

Hello

I am a resident of 9 chalcot road. I would like to strongly object to the above planning application on the basis that the noise will be unbearable from my house and garden.

This is a residential area not an industrial one.

Warm Regards

Fiona Hudson-Kelly

Good Morning —

As a resident of Primrose Hill, off Fitzroy Road, and a business owner in Chalcot Road, Sam's Cafe, I strongly object to the plan to install noise-making equipment in Utopia Village. The plan is not reasonable and the noise reduction plan is bogus. Residents in Chalcot Road will suffer constantly. This is against the legislation about separating industrial noise from residents.

I urge you to reconsider this plan immediately.

Yours sincerely,
Andrew O'Hagan

8 Primrose Hill Studios
Fitzroy Road
NW1 8TR

Dear Camden Council Planning Department,

I am writing to object to the planning application listed under the reference 2023/4757/P in Utopia Village (note, the documents are temporarily unavailable which is unacceptable when the deadline is Dec 23).

Any application needs to go to the Department of Environmental Health to get approval or rejection based on the building regulation requirements for acceptable noise level.

The proposed installation noise level should be 10db below the surround level measurement .

This "Industrial Engine Room" installation proposed in Utopia Village is substantially above this amount and would never pass this test and hence not be valid for approval by the DoEH.

Any development of this nature would be extremely detrimental to the environmental health and wellbeing of the residential community, and clearly in breach of existing regulations.

Please confirm receipt of this objection.

Kind regards

Celine

Dear Mr Campbell

Ref. 2023/4757/P

I am a resident of Primrose Hill and I **strongly oppose** the proposed development to Utopia Village on noise and conservation grounds.

It is completely unjustifiable to place an industrial engine room in the middle of a residential area. The proposed development goes against all conservation rules laid out in the Camden Local Plan and will irrevocably change the character of the neighbourhood.

I wanted to view the planning application listed under the reference 2023/4757/P. However, when I tried to view it on your website, an error message appeared, explaining that the documents are temporarily unavailable. In addition to logging my objection to the above, please can you explain why the documents are unavailable and when they will be available to view? Please confirm that there will be an extension to the deadline for formal consultation and commentary, to reflect the lack of access in viewing the documents.

Regards

Laura Foster

Dear Sirs or Madams

My wife (Kelly Gemmell, copied) and I are the joint owners and residents of Flat 3, 5 Egbert Street, London NW1 8LJ. We have lived in the property for over 8 years.

We were very disappointed and alarmed to learn that a planning application has been filed by the owner of Utopia Village (believed to be a corporate vehicle owned by Elisabeth Murdoch) to build an enormous cage housing industrial equipment right against the houses on Chalcot Road. We also understand that the developers plan to put in even more industrial machinery touching the small gardens of the houses on Egbert Street.

We are very worried by the potential noise and disturbance this could cause to a quiet residential area deep in Primrose Hill Conservation Area. We have heard reports that the noise from the equipment would be similar to standing next to a passing train or a jet flying over 100 feet. We are also concerned about the proposed aesthetics of the cage - the ability to preserve the look and feel of the local area is important to locals and visitors alike and development thus far has kept this firmly in mind.

Many of the residents of Egbert Street and Chalcot Road have lived in their properties for years and there is a strong sense of community. We are concerned that the appearance and noise of the proposed site could drive people away and break up the strong local ties - who would want to live (and work, given the rise of home working) next to a noisy cage?

We have spoken to many local residents over the past few weeks about the proposed application (in Egbert Street and elsewhere) and all of them are concerned by it. None have welcomed it.

This seems to be a case of prioritising a very wealthy individual against the needs and wishes of the local community.

We find it deeply concerning that there has been next to no consultation about this proposed plan.

We are copying in our local MP, Kier Starmer, for information as this planning application would damage an important area of his constituency.

We therefore respectfully request that you reject this planning application.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further with you.

Kindly acknowledge receipt of this email.

