

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0419/T	Ralph Seward	13/02/2022 17:44:19	OBJ	<p>Having lived here my entire life, I can attest to the importance of these trees as a vital link to the natural world for the many people who live in this part of London. Millman Street, sections of Guilford Street, Doughty Street and Doughty Mews all benefit from, value and care for these trees. They harbour much needed urban wildlife, clean our air and mark the passage of the seasons.</p> <p>I have seen the letters and local media campaign which the Egypt Exploration Society has engaged in recently, in their efforts to finally remove these trees. It is my personal opinion that, though works may well be necessary to accommodate both the trees and building, the removal option gives the Society a better chance of selling the building when they choose to do so. This is not a good enough reason to remove these important local assets in my opinion.</p> <p>Add to all of this the well known climate and health benefits, the fact that Camden is designated a 'Tree City of the World' and has made such efforts to add to the already impressive collection of old and new trees that we have in the borough, it would be a colossal shame to lose two which are so important to so many in this corner of the borough.</p>
2022/0419/T	L Farrell	12/02/2022 09:39:47	OBJ	Please look for a different solution. Trees must be protected as there are so few of them in London and they can't be easily replaced.
2022/0419/T	Nuala OSullivan	13/02/2022 01:11:33	OBJ	<p>I am writing to appeal for a review of the trees at the back of 8 Doughty Mews in WC1.</p> <p>The trees are part of the neighbourhood's architecture and should be supported to remain. I am aware that there are plans in place to pay for structural and arboricultural reports to show how the rear wall of the Egyptian Society could be repaired without threatening the trees. Please review your intention and save these local trees.</p>
2022/0419/T	ALEC FORSHAW	14/02/2022 15:13:18	OBJ	<p>As a long-standing local resident, and someone with a deep interest in local history, I object very strongly to the proposed removal of these two mature trees. They contribute enormously to the character, appearance, health and well-being of the area, and as substantial specimens they are irreplaceable.</p> <p>As a professional town planner and conservation officer who worked for 35 years in the London Borough of Islington I dealt with many cases where trees and building were seen to be in conflict, but in my experience a solution can always always be found that enables them to co-exist and flourish. That must be the case too at 8 Doughty Street.</p> <p>Please refuse this application.</p>
2022/0419/T	Matthew Priestman	13/02/2022 22:26:50	OBJ	<p>Tree Felling: 8 Doughty Street WC1</p> <p>My family and I have known this magnificent tree for over 40 years through friends and neighbours in Doughty Mews and Doughty Street. It is a priceless life-enhancing natural asset in enclosed back gardens. I am shocked that an application for its felling has been made, and very strongly OBJECT. Given modern methods of dealing with building damage by roots and branches (I understand reports on mitigating measures are being submitted separately by others), given the proven statutorily supported benefits of major trees, given the sheer wonder of this beautiful living thing, I can see no reason why this application should be entertained and urge Camden to refuse permission.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0419/T	S Louis	12/02/2022 12:05:14	OBJ	I object to this as I believe that alternative plans which would save the tree are not unreasonable . London should value long standing trees .
2022/0419/T	Anna Liu	15/02/2022 08:38:20	OBJ	The London Plane trees are one of the most beloved trees of London. A mature tree such as this one, over a hundred years old, brings quality and character to the property, and the owners would be short-sighted to remove it. All efforts should be made to retain mature trees. Trees bring shade, their huge canopies cleanse as well as cool the air through evaporative cooling, their leaves slow down the runoff of rainwater, and do lots more underground: store carbon, prevent flooding and soil erosion through their network of roots, host a diversity of habitat underground, above ground, and in the canopies. Particularly, Plane trees are large, robust, and long-lived trees, they have survived centuries of city pollution. The bark flakes away, shedding pollutants, whilst their huge canopies and large leaves oxygenate and cool the air. Thanks to their heights, London Planes are attractive habitats for birds including magpies, warblers, and woodpeckers (Paul Wood, author of London's Street Trees and London is a Forest).
2022/0419/T	D Howard	12/02/2022 18:36:30	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this application.</p> <p>The trees are beautiful and provide much needed home to wildlife in Central London. If new trees were planted it would take over 100 years for them to grow to sufficiently replace these majestic trees.</p> <p>The trees are a key feature for people walking down the historic Doughty Mews. If they were removed, the change to the view down Doughty Street would be the biggest in over 100 years.</p> <p>They also counter climate change and help reduce pollution in the area.</p> <p>I urge the Egyptian Society to instead explore structural works to the property to solve the problem, which were previously recommended. I also note that many of the supporting comments are from people connected to and with an interest in the Egyptian Society.</p> <p>I also note that the previous, recent application of felling of these trees was NOT granted and I hope that the comments and feedback from that application are taken into account this time too.</p> <p>As a resident of Doughty Mews, I am praying that the trees are not felled.</p>
2022/0419/T	Anna Liu	15/02/2022 08:38:18	OBJ	The London Plane trees are one of the most beloved trees of London. A mature tree such as this one, over a hundred years old, brings quality and character to the property, and the owners would be short-sighted to remove it. All efforts should be made to retain mature trees. Trees bring shade, their huge canopies cleanse as well as cool the air through evaporative cooling, their leaves slow down the runoff of rainwater, and do lots more underground: store carbon, prevent flooding and soil erosion through their network of roots, host a diversity of habitat underground, above ground, and in the canopies. Particularly, Plane trees are large, robust, and long-lived trees, they have survived centuries of city pollution. The bark flakes away, shedding pollutants, whilst their huge canopies and large leaves oxygenate and cool the air. Thanks to their heights, London Planes are attractive habitats for birds including magpies, warblers, and woodpeckers (Paul Wood, author of London's Street Trees and London is a Forest).

