

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/4757/P	James Kennedy	26/12/2023 05:42:11	OBJ	<p>I object to the application. In doing so I rely on and adopt the material presented by my fellow local residents and neighbours, in particular the expert planning and noise consultant material that they have submitted. In summary, I object on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In disregard of the requirements of the Camden Local Plan the developer has failed to justify the need for the proposed level of heating/cooling (see Paras 8.41 to 8.43 re minimising internal heat, demonstrating clear need after all preferred measures considered, developer to submit a statement etc; Para 6.99 air conditioning only permitted where a clear need demonstrated after other measures are considered; and Para 8.39 Council to discourage the use of air conditioning and excessive mechanical plant). 2. This is particularly so given the high impact on amenity to the local residents which is obvious given the distances between the plant room and the houses. 3. The report from the developer's noise consultant (Noico) is patently inadequate - both on its face (given the scale of the development) and for the reasons set out in the reports commissioned by local residents. 4. A relevant consideration is the prior history of the development on the site: in the last couple of years heating/cooling plant and equipment has been installed along the edge of the Utopia Village site facing Gloucester Ave (at the bottom of my garden). Following strenuous objection from local residents it was reduced in volume and spread out over several locations and the Council allowed the relevant planning application on the basis of this revision and the proposed mitigation of noise impact - again on the basis of a report produced for the developer by Noico (which, again, at that time the residents maintained was inadequate - based on a report they commissioned). Now that the plant and equipment has been installed at that location this has demonstrated that the noise mitigation is (as the residents predicted) inadequate and the plant can clearly be heard producing a deep droning noise at nighttime. The Council should not make the same mistake twice - and fall for the same assurances it did on the last occasion. The suggested noise mitigation measures need to be examined and tested very thoroughly for this new application. 5. There has been no genuine consultation on this proposal. What's worse, the developer went through a process of consultation in the summer of this year - although it did not present the core of this proposal as part of it. Like others no doubt, I attended the "consultation" and at that time saw no particular point of alarm - but that was because what is now being proposed was not part of the consultation. This failure to consult on what is a very sensitive issue (which some would say is exacerbated by the cynical timing of this application just before Christmas/holidays) has been a pattern of behavior by this developer. Given the history of the site, there is simply no justification for this.
2023/4757/P	Lionel Saph	25/12/2023 09:28:37	OBJ	<p>I object to the plans.</p> <p>It has been clearly shown that the acoustic impact of the proposed installation will be detrimental to nearby residents and others - the air management systems will produce unacceptable levels of low frequency vibration which propagates through solid materials: walls, ground etc; a search for "propagation of low frequency noise" results in many studies on this matter, almost all showing detriment to the environment. This will not only affect immediate residents but will increase the ambient, low level noise pollution for residents over quite some distance. There are many examples of "hums" caused by such equipment; again a search for "the hum" will return many instances.</p> <p>The aesthetic design is inappropriate for the area and will be to the detriment of all in Primrose Hill.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/4757/P	Sue Byrne	22/12/2023 15:55:41	COMMNT	Well well well. Utopia are doing it again - showing one set of plans to residents and then presenting Camden with a different set which, so I understand, affects a different group of local residents. Utopia's repeated protestations of 'getting on with the neighbours' once again rings a bit hollow and their claim 'we've consulted locally' likewise. The aircon units in their grey coffin on the roof opposite our house on Gloucester Avenue are now fully operational. Two nearby neighbours are aware of the constant low hum during working hours. Plus we were told the units would be switched on at 7.00am and, I understand, they come on at 6.00am. More subterfuge. Again there is no independent assessment of the noise transfer from the proposed installation to the neighbours houses and gardens. Clearly the company commissioned to install the units would prepare a favourable report on sound transmission as was the case on the installation affecting Gloucester Avenue. It is on these grounds that I object to the development. Unsightly is one thing but constant hum that starts at dawn is another and to be avoided.
2023/4757/P	R.Blachowska	24/12/2023 12:19:55	OBJ	I would like to object to this planning application on the grounds of the noise that the powerful air-conditioning system will create. This will greatly disturb the local residents.
2023/4757/P	CATHERINE PACE O'SHEA	22/12/2023 16:01:41	OBJ	I wish to register my objection to this application . As I have been busy in the run up to Christmas I have had little time to read the proposal in any detail. While I am no expert in Noise Assesment, there appears to be little or no regard for the negative impact on the local residents. Further detailed information is required on this matter and until then the applcation must be rejected. I am also disappointed that the response time for such an important applicaton is not extended to accomodate the holiday.