Yours faithfully

Steven James and Kelly Gemmell
Co-owners and residents of Flat 3, 5 Egbert Street, London, NW1 8LJ

Dear Mr Cooper,

I wish to raise an objection to the above application on the following grounds:

- 1) it is totally inappropriate in what is essentially a residential area and would be completely inconsistent with Camden Council's current conservation policy.
- 2) the noise pollution resulting from the installation of an engine room would badly affect residents in the wider surrounding area.

I am sure mine is one of many voices expressing grave concern about the incongruous nature of this application and sincerely hope you will give my comments due consideration.

Thanks and best regards,

Steven Hurwitz

6 Sharpleshall Street

London, NW1 8YL.

Hi, I am a camden and Primrose Hill resident and I strongly oppose the proposed development to Utopia Village (2023/4757/P) on noise and conservation grounds.

It will irrevocably change the character of the neighbourhood, it is unjustifiable to have an industrial engine room in the middle of a residential area and it goes against all the rules laid out regarding conservation in the Camden Local Plan.

Hope you take the feelings of the residents seriously,

Thank you,
Jane

Dear Councillors

I am writing to **strongly oppose** the proposed development to Utopia Village (2023/4757/P) on noise and conservation grounds.

It will irrevocably change the character of the neighbourhood, it is unjustifiable to have an industrial engine room in the middle of a residential area and it goes against all the rules laid out regarding conservation in the Camden Local Plan.

I have had to write to you directly since the planning portal comes up with a server error when linking to this application.

Please note my objection, which I believe is widely held among residents in the local community.

Kind regards

David Shasha
15 Regents Park Terrace
NW1 7ED

Dear Mr Campbell

Ref. 2023/4757/P

To add to my previous email, any application needs to go to the department of environmental health to get approval or rejection based on the building regulation requirements for acceptable noise level.

The proposed installation noise level should normally be 10db below the surround level measurement. This installation would never pass this test.

Regards

Laura Foster

Dear Camden Council Planning Dep,

I strongly oppose the proposed development to Utopia Village (2023/4757/P) on noise and conservation grounds.

It will irrevocably change the character of the neighbourhood, it is unjustifiable to have an industrial engine room in the middle of a residential area and it goes against all the rules laid out regarding conservation in the Camden Local Plan.

It's also outrageous that we cannot even view the plans.

Regards

Louise Edwards

Dear all,

I strongly object to the proposal to put a power plant in the middle of a residential area. Not only will it be unsightly, it will be extraordinarily noisy.

We are so grateful to live in the haven that is Primrose Hill, uniquely peaceful in the heart of London. Please don't give permission to something that will undoubtedly disrupt the peace but also devalue all of the neighbouring streets for tourists and locals alike.

Thank you for your consideration,
Katie

Planning Application 2023/4757/P Utopia Village

I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the proposed plant rooms that form part of this application.

