



10A South Grove, Highgate, London N6 6BS

To: Haringey Planning Services

Date: 8 May 2026

Dear Mr Parker

HGY/2026/0720 - Boundary treatment changes

We write to object to the above planning application for the erection of a fence on a boundary wall, resulting in a combined height exceeding 2 metres.

1. Harm to the Highgate Conservation Area

The proposed increase in boundary height, through the addition of a fence above the existing wall, would result in a visually dominant feature that is out of keeping with the established character of boundary treatments in Highgate. Traditional boundaries in the area are typically formed by modest-height brick walls, hedging, or visually permeable treatments. The proposal introduces an overly tall and visually intrusive structure that would erode this character.

As the fence would be clearly visible from the public realm, its impact on the street scene would be harmful and would fail to meet the statutory requirement to preserve or enhance the conservation area.

2. Conflict with Haringey Local Plan – design and amenity

The proposal conflicts with design policies within the Local Plan, which require development to:

- Respect the scale, height, and massing of its surroundings
- Respond positively to local context and character
- Avoid creating visually intrusive or overbearing structures

By exceeding 2 metres in height, the combined wall and fence would appear excessive and would introduce an oppressive sense of enclosure, particularly when viewed from the street, and would detract from the visual amenity of the area.

3. Non-compliance with the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan

The proposal is also inconsistent with the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan, which emphasises the importance of preserving local distinctiveness and ensuring that development respects the established townscape.

The addition of a fence above an existing high wall creates a tall and visually impermeable boundary and fails to reflect the prevailing character of the area.

4. Loss of light and overbearing impact on neighbouring properties

A significant material consideration is the impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

Due to the differing ground levels, with adjoining gardens situated at a lower level, the increased height of the boundary would result in a disproportionate and overbearing structure when viewed from neighbouring gardens. This would:

- Materially reduce the amount of natural light reaching neighbouring gardens
- Create a sense of enclosure and overshadowing
- Harm the enjoyment and usability of adjacent outdoor spaces

The attached photographs, taken from a neighbouring garden, clearly demonstrate the extent of the level difference and the dominating visual impact that the proposed increased boundary height would create.

This impact is materially harmful and conflicts with Local Plan policies that seek to protect residential amenity.

5. Inaccuracies and Misleading Comparisons within the Heritage Statement

The Heritage Statement contains inaccurate and misleading comparisons intended to justify the proposed boundary treatment.

On page 6, the statement claims that the proposed perimeter works would be “contiguous” with the adjacent boundary treatment at 1 North Road. However, this comparison fails to acknowledge the significant change in land levels between the properties. The site is located on sloping ground, with levels falling approximately 3 metres from 1 North Road towards 2 Hampstead Lane. As a result, maintaining a continuous perimeter height across these differing ground levels would create an excessively tall and disproportionate structure when viewed from neighbouring properties and the public realm.

Furthermore, page 7 of the Heritage Statement relies on the boundary treatment at 1 North Grove House as a precedent, showing a photograph of continuous vertical overlapping boarding above a public seating area. However, this example is misleading. The original fencing at 1 North Grove House was constructed at a height exceeding 2 metres and was subsequently subject to objections made to Haringey Council. Following those objections, the height of the overlapping boarding was reduced in order to comply with permitted height regulations.

Accordingly, the examples cited by the applicant cannot reasonably be relied upon as an appropriate or accepted precedent for the current proposal.

For the reasons set out above, we respectfully request that the application be refused.

Yours sincerely

Liz Morris
Co-chair Highgate Society Planning Committee

Disclaimer: The Highgate Society is an unincorporated association established for the public benefit. It endeavours to ensure that the information it provides as a free service is correct, but does not warrant that it is accurate or complete. Nothing in its correspondence, or discussed verbally at any time with representatives of its Planning Group, constitutes professional or legal advice and may not be relied on as such.