

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/0989/P	Andrei Rozhdov	19 Highfields Grove	04/04/2016 16:04:08	OBJ	<p>I would oppose the proposal for the following reasons.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the previously approved Application 2015/4772/P are not of a small scale as declared.</p> <p>New double glazed doors will change the look of No 20 to the asymmetrical and will effectively put the house in contrast to the other houses in Highfields Grove changing for worse its unified look and architectural idea. This change will be visible and cannot be welcomed.</p> <p>It as well applies to the proposed removal of chimney.</p> <p>I would like to draw LPA attention to architectural design of Highfields Grove, which provides clever house spacing and gaps in brick walls. Even low built separating walls have some railings to give “see through” feeling.</p> <p>Raising the section of the infill between garage and main building will make this new wall quite visible thus further blocking the view and will create a “sunken” and claustrophobic feeling to the neighbouring No 19, which is located on lower to No 20 level.</p> <p>Taking up a part of forecourt to create bin storage covered by tiled roof will reduce the visible space and again will negatively affect the amenity for No 19 as the passage up the steps to Highfields Grove level will then be felt like rising from a canyon.</p> <p>Altogether, the proposed changes will not enhance the amenity of both Highfields Grove and Conservation area and they will cause stress and annoyance to the neighbour.</p> <p>I would also take the liberty to mention that the creeping nature of gradually asking for more and more (especially when using well-known firm of architects who undoubtedly know their onions and do not need to change design once so often) seems odd and suspicious indicating certain strategy for achieving yet unknown target.</p>

---