1. No consultation was conducted on these specific proposals prior to submitting a planning application despite the scale of the plans and the serious risk of loss of amenity to residents. Requests for proper consultation, including from local councillors, have been ignored.
2. The Camden Local Plan, paragraph 6.88, states that: "The aim within development proposals should be to design out noise prior to proposing mitigation. The effect of noise and vibration can be minimised by separating uses sensitive to noise and vibration from sources that generate them." The proposed development fails against this policy by placing extremely noisy industrial machinery on the periphery of the development site where it affects neighbouring properties and only then proposing mitigation.
3. The developer has not submitted an energy statement to explain why equipment on this scale is required to power such a small and little used site. What is the capacity of this equipment compared to the energy consumption of the site during the last 12 months, for example? The developer has not explained which alternatives have been considered and why they have been rejected. In its statement, the developer says that the amenity of neighbouring residents must be "balanced" against its desire to maximise lettable floor space. The purely commercial interests of the developer cannot be "balanced" in this way against lawfully protected amenity. The amenity must firstly be protected, by (Section 6.88) separating uses sensitive to noise from sources that generate them, and then the developer must work out how to maximise his commercial interests. There can be no question of "balance". The requirements of Sections 6.88 and 6.91 should be met by locating machinery where the loss of amenity is confined to the site itself and not pushed out to the neighbouring residents.
4. In its Noise Assessment Report, the developer completely ignores the right of residents to benefit from the amenity of their gardens. Camden Policy A4 Noise and Vibration states that: "We will only grant permission for noise generating development, including any plant and machinery, if it can be operated without causing harm to amenity." Section 6.90, which covers noise sensitive developments, states unambiguously that: "The impacts on external amenity spaces such as gardens and balconies will also be considered". The requirements are referenced in section 6.89 and specified in Appendix 3, Table C: "Noise levels applicable to proposed industrial and commercial developments". Between 07:00 and 23:00, the noise threshold of 10 decibels below background noise levels (or 15 if tonality is present) applies to the garden and not just to the house. All noise consultants, including the developers' own, agree that noise levels in the garden will exceed maximum acceptable levels.
5. The Environmental Survey that underpins the maximum allowable noise output of the equipment were not conducted in the areas most affected by the plant noise and therefore cannot be relied on to gauge the background noise levels of the area. One of the surveys was conducted in the opposite corner of the site, just 80 metres from the train tracks, rather than 140 metres where the plant is proposed, and is therefore likely to have higher background noise readings.
6. Independent noise consultants and engineers do not agree that the proposed level of noise attenuation is realistic with such loud equipment in such a small space. They also note that the developers' plans include no "redundancy", meaning that even small errors, miscalculations or difficulties will mean that maximum noise levels will be breached. One such error is the inaccurate

“assessment” of garden lengths at 6 metres when the actual length (4.95 metres) can be easily measured. This alone pushes noise levels above maximum allowable levels in the houses.

7. Camden Policy D2 Heritage states: "The Council will require that development within conservation areas preserves or, where possible, enhances the character or appearance of the area." The new building, a frightening, black-clad, windowless cage, cannot be claimed, by its nature, to preserve and could not, on any reasonable definition, be argued to enhance the character or appearance of the site or of the broader Conservation Area, which will be enormously altered in a way completely unsympathetic to any other neighbouring structures and, at the same time, will become more visible from the street because of the extension of the footprint. Worryingly, if permitted, it will set a precedent for other similar demolition and development elsewhere in the Conservation Area, in direct opposition to the purpose of Primrose Hill and other parts of Camden holding the Conservation Area designation.

In summary, if this plant be permitted, and the residents prove later that background noise levels have indeed risen, as seems inevitable, the problem will be passed onto them. We cannot risk this situation happening as it will then be too late for us to do anything. Considering the multiple, serious errors in the report, the fact that the proposed solution has already been accepted by the developer to significantly exceed maximum noise thresholds in the gardens and that the residents, and not the developer, are the ones who will have to live with these noise levels, we request that you refuse the application.

Best,
Charlotte Claydon
18 St Marks Crescent, NW17TU

I am writing to object to this planning application.

There are elements in it which are objectionable. These, however, have been added only at a late date in the process (27 November 2023).

These elements have been introduced without due notice, explanation, consultation or liaison with those in the neighbouring streets who will be adversely affected.

The developer's failure to announce their objectionable additions openly, at a time of year when many people are preoccupied with other matters, has meant that those affected have only in the last few days become aware of the implications of the recently introduced elements. Camden's planning website has also not been working for a number of days recently.

I am therefore writing to demand that the consultation process on this planning application should be extended, to allow the recently added elements to be explained, examined and assessed without the unreasonable pressure of a short deadline.

I am writing this both in my capacity as a local resident and as the Chairman of the Gloucester Avenue Association. As a substantial number of the residents who will be affected by the objectionable elements live in Gloucester Avenue, I expect you to take their interests into consideration. Many of them, however, have yet to become aware of the impact this addition to the planning application is likely to have.