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0419/T	Rosalind Clayton	13/02/2022 20:37:13	COMMNT	Please do not allow these trees to be felled. A previous application some time ago was rejected. There is no need to chop them down. They are beautiful mature trees which greatly enhance the neighbourhood.
2022/0419/T	Rosalind Clayton	13/02/2022 20:37:19	COMMNT	Please do not allow these trees to be felled. A previous application some time ago was rejected. There is no need to chop them down. They are beautiful mature trees which greatly enhance the neighbourhood.
2022/0419/T	Rosalind Clayton	13/02/2022 20:37:26	COMMNT	Please do not allow these trees to be felled. A previous application some time ago was rejected. There is no need to chop them down. They are beautiful mature trees which greatly enhance the neighbourhood.
2022/0419/T	Tuba Unal	12/02/2022 18:42:08	OBJ	<p>I object to this application.</p> <p>These trees cannot be replaced in our lifetime and are a key feature of the area, for both us and our local wildlife! Doughty Mews would not look the same if they were lost.</p> <p>Sufficient alternative options have not be comprehensively explored in my opinion.</p> <p>How would we be judged by future generations, for whom climate change and pollution will be an even bigger issue, if we were to allow this to happen, without exploring every possible alternative first.</p>
2022/0419/T	PATRICIA RICHARDSON	13/02/2022 15:05:00	YES	Don't cut . Will cause more damage to kill it. Roots fill cavities
2022/0419/T	PATRICIA RICHARDSON	13/02/2022 15:05:03	YES	Don't cut . Will cause more damage to kill it. Roots fill cavities

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0419/T	Dr Mary Boulos Ayad	11/02/2022 20:57:23	PETITNSUP P	EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY SUBMISSIONS TO CAMDEN COUNCIL IN THE MATTER OF TWO TREES The case of Pharoah V The Two Trees

SECTION A BACKGROUND FACTS

I CURRENT AND FUTURE DAMAGE CAUSED BY THE TWO TREES

PARAGRAPH 1.3 OF: Subsidence Tree Report For The Egypt Exploration Society

"1.3 2 mature London Plane trees are in direct contact with the rear wall of the property causing displacement damage to the wall of the building. This is not a 'typical' subsidence claim as a result but due to direct physical contact damage." The report further states that the trees are not subject to a protection order even though they are in a conservation area.

