

From: jacquelinefogden@btinternet.com
Sent: 18 March 2025 10:28
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application 2025/0034/P Objections

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

Dear Camden Planning Department,

I am writing to lodge and further reiterate my strong objections to the planning application **2025/0034/P** at 30, Solent Road, NW6 1TU, lodged by Mr and Mrs Jenkins.

I am the resident and owner of 28, Solent Road, next door to no 30.

I had already lodged objection to the planning application in emails to you. Last month, Mrs Sophie Jenkins (also known as Pickering) wrote to me to say they were no longer going ahead with the extension. I was very relieved as I had been very anxious about the prospect and I wrote back to her to express my relief.

However, I now see from your website that she has submitted a new application with slightly different aspects. Mrs Jenkins gave me no notification of this. I am shocked and disappointed to see this re-submission.

This application is for a further extension to the already huge, highly disruptive extension, planning application **2021/5082/2021** which has only recently been completed. Mrs Jenkins had consulted me on this and I had not lodged a formal objection.

But having experienced the lengthy disruption to my privacy and the effects on my house structure, reduction of light and view/ aspect, I am **objecting to this renewed planning application**.

I strongly object to the infringement on my party wall. This was initiated by the previous extension without any consultation. I had deployed the surveyor to insist that I retained a fence as opposed to a brick wall which my neighbours wanted but would have considerably reduced space on my side. I was very clear that there should be no building on the party wall. But then they extended the roof so that there is now a merger over the party wall at roof level.

When my previous neighbours and I built our loft extensions, we agreed not to build on the party wall and a gap was left between the lofts.

This gap no longer exists.

It did not seem a coincidence that I experienced water seepage down my chimney breast for the first time after this (and I have lived here since 1980). After much expensive investigation, including drone pictures, I had to pay hundreds of pounds to have a waterproof seal placed over the merger of the roofs as rain water can no longer drop down to the party wall and drain away.

I cannot now not be sure that there will be not be a further impact to the party wall.

I am also concerned by the building proposed on the party wall between no 30 and 32 and the movement of the chimney which are bound to have a reverberation to my house and I object to this. Many small cracks appeared in my house after the previous extension.

The renewed plan states that bricks will be used instead of the existing tiles on the outrigging from the last extension. I assume this is an attempt to make an improved appearance to the present unattractive extension. As the orange bricks used for the kitchen extension are oozing white salts and make no attempt to match the Victorian bricks, Camden's guidance will be further breached.

Apart the strong objections regarding the impact to the structure of my house, I object to my light and view being even further restricted and impaired.

Kind regards,
Jacqueline Fogden



Virus-free. www.avg.com