An extension to the deadline in this case is, I know, strongly supported by our local Councillors.

Martin Sheppard

Chairman, The Gloucester Avenue Association

--

Martin Sheppard

102 Gloucester Avenue
London NW1 8HX

Dear Sirs,

You will find attached the texts of two emails I recently sent to Camden Councillors, members of the PHCAAC and to the Planning Officers. For the reasons given in those emails, **I would respectfully and formally request that Planning Permission for the said Application be refused.**

I remain, yours sincerely,

Michael MULVEY

Dear Planning,

In answer to your query, the planning reference number in question is: **2023/4757/P** and the address of the development site is: **Utopia Village, 7 Chalcot Road, NW1 8LH.**

May I avail myself of this opportunity to raise one additional point? The developer has refused to consult on the plant rooms, despite being aware of widespread concern and being specifically and repeatedly asked by local councillors to do so. With the overall use of the site unchanged, this is the **one** area in the proposed development involving genuinely existential issues, the other areas where consultation **has** been granted being largely aesthetic and matters of preference.

I remain, yours sincerely,

Michael MULVEY

Planning Application 2023/4757/P Utopia Village

I am the resident of 9 Chalcot Road.

I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the proposed plant rooms that form part of this application.

1. No consultation was conducted on these specific proposals prior to submitting a planning application despite the scale of the plans and the serious risk of loss of amenity to residents. Requests for proper consultation, including from local councillors, have been ignored.
2. The Camden Local Plan, paragraph 6.88, states that: "The aim within development proposals should be to design out noise prior to proposing mitigation. The effect of noise and vibration can be minimised by separating uses sensitive to noise and vibration from sources that generate them." The proposed development fails against this policy by placing extremely noisy industrial machinery on the periphery of the development site where it affects neighbouring properties and only then proposing mitigation.
3. The developer has not submitted an energy statement to explain why equipment on this scale is required to power such a small and little used site. What is the capacity of this equipment compared to the energy consumption of the site during the last 12 months, for example? The developer has not explained which alternatives have been considered and why they have been rejected. In its statement, the developer says that the amenity of neighbouring residents must be "balanced" against its desire to maximise lettable floor space. The purely commercial interests of the developer cannot be "balanced" in this way against lawfully protected amenity. The amenity must firstly be protected, by (Section 6.88) separating uses sensitive to noise from sources that generate them, and then the developer must work out how to maximise his commercial interests. There can be no question of "balance". The requirements of Sections 6.88 and 6.91 should be met by locating machinery where the loss of amenity is confined to the site itself and not pushed out to the neighbouring residents.
4. In its Noise Assessment Report, the developer completely ignores the right of residents to benefit from the amenity of their gardens. Camden Policy A4 Noise and Vibration states that: "We will only grant permission for noise generating development, including any plant and machinery, if it can be operated without causing harm to amenity." Section 6.90, which covers noise sensitive developments, states unambiguously that: "The impacts on external amenity spaces such as gardens and balconies will also be considered". The requirements are referenced in section 6.89 and specified in Appendix 3, Table C: "Noise levels applicable to proposed industrial and commercial developments". Between 07:00 and 23:00, the noise threshold of 10 decibels below background noise levels (or 15 if tonality is present) applies to the garden and not just to the house. All noise consultants, including the developers' own, agree that noise levels in the garden will exceed maximum acceptable levels.
5. The Environmental Survey that underpins the maximum allowable noise output of the equipment were not conducted in the areas most affected by the plant noise and therefore cannot be relied on to gauge the background noise levels of the area. One of the surveys was conducted in the opposite corner of the site, just 80 metres from the train tracks, rather than 140 metres where the plant is proposed, and is therefore likely to have higher background noise readings.
6. Independent noise consultants and engineers do not agree that the proposed level of noise attenuation is realistic with such loud equipment in such a small space. They also note that the

developers' plans include no "redundancy", meaning that even small errors, miscalculations or difficulties will mean that maximum noise levels will be breached. One such error is the inaccurate "assessment" of garden lengths at 6 metres when the actual length (4.95 metres) can be easily measured. This alone pushes noise levels above maximum allowable levels in the houses.