Further details re the damage caused by the trees is found in paragraph 5.3 of said report: "5.3 Subsidence from vegetation and trees occurs when the vegetation dries the underlying soil and if this contains clay it can shrink in size and the building subsides. The soil then rehydrates during the wet winter months giving classic cyclical movement profiles. In this claim damage is being advised as being due to the direct physical contact of the stems of the 2 trees against the rear elevation." Furthermore, there is physical evidence of future damage as per soil conditions here at paragraph 5.8: "5.8 Soil testing is inconclusive given the underlying soil type but there can be no doubt given the size of T1 & T2 relative to the property that the trees will be depleting soil moisture levels below foundation level." This assessment proves future damage which is reasonably foreseeable. Further damage is at paragraph 5.9: "5.9 No monitoring is available, but the overall engineering opinion is one of direct physical displacement damage of the rear wall being caused by long standing direct contact of an expanding lower stem. This is pushing the rear wall of the property out of line."

More evidence of deep future damage is cited here: "5.12 The proximity of the trees is such that large structural roots likely extend below the footing and there is a risk that as they decay voids are created but this would be unusual in resulting in actual further damage to the building as the general rate of decay of such roots is generally slow. The alternative is to not remove the trees but the issue will progress as the trees continued to expand in size." However, the decay is taking place. There are two sources of damage: 1. Physical damage, and 2. Damage to the soil. They invoke the legal principle of reasonable foreseeability because they are now known and have been made known to the Council.

II PRECEDENCE OF THE BUILDING OVER TREES

As per the quoted report, the building was erected before the trees were planted:

"5.11 The buildings appear to date from circa 1890 and both T1 & T2 are of the same size and located either side of what would likely have been a door to stabling originally. This suggests they were planted after the buildings were constructed. A highly shrinkable clay soil is not present suggesting (when considered in the context of tree age) the risk of heave in the event of the trees being removed would appear low."

III CONSERVATION AREA

The trees are large but not accessible to the public. In terms of conservation, the trees are therefore not significant and do not give a significant benefit or amenity to the area, in this case, in fact, worse than that, they cause harm and should not be protected. Please see paragraph 5.13 of report that states they are not accessible. Sadly, they add no value to the public.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

SECTION B APPLICATION OF THE RELEVANT LAW TO THE FACTS
I ENGLISH LAND LAW CASES

In the case of *Donoghue V Stephenson* [1932], the judge held that neighbours (and this thus applies to tree owners) have a duty of care to avoid acts or omissions which if allowed to persist can harm a neighbour. In this case, the trees are on neighbouring land which border meets the building of the Egypt Exploration Society.

Rylands V Fletcher [1868] held the person who for his own purpose brings on his lands and collects and keeps there anything likely to do mischief, if it escapes, must keep it in at his peril, and if he does not do so, is prima facie answerable for all the damage which is the natural consequence of its escape. Here, the mischief is in the form of the two trees which are encroaching and an argument can be made that they have escaped their boundaries by physically leaning against the building with such force that they have caused structural damage (mischief) to the building and are causing it to lean in.

Kent V Marquis [1940] upheld this precedent. In the case of *Chapman V Barking* [1997], the court held that there is a duty for a follow up inspection that the tree is not causing an unreasonable danger to the target zone underneath, and a duty to remedy the damage, in this case to remove the trees. In this case, the two trees have already been proved to be causing unreasonable danger to the soil which will manifest in a matter of time, in addition to physical danger to the building so the case of *Chapman* applies. It is unreasonable danger because it is causing harm to the building and to the soil under the building which has ramifications for the building.

In *Leakey V National Trust* [1980], the judge held there is a general duty to ensuring that natural hazards do not stem from the land and affect the neighbouring land. That case concerned land of a status similar to this case in which the trees are on a conservation area so the case facts parallel in this regard. Moreover, the Counsel has a duty to act now that the trees have become a natural hazard to their neighbouring land.

In *Khan v London Borough* [2013], the court held that the duty of care arises when the damage is known. In this case, the tree report has exposed three known factors of damage; the physical leaning of the trees on the building, the soil damage, and future physical and soil damage which are undoubtedly going to happen if this continues. Moreover, this case employs the objective test of what ought to have been known to the reasonable owner. Therefore, since the tree report verifies that the current and future damage is known, this case applies.

Quinn V Scott [1965], argued that since the clear hazard was visible, the tree should have been felled. This applies to our case because the hazard is conclusively proved by the experts and thus the tree should be removed. The trees are visibly leaning on and pushing into the building and have clearly caused physical damage to the structural integrity of the building.

