

HGY/2026/1759: 41 North Hill

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objects to this application in the strongest possible terms as set out below.

‘1630’

The Heritage Statement gives credence to the plaque on the front of the building which claims the building was built in 1630. No evidence to support this date is provided for an earlier building having been on the site. We know this date does not relate to the existing building or any part of it. Prickett’s map (1842 – Figure 2) is the earliest map provided by the Heritage Consultant. Paragraph 2.4.3 gives an accurate summary of the existing buildings on the site from that date, namely, three of the four cottages, though somewhat altered. are extant. It is the case that a 19th century building was extended at the front in the 1930’s when the rather unfortunate timber framing was applied at first floor level. The building was at one time occupied by a builder’s merchants which, we surmise, might explain the shopfront appearance of the ground floor.

Decision makers must be made aware that there is no evidence that the existing building or any part of it dates from 1630.

Heritage Statement

The Heritage Statement is 56 pages long. The assessment of the setting of the listed buildings nos 43 – 57, which the listing states forms a group, are ‘scoped out’ at para 3.2.4 and that the impact of 43/35 is all that is necessary. The Statement also comes to the opinion that neither the group nor even 43/45 need to be assessed because they cannot be seen as there are large mature street trees which prevent any of them being seen. It is our view that, firstly, the impact of the proposed alterations to no. 41 on the listed group has to be considered; and the large trees have no bearing on assessing the impact on the heritage assets including the Highgate Conservation Area. Finally, at 3.4.12 the Group are scoped in but the assessment suggests there would be no harm to the setting of the listed group. HCAAC considers the proposal would cause harm to the setting of no. 43 and to the listed group for the reasons set out below.



Nos 43 – 57 North Hill, seen on the right of this image are those which are listed as a group. An extra storey to no. 41 would visually close the gap between 39 and the listed group thus

diminishing appreciation as the historic group. The photo below also illustrates the harm to the setting of no. 43/45 if an additional storey were permitted.



This photo is useful to illustrate the harm to the setting of no. 43; the existing boundary condition between 41 and 43/45; the considerable reduction in daylight received most particularly in the rear bedroom of 43/45 as a result of both the proposed additional storey and the proposed steeper pitch to the historic part of no. 41 at the rear; and the impact of a continuous glazed passage built off the boundary garden wall which would be intolerable light pollution in several of the rooms in 43/45 and in its small but exquisite courtyard garden.



Architectural concept and design

- Concept: HCAAC regrets disagreeing with Haringey Conservation and Planning Officers if they did indeed suggest that a 'Townhouse' over three floors would provide a suitable model for this location. At the moment there is a visual gap between the listed group 43/45 to 57 and the later group to the south. It therefore follows that filling the gap with a 3 storey building would eliminate the setting of listed 43/45 – 57 as a listed group. This concept causes harm to the setting of 43/45, the listed group and Highgate Conservation Area.
- Architectural design: even if a 3 storey 'Townhouse' were an acceptable model, HCAAC considers the design would be unacceptable. The new front elevation consists of different treatments at each floor level leading to incoherence in architectural design. That having been

said for all the reasons set out above the proposal fails to meet the required standards for daylight/sunlight at 43/45 North Hill, would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbour and create unacceptable and unneighbourly light pollution in various rooms and in the small rear courtyard.



Above and below: View from one of the bedrooms in 43/45 North Hill:
Impact on setting and reduction in daylight



The scale, bulk and massing of the Applicants' proposals would cause harm to the heritage assets including the Conservation Area. Therefore, for all the reasons set out above Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee is of the firm opinion that this application must be refused.

