

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/2393/L	Dr. Marc Mannatt	18/07/2024 12:06:15	OBJ	<p>18 June 2024 Application 2024-2393-L</p> <p>The Applicants' Camden Council Planning Application 2024/2393/L re "site address 9 Wedderburn Road, London, NW3 5QS" refers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I Object to the following: Camden Council's: "Details Page for Planning Application under "Proposal" states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "pursuant to listed building consent ref 2023/4458/L, comprising installation of bathroom in side extension": <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This creates the erroneous belief that said side extension to which I have obdurately OBJECTED TO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ∩ was approved some time ago – not true: ∩ was already installed some time ago – not true - and 'thus': ∩ is an existing side extension – not true: ∩ that only requires a bathroom to be installed into it – not true. • There is no side extension application within this Application 2024-2393-L. 2. For the record again: I RESOLUTELY OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to any extensions of any type to any part of this building including also not to my Flat 9B Wedderburn Road, Hampstead, London, NW3 5QS: 3. Inter alia my 12 June 2024 Researched Founded Comprehensive 65 page REPLY OBJECTION DOCUMENT THAT INCLUDES NUMEROUS PROOFS and emails to inter alia Camden Council Planning and to the Applicants et al re the applicants' applications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2024-1693-L: • 2024-1033-P: Importantly refers. 4. Extensions to buildings especially Grade II Listed Buildings and Conservation areas such as this: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scar these beautiful buildings: • Are like ugly carbuncles stuck onto these beautiful buildings: • Are ugly appendages on the side of these beautiful buildings: • Completely distract from and destroy the aesthetic beauty of these irreplaceable buildings: • Are entirely unnecessary: • No need for any extension has or can be made: • The applicants and their 'planners' have failed to provide any rationale for an additional bathroom to be inserted into this requested extension attached onto the side of this property: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Proves the applicants have none: • Had the owners (with respect) truly needed 'more space' they very recently had the opportunity to buy a bigger property prior to buying this property: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They did not: • This Proves that the square meterage and layout of this property has already met their requirements: • This property in any event already has commodious proportions: • In which minor internal adjustments can easily be made for a fourth bathroom:

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

- Which in any event is superfluous to requirements given that this property already has 3 good bathrooms:
- An additional bathroom is not a necessity:

5. Again:- I resolutely object to in the main but not limited thereto:

- Any further disturbance of this 3-owner property's foundations:
- Any further damage to this 3-owner property's foundations:
- Any further additions to this 3-owner property's foundations:
- Any further additions to this already large property:
- Any Structural changes thereof or thereto:
- Any extensions thereof:
- Any external pit.

6. The Freehold that belongs to all 3 Freeholders is not for sale:

7. The Freehold Land that belongs to all 3 Freeholders is not for sale:

8. There is thus no land available for the applicants' proposed extension for a 4th and/or 5th bathroom therein:

This Application 2024-2393-L refers:

9. The few important Objections I have made are:

- Not in my sole interest:
- Are in the interest of all 3 owners:
- In the interest of us 3 owners to get Insurers to insure this property.
- Is also in the interest of the applicants:
- Still allows the applicants to enjoy their large spacious well-laid-out flat that already has 3 ensuite bathrooms:
- It is always unwise to over-capitalise on any property.

10. All my Proofs in all my Written and Filed OBJECTIONS to date additionally refer.

11. I Absolutely OBJECT to the 'new bathroom to the side extension'.

12. "Re-opening of historic opening": My OBJECTIONS and COMMENTS in Applications 2024-1693-L and 2024-1033-P refer.

13. I OBJECT to Structural Beam changes unless they are Proven in writing to me to improve the strength and structural integrity of the building as a whole. Anything less is unacceptable.

14. I ABSOLUTELY OBJECT to the proposed position of the KITCHEN VENTILATION GRILL:
This is RIGHT UNDER + NEXT to the MAIN ENTRANCE of BOTH:

- My Dr. Marc Mannatt's '9B Wedderburn' flat: and:
- The owner of the '9A Wedderburn' flat.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

15. Would the Applicants accept same at the entrance of their flat? No.

16. I too do not and will not accept this.

17. The current spacious kitchen is in exactly the correct position where it currently is whereby it efficiently serves all sections of this property:

18. All window replacements must be "LIKE for LIKE" i.t.o GRADE II LISTED BUILDING REQUIREMENTS to these 3 properties as I have done.

19. Precedent is paramount as confirmed by the Supreme Court of Appeal:

20. I do not object to the replacement of the following with new as long as they meet or exceed UK Government Standards + Listed Building Requirements + Conservation Area Requirements for use in these Grade II Listed Buildings:

- Skirting:
- Cornice:
- Flooring:
- New fireproof plasterboard ceiling:
- Bathroom refurbishing (current):
- Kitchen Refurbishing (current):

Yours Faithfully

Dr. Marc Mannatt – Owner of the top-2-Floor Penthouse Flat