In *Kennedy v Bournemouth Borough Council*, 17.09.12, Bournemouth County Court held that by the spring of 2009 it was reasonably foreseeable to D that the maple tree's roots could cause blockages to the drains to C's property. D was then under a duty to consider what, if anything, would be reasonable to do about this. Here, again, the reasonably foreseeable test was applied and upheld and again, the Council is now under a duty to give planning permission to remove the trees because it is reasonable foreseeable that if it does not act or if it fails to act, further hazards, damage, and mischief will occur.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

In *Berent v Family Mosaic Housing* (Court Circular, September 2012), the Court of Appeal held that if a tree creates a 'real risk' of property damage, consideration should be given to what action, if any, should be taken to address that risk. In this case the risk to property damage is real because it has already occurred and expert evidence shows it will continue.

To summarise, on the merits of these facts alone, the body of case law authority and precedent shows a strong favourable view in removing these trees, even if they are on a conservation area.

II INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS LAW PROTECTIONS ON WORLD HERITAGE

Cultural rights fall under international human rights instruments and are available to everyone. Within cultural rights are protections that are relevant to this case.

1. UNESCO

The constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) was ratified by the United Kingdom in 1946. This means that the United Kingdom has bound itself to the obligations enshrined therein.

2. Resolution A/HRC/RES/37/17

On 22 March 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted Resolution A/HRC/RES/37/17. This resolution calls upon all states to respect, promote and protect the right of everyone to take part in cultural life, including the ability to access and enjoy culture heritage, and to take relevant actions to achieve this. Thus, the council of London is duty bound to uphold this provision in the context of the valuable and rare cultural heritage records and artefacts held at the Egypt Exploration Society library and buildin.

3. The 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its Two Protocols

The 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its Two Protocols are designed to protect cultural property from destruction and looting during conflict. These include monuments, archaeological sites, work of arts and important artefacts. This further cements the UK's position as a world leader in cultural heritage protection and sends out a clear message on our commitment to protecting cultural property during conflict. The UK signed this in 2017.

Although we are not in war time, this is still absolutely relevant because the UK has made itself a world leader in the protection of world cultural heritage and therefore to allow two trees to damage rare holdings goes against the principle of the international obligations that the UK has signed up for as a leader. It is incumbent upon the UK to demonstrate leadership and a precedent in the protection of such rare and valuable world and cultural heritage items.

4. The Granada convention 1985

First entitled the European Charter of the Architectural Heritage, it became the "Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe."

It defines 'architectural heritage' and each signatory promises to maintain an inventory of it and to take statutory measures to protect it. There is also a promise to provide funding, but only within budgetary limitations, and to promote the general enhancement of the surroundings of groups. Signatories (including the UK) also promise to adopt integrated conservation policies in their planning systems and other spheres of government influence that promote the conservation and enhancement of architectural heritage and the fostering of traditional skills. Thus, here, in this case there is the need to conserve and protect cultural heritage above and beyond protecting the building as a physical property but also as a cultural footprint and as a

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

sanctuary for housing cultural artefacts of great historical importance and significant value. This need outweighs the need to protect these two particular dangerous trees. The fact that the tree is leaning is an indication of its instability and foreseeable danger.

III Criminal Law

An argument can be made that the trees are causing damage to the building and this can be construed as the trees causing criminal damage to the building. Moreover, if in future a person is in the building and is harmed by the building as a result of the impact of one or both of these trees, it could incur criminal liability. The case law authority for this is the case of the Birmingham Ash, Stagecoach South Western Trains Ltd v Hind and another [2014], where the defendant was ordered to pay £150 K and could have been found criminally liable. Here, the court held that the resources of the landowner would be taken into account when assessing whether they had done all that could be expected of them, and a local body or corporation may be held to a higher standard than the one given to Mrs Hind. In this case, it means that the Council can be held to a high standard of liability given the seriousness of the damage and the fact that it is affecting a charity which serves the public. The matter of reasonable foreseeability in the case of the Council is also important.

IV INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS LAW ON THE PROTECTION OF PROPERTY.