7. Camden Policy D2 Heritage states: "The Council will require that development within conservation areas preserves or, where possible, enhances the character or appearance of the area." The new building, a frightening, black-clad, windowless cage, cannot be claimed, by its nature, to preserve and could not, on any reasonable definition, be argued to enhance the character or appearance of the site or of the broader Conservation Area, which will be enormously altered in a way completely unsympathetic to any other neighbouring structures and, at the same time, will become more visible from the street because of the extension of the footprint. Worryingly, if permitted, it will set a precedent for other similar demolition and development elsewhere in the Conservation Area, in direct opposition to the purpose of Primrose Hill and other parts of Camden holding the Conservation Area designation.

In summary, if this plant be permitted, and the residents prove later that background noise levels have indeed risen, as seems inevitable, the problem will be passed onto them. We cannot risk this situation happening as it will then be too late for us to do anything. Considering the multiple, serious errors in the report, the fact that the proposed solution has already been accepted by the developer to significantly exceed maximum noise thresholds in the gardens and that the residents, and not the developer, are the ones who will have to live with these noise levels, we request that you refuse the application.

Warm Regards
Fiona Hudson-Kelly

Utopia Village 7 Chalcot Road London Camden NW1 8LH (2023/4757/P) Utopia Planning Application 2023/4757/P I am writing to lodge the following points and grounds for objection and ask officers to:

1. Refer this application back to the applicant, local councillors and officer and scrutiny committee
2. Highlight that the recent additional elements added (27 November 2023) to the application have been introduced without due notice, explanation, consultation or liaison with those in the neighbouring streets who will be adversely affected.
3. There is inadequate, unsubstantiated and inaccurate data relating to a) noise impact on surrounding residents
4. There is inadequate, unsubstantiated and inaccurate data relating to b) amenity impact on surrounding residents
5. There is inadequate, unsubstantiated and inaccurate data relating to c) business case for Utopia at the expense of local residents
6. This application represents an insensitive over increase in development in a unique conservation area, and lies outside of the spirit of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area
7. This application represents an insensitive increase in development in terms of the Heritage of the site
8. This application works against the spirit of Camden's own strategic plans for sensitive development

Please note that Camden's planning website has also not been working for a number of days recently.

A way forward whilst this application is considered by the scrutiny committee and reconsidered by the applicant in terms of the new elements introduced and inadequate, unsubstantiated and inaccurate data, is that that the consultation process on this planning application should be extended.

I am writing this both in my capacity as a local resident and as a member of the Gloucester Avenue Association. As a substantial number of the residents who will be affected by the objectionable elements live in Gloucester Avenue, I expect you to take their interests into consideration.

Dr Marilyn Panayi

Dear Planning team,

I would like to object the plans of application number 2023/4757/P.

I live on Chalcot road, near the Egbert Street and I'm very concerned about the noise impact of this development. This is a residential area and therefore any building containing industrial equipment and noises related to it, should not be allowed. There are houses and gardens, and I believe it would cause extreme disruption to the neighbourhood.

I am sure your team will assess this planning request carefully and make sure that the neighbourhood is not impacted by an acceptable noise level.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kind regards,

Yvonne Pengue, Chalcot Road

Reference: 2023/4757/P - Utopia Village, Chalcot Road

I live in Primrose Hill close to Utopia village and I strongly oppose the proposed development as named above. It will without doubt change the character of the neighbourhood, it is unjustifiable to have an industrial engine room in the middle of a residential area and it goes against all the rules laid out regarding conservation in the Camden Local Plan.

Sophie Jolowicz