

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received:           | Comment: | Response:   |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2023/4757/P     | Susanna Pancaldo | 16/12/2023 11:17:02 | OBJ      | This proposal seems entirely out of place to me. Primrose Hill is a small, mostly residential neighbourhood with a number of small businesses. A structure this size (and this noisy!) would surely spoil the atmosphere of the neighbourhood and have a hugely negative impact on both residence and businesses near the construction site. I think the developers will need to start from scratch and rethink how they might meet their needs without causing harm to their neighbours and neighbourhood.   |
| 2023/4757/P     | Robert Speight   | 16/12/2023 16:36:30 | WREP     | <p>We live in Gloucester Avenue . At the back of our small gardens is Utopia Village . We are writing to object to this proposal</p> <p>Recently , following approval by Camden Council which we strongly resisted ,the owners of Utopia installed similar units to those now being proposed in this current application. In our attempt to stop that development we put forward objections based on independent acoustic studies which were in no doubt that their sound emission would impact adversely on the residents . As anticipated , the legacy of the decision by Camden to side with the developers has left us contending with an unpleasant invasive pulsating hum disturbing sleep and the peaceful and the rightful enjoyment of our homes.</p> <p>We are therefore sadly fully entitled to speak from our experience that this new application would indeed have a significant deleterious effect on our neighbours.</p> <p>The following questions must be answered:</p> <p>(1) what is the justification for such an enormous structure ?</p> <p>(2)what alternatives have been explored?</p> <p>(3) why are Utopia not locating these works internally?</p> <p>Camden must not rely on the acoustic projection provided by the owners of Utopia</p> <p>Furthermore the the deadline for this consultation process must be extended. The owners of Utopia historically consistently choose to put their applications in during holiday periods .. The present one has been slipped in during the run up to Christmas.</p> <p>Please note that when Utopia called a consultation meeting with residents during the summer (when many of us were away) they made absolutely no mention of the current enormous proposed structures. This application has come as a complete surprise and must be rejected</p> |
| 2023/4757/P     | Lucy C.          | 14/12/2023 12:31:59 | OBJ      | <p>Although my property is not directly adjacent, I am concerned that this development will set a precedent in terms of acceptable noise levels and the (unattractive) housing of equipment in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area.</p> <p>Many, if not most, local residents welcome having businesses here alongside residential properties, providing jobs and lunchtime trade for local restaurants. However, in order for both to co-exist harmoniously, noise levels and design must be appropriate to the setting, to avoid disturbance and allow people's quiet enjoyment of their homes. The current plans do not seem to have addressed this, and so I suggest you should refuse the application.</p> <p>Hopefully modified future plans will address these issues to their neighbours' satisfaction.</p>   |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received:           | Comment: | Response:   |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2023/4757/P     | Roger Morley     | 17/12/2023 18:17:24 | OBJ      | <p>Dear planning inspector,</p> <p>I would like to object to planning application 2023/4757/P in Utopia Village, 7 Chalcot Road, NW1.</p> <p>I struggle to see how the proposed new plant facilities, located at the southern end of the site, next to the entrance to Utopia Village can possibly be allowed. I understand that the existing bland building on this site dates from the 1950s, but that should not provide carte blanche to replace it with a hideous industrial building in the heart of the Primrose Hill conservation area. The proposed plant may be partially hidden from the street, but it is very visible from the surrounding Victorian houses and clashes with the charming Victorian heritage buildings that currently dominate the entrance to Utopia Village.</p> <p>Furthermore, I note from many of the other objections to this planning application that the plant house will omit unacceptable levels of noise. As noted above, the proposed noise abatement cladding is ugly in addition to being unproven. The design statement claims that the plant site was chosen after extensive neighbourhood consultation, but no one in the neighbourhood appears to have been aware of the alleged consultation.</p> <p>If the applicant would like to have a centralized plant facility, perhaps they should centralize it on their site so that it is their tenants rather than their residential neighbours who would have to put up with the noise. At least the tenants of Utopia Village will have the option to go home in the evenings and at weekends to escape the incessant drone of the plant.</p> <p>Beyond the anti social impact on the direct neighbours, I am, as a former resident of Primrose Hill and still a frequent visitor, concerned that this development will chip away at the unique character of the area which makes it such as appealing location to live and work.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Roger Morley</p> |

---

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received:           | Comment: | Response:              |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|------------------------|
| 2023/4757/P     | Sophie Morley    | 17/12/2023 18:24:31 | OBJ      | Dear Planning Officer, |

Objection for Planning Application 2023/4757/P Utopia Village

1. The developer has applied to build plant rooms housing industrial equipment directly at the end of neighbouring gardens without any consultation with residents or councillors. The plans appeared for the first time in a planning application lodged less than a month before Christmas. Three direct requests for withdrawal of the application and proper consultation by Councillors have been ignored.