There are international human rights laws that protect property, many which derive their authority from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 and in this case both the building and the records constitute property that is protected on its own merits and even more so on the merits of its cultural and world heritage value. In addition to this there are international human rights instruments that protect African property such as the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights and this is relevant here because the records reference sites that no longer exist in Egypt and Sudan. In the case of Sudan this is even more vital that the building that houses rare records on lost Sudanese sites is ever more important especially in the light of Sudanese history where conflict has led to such losses that what does remain of its heritage is even more rare and valuable as part of world heritage.

SECTION C ARCHEOLOGICAL WITNESS OF THE EXTREME VALUE OF THE LIBRARY HOLDINGS.

The Egypt Exploration Society archive contains a unique record of British-Egyptian relations since 1882 as well as some of the only records pertaining to sites now lost in Egypt and northern Sudan. The building itself was once the home of renowned Argentinian Egyptologist, Ricardo A Caminos who lived there from the 1980s until his passing in 1992, and is used as a library of rare records vital to world cultural heritage.

The fact that the library contains the only records pertaining to sites lost in Egypt and Northern Sudan makes these records extremely valuable as part of humanity's cultural heritage. From an archaeological and Egyptological perspective, these records are absolutely protected items. In 2004 I worked in the UNHCR Cairo office with Sudanese refugees who crossed into Egypt through the Southern border of Egypt and can attest first to the fact that Northern Sudan was part of the Sudanese war; as I interviewed Asylum Seekers awaiting refugee claims on details of their war experiences. The fact that these sites currently documented in these records no longer exist make these extant records extremely valuable. I can further attest that archaeological sites are also vital primary data sources and that records of lost sites are as valuable as the original sites, because they are all that remain of world and cultural heritage. The building itself holds cultural significance as a foundational part of the history and footprint of the Egypt Exploration Society and should have the protected status of a museum.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Because this library holds world heritage items, the London Council of Camden bound to uphold the spirit of the provisions when the United Kingdom ratified UNESCO's provisions. These records are vital to humanity's world heritage. The functioning and day to day operations of the Egypt Exploration Society are absolutely vital to the preservation and conservation of world heritage.</p> <p>SECTION D PLEA FOR RELIEF I NO PROTECTION ORDER We therefore respectfully request that the Council not grant a protection order for the two trees; T1 and T2 and that the Council respectfully weight the value of the archeological records and artefacts as outweighing the value of these two trees in question; T1 and T2 and that the Council cuts down the trees due to expert testimony of established current and foreseeable future damage to world heritage, and even beyond that that the Council provides financial compensation for the damages already incurred by the two trees which were planted after the building in question was build.</p> <p>II NO COST TO THE SOCIETY We plea that the Council grants written permission for the trees to be removed without costing the Society, and in accordance with legal standards by paying for a tree surgeon to carry out the work.</p> <p>III FINANCIAL COMPENSATION In fact, when the trees were planted, they were negligently planted too close to the building in the first instance and as such are legally considered a nuisance which is a legal term due to the roots and to the heavy weight of the trunk leaning and pushing against the building, as well as due to the impact on the soil which in turn affects the building foundationally. This gives rise to a civil liability claim which under the objective test is that the harm caused is indeed reasonably foreseeable and which gives rise to liability because no steps at the time were taken to prevent the now current and future harm. This liability implies financial damages caused to the building and to the Society due to harm and ought to be compensated for, particularly as the Egypt Exploration Society is a valuable charity.</p> <p>SECTION E CONCLUDING REMARKS The loss or risk of loss of these records is tantamount to a loss of human history. These records constitute the subject matter of human memory and as such are classed as documentary heritage by UNESCO. We have a duty to preserve these original, unaltered documents in their current format. These documents and their accessibility is essential to the collective memory of humanity. By definition these records and the building that houses them are protected cultural property.</p>
2022/0419/T	PATRICIA RICHARDSON	13/02/2022 15:05:08	YES	Don't cut . Will cause more damage to kill it. Roots fill cavities
2022/0419/T	Ms. L. Abbott	12/02/2022 18:26:18	OBJ	Please do not approve this application. Surely the trees can be professionally maintained to mitigate any of the supposed problems they are supposed to be causing without felling them. These are old, established, beautiful trees that will take decades to replace. When there is such a move to reduce pollution and increase green areas it seems madness to kill these trees. Property owners are so quick to want to destroy trees without considering all of the options first. In this jubilee year we have been asked to increase trees, not kill them.
2022/0419/T	PATRICIA RICHARDSON	13/02/2022 15:04:37	YES	Don't cut . Will cause more damage to kill it. Roots fill cavities

