



Adam Silverman
Planning Services Development Management,
Haringey Council,
River Park House,
225 High Road,
London N22 8HQ

By email.

Date: 03.08.2026

Dear Mr. Silverman

Planning Application HGY/2026/1759

Site: 41 North Hill London N6

I am writing on behalf of the Highgate Society to strongly object to the planning application for 41 North Hill London N6. The Society's objection mainly relates to the impact of the proposal on the adjoining properties, 47 North Hill and, in particular, 43/45 North Hill. The reasons for the objection are as follows:

1. Impact on nos. 43/45 North Hill

The proposal has a major impact on the gardens and rear elevation of no 43 and 45 North Hill. From the notes from Professor Usborne on the Pre Application conclusions, submitted to support her objection, the acceptability of the principle of the development, seems to have been the main conclusion. This omits to assess the impact on the adjoining properties

The Society considers this impact a major reason for refusal of this application. The addition of approximately 3.5m on the height of no. 41, thus increasing the building from 2 to 3 storeys with a flank wall approximately 1m away from the boundary of 43 and 45, severely restricts the outlook from 43 and 45 thus creating a sense of enclosure.. This is illustrated clearly in the images submitted with the objections from the Highgate CAAC and Claudia Zorbis.

Although views do not form part of the planning process, in an urban setting such as this, particularly one in a conservation area, it is essential, any development with the potential to cause damage to a neighbour's amenity is carefully examined

The building line of North Hill is extremely variable with houses being set towards the street, in the middle and well to the rear, as is the case with no 41. This leads to an unusual configuration between no. 41 and nos. 43/45 in that no. 41 is set well back from the building line with a large front garden. Rather than flank walls adjoining and additional storeys having a lesser impact on adjoining properties In this case, being set due south and west directly adjoining the small rear garden of 43/45, the provision of an additional floor has a far greater impact on the amenity of the garden and the rear of the houses at 43/45/. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that the rear gardens of nos. 43 and 45 are very small and triangular in form

There is currently one new window in the flank wall of the new extension at 2nd floor level.. This will cause overlooking, not only of the rear gardens of 41/43 and 47 but also the rear windows of the respective houses.

2. Harm to Heritage Assets

Linked to this is the impact of the setting of Heritage Assets In this case both the Haringey Highgate Conservation Area and the statutorily Listed adjoining properties constitute designated Heritage Assets. Under NPPF Chapter 16, Conserving and enhancing the historic environment, Clause 215 states:

“Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use”

Although it is acknowledged this development causes “less than substantial harm”, this not offset by any public benefit and therefore this application should be refused on the basis of causing harm to a heritage asset

3. Listed Building Application.

The Heritage Statement produced by HEA states, in the first paragraph of the Introduction section of the Executive Summary states: *“Planning permission and listed building consent are being sought for a roof extension to the building at 41 North Hill N6 4BS. This is an unlisted building located within the Highgate Conservation Area and the setting of a number of listed buildings.”* However, there is no evidence of any listed building submission to accompany this planning application.

The subject application includes a glazed side extension built off the boundary wall with no 43/45 for the length of flank wall of 41. Bearing in mind this wall is either totally or partially owned by no 43/45, this forms part of its curtilage and is thus covered by the listing. Any work to this should be subject to Listed Building Consent which should be assessed concurrently with the Planning Application with full details of the materiality and construction of this extension .

4. Sunlighting and daylighting.

Although sunlight studies have been submitted with the application, there are no verified daylight and sunlight calculations to support these in accordance with BRE and other guidance. However, the submitted sketches do appear to show a considerable reduction in the amount of sunlight reaching the garden and ground, first and second floor windows on the rear elevation of 43/45 particularly at Equinox This is required to enable an accurate assessment to be made of the scale of loss of daylight and sunlight

5. Lack of detail

The information submitted is not sufficient to make an informed decision on this application. In particular, the glazed corridor on the boundary wall with no 43/45 is only shown in diagrammatic form. This and sections and rear elevations showing the full impact, included relative levels, should be submitted with this application.

6. Conclusion

For the above reasons, the Society objects to the application in its current form and ask the Council either to refuse the application or require further clarification and amendments before any permission is granted. Thank you for considering our comments.

Yours sincerely,

Elspeth Clements
For and on behalf of
The 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 this correspondence constitutes professional or legal advice and may not be relied on as such. In no event will the Society be liable for any loss or damage including without limitation indirect or consequential loss or damage or any damage whatsoever arising from any objections criticism advice and information it provides.