rich history. One only needs to mention Sir Flinders Petrie to conjure up the very foundations of modern Archeology as a science with his remarkable work in archeological dating techniques such as pottery serialisation. The result of the Egyptian Exploration Fund sending a visionary to explore.	
				Societies such as Egypt Exploration Society are often faced with increasing financial constraints; continuing work, staff salaries, equipment, costs associated with their premises etc. and especially when they are in older premises such as 8 Doughty Mews that was never really designed for the purpose of its current use, the associated building fabric maintenance cost can become quite constraining and even crippling if regular work is not done to mitigate problems as they arise.	
				Sadly, this is one of the situations where early intervention would have resulted in a totally different set of circumstances where these precious mature trees could have co-existed with the buildings in perfect harmony. Alas, decades of neglect has lead to this very unfortunate situation where the trees are now causing damage to the building.	
				The Egypt Exploration Society is now seeking to remedy this situation and have on the face of it, commissioned some very distinguished experts who produced a very extensive reports providing evidence for their preferred solution - to take the trees down. But is this really the only option? The report is entirely silent on any form of mitigation to remedy the situation.	
				Now, I could provide you with a very long tome on the Climate Crisis and how vital trees are to society and to our climate and to the planet and indeed to humanity as a whole, but I am sure you are all very familiar with the narrative on this agenda.	
				So, what am I suggesting?	
				I am begging you for a reprieve for these trees. Spare them and commission your experts to explore whether there are not other ways of addressing the problems and prevent any further damage to your building. Could the trees not be reduced in size? Could your building that does appear to be built right up to the boundaries not have a replacement wall that is a bit further set back? As you would in all likelihood replace the wall in any case, why not move the wall further back and give the trees that little bit of room to thrive for another 50 years.	
				It might sound like kicking the can of the inevitable down the road and it probably is Will a reprieve for two trees really make any difference to the climate? Probably not, but the world would be a little better place that we leave behind for our children.	
				So in the spirit of a pioneer like Sir Flinders Petrie, let's think creative and find the answer that eludes us. Let's find a visionary solution rather than the cheapest easiest option. Imagine the Egypt Exploration Fund didn't have the foresight to send Sir Flinders to Egypt. We would never have been able to tell the age of sites through pottery. Similarly, we should find a modern Sir Flinders solution.	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Re
2022/0419/T	Robert Sakula	05/02/2022 12:27:55	OBJ	Th
				29

Response:

This is the second application in as many years to fell two beautiful mature London plane trees. I am writing, as an architect and a local resident of 40 years, to object to the proposed felling of these two trees in the garden of 8 Doughty Street, two doors away from my home. These trees are important because:

- They are old and slow growing. Replacing them will take more than 100 years.
- They are a rare survival of significantly sized trees in this corner of east Bloomsbury.
- They host wildlife.
- They counter pollution.
- · They counter climate change.
- They are beautiful and much loved by many in the neighbourhood.

It seems incredible that Camden would acquiesce in the loss of trees at a time like this. Yet the reason why it might do so is that it cannot see any alternative, given that the applicant's reason for felling is that the trees threaten an adjoining property. That property was previously on the market for some time, and it was not sold because of nervousness about the trees. One surmises that the reason for wishing to fell the trees is because they are obstructing the sale of the property in question.

However, as an architect and landscape designer with four decades of experience of co-locating buildings and trees, I can state that, with the right advice and proper management, trees and buildings can happily co-exist for decades and even centuries.

A nearby example is the Coram Campus. Twenty years ago Coram wished to demolish the buildings there, which had cracking caused, it was said, by the large nearby plane trees. They had an engineers' report saying that there was no alternative. In the end, partly helped by local protest, wiser counsel prevailed and today trees and buildings are both doing fine.

In the present case, a strategy could be developed for enabling the trees to exist side by side with the adjacent building. It would be an engineering solution enabling the trees to continue to grow without further impinging on the building's structure, while stabilising the building from further movement. Probably it would involve some rebuilding of the property's rear wall.

Therefore we recommend that Camden refuse this application pending the following:

1. Further investigation and monitoring of structural movement, if any.

2. Reports from an independent engineer and aboriculturalist, assessing options for retaining the trees and stabilising the building.

It would be a failure of governance if these two fine trees were sacrificed simply to expedite the sale of a property. Their importance is wider than the two ownerships involved. These owners should be tasked as stewards to successfully nurture the trees in the decades to come.

Total: 11