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0419/T	PATRICIA RICHARDSON	13/02/2022 15:04:39	YES	Don't cut . Will cause more damage to kill it. Roots fill cavities
2022/0419/T	PATRICIA RICHARDSON	13/02/2022 15:04:42	YES	Don't cut . Will cause more damage to kill it. Roots fill cavities
2022/0419/T	PATRICIA RICHARDSON	13/02/2022 15:04:44	YES	Don't cut . Will cause more damage to kill it. Roots fill cavities
2022/0419/T	PATRICIA RICHARDSON	13/02/2022 15:04:47	YES	Don't cut . Will cause more damage to kill it. Roots fill cavities
2022/0419/T	PATRICIA RICHARDSON	13/02/2022 15:04:50	YES	Don't cut . Will cause more damage to kill it. Roots fill cavities
2022/0419/T	PATRICIA RICHARDSON	13/02/2022 15:04:52	YES	Don't cut . Will cause more damage to kill it. Roots fill cavities
2022/0419/T	PATRICIA RICHARDSON	13/02/2022 15:04:55	YES	Don't cut . Will cause more damage to kill it. Roots fill cavities
2022/0419/T	PATRICIA RICHARDSON	13/02/2022 15:04:57	YES	Don't cut . Will cause more damage to kill it. Roots fill cavities
2022/0419/T	Elizabeth SEward	11/02/2022 11:17:59	COMNOT	It is disappointing and ironic that in the year of a national tree planting campaign that, yet again, there is a request, to fell the magnificent Plane trees that sit within the conclave of Doughty Mews, Guilford Street, Doughty Street and Milman street. I have contributed before on the value of these trees in the life of this part of Bloomsbury and believe I do not have to rehearse to Camden Council here, the importance of trees within our central London community. I am told that there are root impacts upon the rear wall of one of the least well maintained properties in Doughty Mews. As I commented previously I cannot believe that an solution can not be found to stabilise the property. Why, if there is a question of building v. tree, should we assume that two such exceptional trees (with a protection order), should be felled rather than the building be engineered to accomodate them. Surely, on this occasion, the latter should be the approach of Camden Council. I do hope that this application is refused for the benefit and wellbeing of all those living in this area.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0419/T	Tadas Khazanavicius	14/02/2022 15:42:32	OBJ	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the proposed removal of historic and beneficial trees within view of our home. It goes without saying that those who actually live in the area understand the value of, not only preserving current greenery, but of advocating for an increasingly healthy neighbourhood.</p> <p>A suitable engineering solution to the building encroachment is not rocket science; cutting down trees is not only retrograde but a failing of intellect.</p> <p>Those who support this do not live in the area: I wonder how they would feel if someone came into their neighbourhood to cut down their trees? The suggestions that the holdings of the Exploration Society are at risk does not do much for credibility of those who manage them.</p> <p>Owner and resident, Doughty Street</p>
2022/0419/T	Christopher Prentice	11/02/2022 16:33:31	OBJ	<p>I wish to register my strong opposition to the felling of these two trees in Doughty Mews. The two trees have significant public amenity value. On a personal level, the trees are visible from the rear of my flat and contribute important variety to an otherwise built urban environment and skyline. In Spring and Summer the expanse of green is refreshing. In Winter the pollarded tops of the trees are dramatically silhouetted against the clouds. Such trees are also important for the quality of the air we breathe in the city - they are the best natural carbon sinks. In the post COP26 era, there must be national and London-wide policies for the protection of established trees in our dense urban spaces. This application must be in breach of those policies. Please do not allow these two fine trees to be sacrificed. Preserve the broad public amenity against narrow private interest.</p>
2022/0419/T	Patricia Usick	13/02/2022 10:55:28	COMMNT	<p>These trees must come down and be replaced with smaller trees further from the wall of the EES. They are endangering and damaging the structure of the historic home of an important cultural institution, The Egypt Exploration Society, formerly the Egypt Exploration Fund.</p>
2022/0419/T	Jane King	13/02/2022 18:38:19	OBJ	<p>Robert Sakula has made the case against felling these trees most eloquently; I would only add, as a resident at the southern end of John's Mews, that they are visible all over the neighbourhood and certainly the finest in the immediate area. They have been sensitively pruned over the years and are a pleasure to see at any time of the year, but particularly when they are in full leaf. They must make a major contribution to the environment, which would certainly not be the case with the replacement trees proposed. I support the proposed search for solutions that would enable the trees and the building to co-exist for many years to come.</p>
