

HCAAC objection to [HGY/2023/1154](#) **41 North Hill, London, N6 4BS**

Construction of new front and side boundary walls and gate

These proposals would be contrary to the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan objective of maintaining the “green and open character of Highgate” (p44), and are not in keeping with HNP Policy DH2.

The proposals are clearly contrary to HNP Policy DH6, points I and III (p57).

In addition, there is no DAS or heritage statement for this application as required.

The proposal to raise the front wall to head height would be unacceptable in policy terms. The high wall in front of 43/45 North Hill is anomalous. Houses north and south of 43/45 and on the opposite side of the street have low front walls, some with railings, apart from one narrow house which opens directly onto the street.

Therefore these proposals are out of keeping with the street scene and as such would cause harm to the Highgate Conservation Area.





Turning the front walls of both 41 and 43/45 into one continuous stretch at the same high level would be uncharacteristically monotonous for this stretch of road. It would be better if the stepped levels of the current wall were retained.



The Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal questions the accuracy of the “1600 renovated 1926” plaque on the front of No 41, but nonetheless says any future alterations should give regard to surviving original features:

4.4.73 The Kingdom Hall of the Jehovah’s Witnesses, is a plain 19<sup>th</sup> Century former chapel. It is followed by no. 35, a Victorian villa, with an unusual double width front bay. Nos. 37 and 39 date from the late 1990s and are on the site of a former builder’s yard. No. 41 has a plaque stating ‘*Built 1690, reconstructed 1920*’. It’s exact date is not known and it now has a typical Mock Tudor appearance. Any future alterations should give regard to surviving original features.



The metal gate shown in “Mulvaney 41 North Hill N6 4BS - Gate Details.pdf” is described as “a salvaged wrought iron antique gate which is in-keeping with the property style”. Its style is inoffensive, but not obviously antique nor related to 1600, 1926, mock Tudor, or any other architectural style of relevance to this house.

Do the current front wall and gate date from the 1926 renovation? If so, they might be more “authentic” in some sense.

It is arguable that the reclaimed metal gate is simply too tall and wide for purpose.

One section of the sidewall is fairly low so security concerns might point to a slight increase in height. However, the current “red engineering bricks” match the low wall on the other side of Nos 37 and 39’s parking area. Replacing this side wall with a different coloured, higher wall would mean it no longer matched the wall on the other side of this open area.



This is yet another application to increase the height of front garden walls to the detriment of the leafy and open character of Highgate Conservation Area. This would be particularly unwelcome in North Hill as it features a very wide variety of buildings of different ages, as documented in The Highgate Society’s leaflet: [North Hill, Highgate](#), also reproduced on a street panel outside The Bull. Further details are given in [NORTHERN HEIGHTS CIRCUIT HIGHGATE NORTH HILL](#).

The proposals in this application would set a very unwelcome precedent for hiding the wide variety of interesting buildings in North Hill behind high walls so they can no longer be seen in the way envisaged above.

The proposed higher front wall would also block the view of the intriguing diamond patterned low wall set about a metre behind the front wall.



For all of the above reasons, Highgate CAAC objects to this application and regards it as potentially setting a very unwelcome precedent for higher front walls in this road.

The application should be refused.