2. Section 6.88 of the Camden Local Plan is clear that “development proposals should... 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 owner of Utopia Village has repeatedly refused to house noisy industrial equipment in the centre of their site, always pushing it to the edges where the loss of amenity is moved out to neighbouring residents. The owner openly accept that this is because they wish to maximise their profits.

3. The developer’s Noise Assessment Report has been heavily criticised by independent, qualified experts, who have highlighted numerous examples of errors, omissions and miscalculations, as well as failures to consider or comply with Camden Policy. Significantly, the developer has failed to consider noise levels in gardens at all, directly contrary to Appendix 3 of the Camden Local Plan. An independent expert has estimated that noise levels in the garden would be more than 20 times those at the windows, even assuming the developer’s proposed attenuation where possible, about which there is considerable scepticism.

4. In order to attenuate the deafening noise of heavy industrial machinery, the developer proposes demolishing the existing building and replacing it with a black-clad, windowless box, which is completely out of character with the surrounding Victorian houses. Policy D1 Design of the Local Plan. states that: “The Council will require that development (a) respects local context or character... [and] (f) integrates well with the surrounding streets and open spaces... and contributes positively to the street frontage... [as well as] (j) preserves gardens and other open space.” The proposed building would clearly not, especially in the context of Conservation area, which Policy D2 Heritage is designed to protect. The character and appearance of Utopia Village and Primrose Hill will be enormously altered in a way completely unsympathetic to any other neighbouring structures. 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 holding the Conservation Area designation.

Kind regards,

Sophie Morley

| <b>Application No:</b> | <b>Consultees Name:</b> | <b>Received:</b>    | <b>Comment:</b> | <b>Response:</b> |
|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 2023/4757/P            | Lucy Triesman           | 17/12/2023 12:49:15 | OBJ             | Dear Sir/Madam   |

I am a resident of Egbert Street London NW1 8LJ. I have been a resident in this street for over 30 years at two different addresses. Over that time there have been quite a few changes proposed to Utopia Village by successive owners and I have not been against all of them.

But this one is inappropriate and what is more has not been planned or consulted on in any transparent manner. The developer has been sly, disingenuous even. I have kept the last letter that was put through our door which, if you read it now, you would find very reassuring. But that is not what i feel or anyone feels on discovering the true intent and nature of their plans. Far from keeping the noise down, the new plans will face us in Egbert street with up to 100 decibels of noise by the independent noise reports we have commissioned. That is equivalent to the sound of an oncoming tube train.

I am a Disabled council tax payer who works from home. This outcome, if approved will destroy my home and my livelihood. I am grateful to the groups of neighbours who have commissioned the reports which the leader of the council and yourselves will no doubt see.

Here is my formal objection.

1. The developer has applied to built plant rooms housing industrial equipment directly at the end of neighbouring gardens without any consultation with residents or councillors. The plans appeared for the first time in a planning application lodged less than a month before Christmas. Three direct requests for withdrawal of the application and proper consultation by Councillors have been ignored.
2. Section 6.88 of the Camden Local Plan is clear that “development proposals should... 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 owner of Utopia Village has repeatedly refused to house noisy industrial equipment in the centre of their site, always pushing it to the edges where the loss of amenity is moved out to neighbouring residents. The owner openly accept that this is because they wish to maximise their profits.
3. The developer’s Noise Assessment Report has been heavily criticised by independent, qualified experts, who have highlighted numerous examples of errors, omissions and miscalculations, as well as failures to consider or comply with Camden Policy. Significantly, the developer has failed to consider noise levels in gardens at all, directly contrary to Appendix 3 of the Camden Local Plan. An independent expert has estimated that noise levels in the garden would be more than 20 times those at the windows, even assuming the developer’s proposed attenuation were possible, about which there is considerable scepticism.
4. In order to attenuate the deafening noise of heavy industrial machinery, the developer proposes demolishing the existing building and replacing it with a black-clad, windowless box, which is completely out of character with the surrounding Victorian houses. Policy D1 Design of the Local Plan. states that: “The Council will require that development (a) respects local context or character... [and] (f) integrates well with the surrounding streets and open spaces... and contributes positively to the street frontage... [as well as] (j) preserves gardens and other open space.” The proposed building would clearly not, especially in the context of Conservation area, which Policy D2 Heritage is designed to protect. The character and appearance of Utopia Village and Primrose Hill will be enormously altered in a way completely unsympathetic to any other neighbouring structures. 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 holding

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response:  |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--|
|                 |                  |           |          | <p data-bbox="880 129 1249 153">the Conservation Area designation.</p> <p data-bbox="880 161 2040 217">For these reasons, and the many others submitted by local residents, I object to the planned development and request that you refuse the application.</p> <p data-bbox="880 252 2018 308">I have two names - my professional name which is Professor Lucy Hooberman and my married name which you will find on the local electoral register which is Lady Lucy Triesman.</p> <p data-bbox="880 344 1032 400">Kind regards<br/>Lucy Triesman</p> |

---

**Total: 6**