2022/0419/T	Sarah Staton	14/02/2022 17:40:54	OBJ	<p>Please note my objection to this application. These trees are a stunning asset to the neighbourhood and much valued for their visual aspect, their vital role in carbon reduction, and as a habit for the rich and varied bird life in this area. As the planet gets hotter the idea of felling mature trees seems untenable, and with proper management these trees will last for many more decades. Please do not grant permission for removal of these wonderful trees.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0419/T	Elizabeth Duff	14/02/2022 23:00:06	COMNOT	<p>My attention has been drawn to this application as I am concerned about loss of trees in the borough, although the proposed action would not affect me personally. I note that the Egypt Exploration Society has an appeal on its own website https://www.ees.ac.uk/news/help-save-our-london-premises that includes the assertion that these mature trees are no longer providing an ecological benefit in the community. This claim is unconvincing to say the least as in general mature trees are of immense benefit in supporting an environment for birds, insects and other wildlife, as well as playing a part in improving air quality, something for which there is urgent need in inner London especially. Pruning or other reduction of the tree size may offer an alternative to felling, and I would put forward a serious request that all possible options are considered to avoid loss of the trees.</p>
2022/0419/T	khalid Kassim	14/02/2022 20:49:00	COMMNT	<p>I don't think we should be cutting trees down.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0419/T	Dr Linda Steynor	13/02/2022 13:27:15	SUPPRT	<p>As the immediate past Chair of the EES Board of Trustees Board, I write in support of the application for the felling of the two large plane trees growing in the garden of 8 Doughty Street. I understand that One Housing Trust, the owners of the property, support this application, having previously made a similar application (2020/5587/T). Since then further expert investigations, whose results strongly support this proposal, have been carried out on behalf of the EES.</p> <p>It is understandable that there is support for the trees to remain as a local feature, but it is an indisputable fact that the lower trunks of these trees are in direct physical contact with the rear wall of the EES' property at 2-4 Doughty Mews and are pushing against it, causing structural damage, which will worsen with the passage of time. Professional advice from expert investigations is that there is no practical alternative but to remove the trees entirely.</p> <p>Some objectors make the unreasonable suggestion that the rear wall of the EES premises could be demolished instead, requiring the charity to incur substantial expenditure and loss of accommodation for a temporary solution – since the trees will continue to expand. I do not believe that any of the objectors (or for that matter Camden Council) would be content with continuing structural damage being caused to a property they own.</p> <p>Other objectors have suggested that the purpose of the EES in making this application is purely commercial and that we simply wish to sell our property. This is not the case. Having considered possible alternatives, in consultation with our members, the EES Board determined in 2020 that the Society should remain at Doughty Mews, its home since the 1930's, offering a central London location convenient for the Society's members and supporters, who come to us from all over the world.</p> <p>As a registered charity the Board of Trustees is responsible for maintaining all its assets in good order. It is not just the physical structure of the building which is at risk. The EES is a learned society as well as a charitable institution with a worldwide reputation for excellence in our work, which focuses on the archaeology, history and cultural heritage of Egypt and the Sudan. Our building houses an important specialist library and unique collections, including documentation relating to work which has been carried out in Egypt for over a century, since our founding by Amelia Edwards. These collections are currently at risk of permanent and irrevocable damage if the danger of damage by water incursion is not addressed soon.</p> <p>I therefore request that the EES' application be approved by the Council. The actual removal of the trees will be the responsibility of the owners of 8 Doughty Street.</p> <p>Dr Linda Steynor Immediate Past Chair of Trustees</p>
2022/0419/T	PATRICIA RICHARDSON	13/02/2022 15:05:06	YES	Don't cut . Will cause more damage to kill it. Roots fill cavities

Total: 23