
From: Susan Quick [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 April 2024 11:12
To: Planning
Subject: OBJECTION to amended application 2023/4757/P (Utopia Village)

Dear Mr. Campbell,

We strongly object to the proposed Plant Room within amended application 2023/4757/P. We live next to the proposed Plant Room at 1 Egbert St., London, NW18LJ. Our property is identified in the application as one of the properties most affected by this huge increase in noise.

The amended application does not address many of the problems that over one hundred residents mentioned in their objections. The applicant still has denied residents a meaningful consultation process. The amended application still has failed to prove that there will not be a severe loss of amenity to neighbouring residents. The amended application is still lacking in relevant detail and calculations and has not demonstrated that achievement of an appropriate limit can practically be achieved. **Independent sound experts again have confirmed that the application does not provide enough detail to analyse properly and will be impossible to implement within Camden's policies.**

In the independent sound reports on the original plans, experts were all in agreement that the applicant did not provide sufficient information or calculations to verify many of their claims about sound reduction and that many errors were made in their application. Now experts are all in agreement that the amended application still lacks these details and still contains many errors. Even simple distance measurements and exact drawings of the plant rooms either inside or outside are missing. How can the Council possibly verify the applicant's claims without these details, drawings and calculations? All of the experts consulted have opined that this plan cannot work. This plan cannot be approved on the word of the applicant and the company selling the plant equipment. Furthermore, it has not been explained why the applicant chose to get rid of one plant instead of reducing the noise coming out of both plants.

The proposal fails against Policy in multiple areas -
Policy A4 Noise and Vibration

6.88 "The aim within development proposals should be to design out noise prior to proposing mitigation".

6.88 "The effect of noise and vibration can be minimised by separating uses sensitive to noise and vibration from sources that generate them"

This entire plan revolves around the mitigation of very loud noise from many different sources. This is because the applicant insists on putting all noisy equipment at the edge of this large development so that residents suffer and the applicant maximises lettable space.

6.91: "Noise-generating uses and fixed machinery will likely have a greater impact on amenity where the background noise level is lower or in areas where noise sensitive uses such as residential developments co-exist with other uses."

The applicant proposes three 85 dB heat pumps in a small building on the edge of their site, adjoining neighbouring properties rather than (1) operate with a lower thermal load; (2) use less noisy equipment or (3) place it centrally in its site so that any loss of amenity is confined to the site itself

Appendix 3 Table C: The applicant **continues to ignore garden amenity completely**. The application fails to consider garden amenity during daytime hours even though many gardens adjoin the plant room and the closest looks to be less than 2 metres from the inlet. Applicant incorrectly estimates distances to neighbouring homes and gardens and uses distances to windows not gardens in an attempt to show that their (unsubstantiated) noise emission estimates will be within policy limits (although applicant then admits that is unachievable and uses a higher limit than policy allows).

Policy CC2 Climate Change

8.39 "The council will discourage the use of air conditioning and excessive mechanical plant"

There is no proof that Utopia's energy needs are not "excessive". They are certainly very high for a co-working space. Why does the applicant need to run the machinery all night in an office space?

8.42, 8.43 "Active cooling will only be permitted where dynamic thermal modelling demonstrates that there is a clear need for it" Utopia's thermal load for cooling is stated as 415KW. This is very high. No explanation is provided.

8.39: "air conditioning and plant equipment expel heat from a building making the local micro-climate hotter"

The micro-climate is a highly enclosed neighbourhood of high-backed Victorian houses. It is already being seriously affected by climate change.

Additionally, the drawings provided by the applicant are incomplete and do not allow me to assess fully its plans. For example, no inlet/outlet louvre is shown, so I do not know exactly where they are. The shape, size and form of them is also not drawn. I therefore cannot assess the heritage Impact in line with Policy D2 or their potential effect on my own amenity. I can find no detailed drawings of the plant room. None of the drawings include measurements.

These multiple failings against Policy would cause unacceptable harm through loss of amenity to me and my neighbours. There is also insufficient detail of critical design features to allow us to make complete assessment of the plans.

This application should be refused on multiple grounds as it is in violation of many of Camden's policies and even then it will not work as claimed. Three pieces of 85 decibel industrial machinery are completely inappropriate in a peaceful residential area. The application lacks detail to verify any of its claims and no meaningful consultation was conducted. Independent sound experts are all in agreement that it cannot possibly work as the applicant claims. The applicant provides no clear explanation or justification for why such large energy requirements are necessary and its very high thermal power load for cooling in particular. Its proposed attenuation of the noise of the equipment, for which it provides no detailed explanation or technical drawings, is not technically possible and will have a negative effect on the character and appearance on the Conservation Area. Multiple experts have never seen such a project proposed before in such a small space and least of all in a quiet residential area. The applicant refuses to build the plant room in the middle of its own development in order to maximize profits, ignoring the detriment and loss of amenity caused to surrounding residents. This application must be refused.

Thank you for your time and attention to this very important matter,

Susan and Andrew Quick
