

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on: 28/01/2022 09:10:06
2021/5939/P	Stephen Mangan	27/01/2022 14:39:30	OBJ	<p>We object to this planning application in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>[REDACTED] which will be prominently visible from every single rear window of our house, and of those of our neighbours on this terrace, would ruin our rear outlooks. The proposals are insensitive to the visual character of the area.</p> <p>The incongruous structure would also be visible from Fitzroy Road.</p> <p>Describing the siting of these huge units (almost 6m by 4m!) as "inconspicuous" is laughable. Inconspicuous for the occupiers of Utopia Village, maybe. They will enjoy the benefit of the plant but we will pay all the visual and aural cost.</p> <p>This planning proposal is not fundamentally different to the previously rejected proposal. The re-siting of two smaller units does not ameliorate any of our main concerns.</p> <p>We have not been adequately consulted by the applicants. The only "general consensus" is that these proposals are insensitive, unfair and benefit only the applicants. The fact that they installed these units without bothering to first seek the necessary planning permission gives you all the evidence you need of their attitude to consultation with their neighbours.</p> <p>An independent noise survey (Max Fordham Review) has told us that night-time noise levels from these units would be higher than expected for such a site - our bedroom windows are very close to the proposed units (less than 20m) and two of our bedrooms overlook the proposed site, which would result in exacerbating noise issues. The report raises serious concerns about the methodology used by the Noico noise report commissioned by the applicants, as well as their failure to properly consider noise sensitive locations. The issues raised by the Max Fordham Review have not been addressed by the applicants.</p> <p>Stephen Mangan & Louise Delamere</p>	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5939/P	Christopher McLaverty	27/01/2022 20:15:26	OBJ	<p>My objections regarding this most recent Utopia planning application are based on the likely impact on my residence and back garden which directly overlooks Utopia. My main objections are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is wrong for the developers to assert that the aircon units will be more distant and less conspicuous than before → there is no improvement in terms of visual impact. Many of the aircon units will be closer to a larger group of people and they will be much more conspicuous. 2. It is totally unfair to consolidate all the aircon units for the whole of the Utopia site into two locations. This concentrates the massive amenity impact into two sites. I believe that work proceeded on internal wiring and piping in 2020, before planning permission was obtained for any external work. The developer is now stuck with a bill for internal rewiring and is trying to force neighbours into accepting this inappropriate plan to cut their costs and cover their mistakes and prior avoidance of the due planning process. 3. The damaging impact on outlook is huge: chopping the originally proposed hanger for all of the air con units into two pieces simply makes two slightly smaller but still massive hangars → now seen by even more people in the community 4. The scale and design are out of keeping with the Conservation Area: we strongly support the PHCAAC view that this is all wrong. 5. There has been no consultation with residents → what was done was window dressing/lip service. There has been no direct response to concerns over noise, visual and heat pollution 6. The noise issues → raised in relation to the original proposal → have not been addressed even though the developer's noise consultant has had the report that the residents commissioned for a long time. The Council needs to look at this. Even on the developer's own case the proposal only meets the noise emission target by 1dB, so there is no margin for error → with lots of variables unaccounted for. Out rear gardens are like a narrow canyon. There is a likelihood that any noise will be amplified by the narrow space and high walls. Right now, no one can hear air con units from Utopia because they are small and scattered over a large site. There has been no convincing answer to the likelihood of additional noise pollution. 7. The developer has not explained why they need this massive increase in cooling. Under Camden policy, increased use of aircon of this nature need to be justified. Until the developer explains and shows that it has looked at all the other options to avoid this → which it has not → then it cannot be allowed to proceed. It is possible that industrial scale air con units of this nature will heat the immediate vicinity and create a microclimate that is unsuitable for residents, flowers, plants, and animals

Printed on: 28/01/2022 09:10:06

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5939/P	Sara	27/01/2022 20:22:23	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to this planning application.</p> <p>the back of the house faces directly onto the Utopia Village buildings. This new application does not provide sufficient information to reassure me that the noise, vibration and smells that would emanate from the proposed air con/heating units would be of an acceptable level. The Noico addendum has not addressed the questions and concerns raised in the Max Fordham review. I don't understand why the replacement units need to be so large. The back gardens produce an echo-chamber and I fear the units will produce noise that will reverberate around our garden.</p> <p>No genuine consultation took place with neighbouring property owners. For years we have tried to get Utopia to reduce the amount of night time light pollution and despite many promises and reassurances the problem still persists frequently. Visually the impact for us would be huge - a massive structure on the flat roof opposite our house (6mx4m)</p> <p>I fully support the comments made by The Primrose Hill Conservation Association regarding the negative visual and environmental impact this proposal would have.</p>
