

---

**From:** Professor Lucy Hooberman [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 December 2023 12:39  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** 2023/4757/P Utopia Village

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 [REDACTED] 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 the Conservation Area designation.

For these reasons, and the many others submitted by local residents, I object to the planned development and request that you refuse the application.

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.

Kind regards  
Professor Lucy Hooberman

--

Lucy Hooberman

*Advanced Practitioner Executive Coaching ( in training), Guildhall Ignite*

*Guildhall School of Music Arts and Drama*

[REDACTED]