

July 9th, 2026

Mr Parker
Head of Development Planning and Enforcement

Dear Mr Parker,

HGY/2026/0720 - Boundary treatment changes Revised 3/7/2026 to timber fencing above the brick fence for a lighter weight trellis

I write to object to the above revised planning application for the erection of a trellis fence on a boundary wall, resulting in a combined height in excess of 2m.

1. Detriment 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 boundary treatments in Highgate.

The fence would be clearly visible from the street and it would be harmful and would fail to meet the statutory requirement to preserve or enhance the Highgate conservation area.

2. Conflict with Haringey Local Plan – design and amenity

The proposal conflicts with design policies within the Local Plan, which are:

- 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 2-4 m 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 it 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 character and ensuring that development respects the established townscape.

The addition of a trellis fence above an existing high wall is an unsightly boundary and fails to reflect the prevailing character of the area.

4. Loss of light and detrimental impact on neighbouring properties

The proposed erection of a trellis fence on the boundary wall impacts upon the neighbouring dwellings No's 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 North Grove adjoining patio gardens situated at a lower level in common with the lower level at 2 Hampstead Lane. The increased height of the boundary would result in an overbearing structure out of keeping with the neighbouring dwellings when viewed from the North Grove gardens. This would:

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

The attached photographs, taken from a contiguous North Grove garden in July 2025 when an unauthorized 1m fence was constructed, clearly demonstrates the extent of the level difference and the dominating visual impact that the proposed increased boundary height would create. The third photograph illustrates the perimeter wall at the front of 2 Hampstead Lane at the drive. No additional 1 metre fencing is proposed for this perimeter wall, one can clearly see why-it stands at approximately 3 metres above ground level and it would be a monstrous sight to add an additional one metre of fencing to the perimeter wall at the front of the property, so why would a 1 metre trellis fence be required at the rear of the property when by the very nature of the hillside, the perimeter brick wall is already towering higher at approximately 3-4 metres above ground floor level.

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

5. Inaccuracies and Misleading Comparisons contained in the Heritage Statement

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

On page 6, C 3.16, states the wall height is 1.4m, which is misleading, the actual height of this wall should be taken from the patio ground floor of the property which is some 2.3m below the wood decking bridge construction which was used as datum for this measurement (see photographic evidence). The actual wall height at this point is ~3.7m above the ground floor. With the addition of a 1m fence as proposed the perimeter height would be ~4.7m above the ground floor of the property 2 Hampstead Lane which is in common with the ground floor level of the North Grove No's 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 dwellings. The impact of the proposed perimeter height would be materially harmful (see photograph of unauthorized fence towering over North Grove No's 2-12 patio gardens, taken in July 2025).

The Heritage 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 2.5-3 m 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 the neighbouring properties and Hampstead Lane.

6. Further Inaccuracies and Misleading Comparisons contained in the Heritage Statement revised drawings dated 26/6/26 added to Planning Portal 3/7/26

Drawing 03A-existing drawing should include the elevations from the 2 Hampstead Lane property itself and not the Hampstead Lane roadway which is 2-3m higher than the ground floor of the 2 Hampstead Lane property.

Also, Front Elevation South should reference the ground floor of 2 Hampstead Lane, which is 2-3 metres lower than the Hampstead Lane roadway. This drawing misrepresents the proposed changes to the perimeter of the property

Drawing 04A-Rear Elevation North-this drawing is completely erroneous and thus totally misrepresents the proposed changes to the perimeter of the property.

Drawing 05A-this drawing should provide elevations from the 2 Hampstead Lane property itself and not the Hampstead Lane roadway which is 2-3m higher than the ground floor of the 2 Hampstead Lane property. This drawing misrepresents the proposed changes to the perimeter of the property.

Drawing 08A-Site Plan-this drawing importantly misrepresents the layout of the patio garden of the 2 Hampstead Lane property.

Drawing 09A-Roof Plan- this drawing importantly misrepresents the layout of the patio garden of the 2 Hampstead Lane property.

Drawing 010A-Front Elevation (south)- this drawing should include the elevations from the 2 Hampstead Lane property itself and not the Hampstead Lane roadway which is 2-3m higher than the ground floor of the 2 Hampstead Lane property

Drawing 010A-Side Elevation (East)-this drawing should include the ground floor of the 2 Hampstead Lane property and not only floor one and floor two. This drawing misrepresents the impact of the proposed changes to the perimeter of the property and also the impact upon the surrounding neighbouring properties.

Drawing 11A Rear Elevation-this drawing is completely erroneous and it also fails to show the 2 Hampstead Lane property ground floor elevation which misrepresents the impact of the proposed changes to the perimeter of the property and also the impact upon the surrounding neighbouring properties.

Drawing 12A "Proposed" this drawing should illustrate the view on the 2 Hampstead Lane property itself and not the view from the roadway. This view is misrepresentative of the elevations on the 2 Hampstead Lane property itself. Please see photographs (Part I and Part II) attached showing the proposed fence towering above the ground floor of 2 Hampstead Lane patio garden.

Drawing 13A Proposed Location Plan- this drawing importantly misrepresents the layout of the patio garden of the 2 Hampstead Lane property.

Drawing 14A Proposed Location Plan- this drawing importantly misrepresents the layout of the patio garden of the 2 Hampstead Lane property.

In addition, 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 m 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 the permitted height regulations.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

T Howell

PS I also note that the occupants renting Mr Laurence's property who requested the erection of the unauthorised 1 metre high fence in July 2025, have now left the property and new clients have moved in.





