

Highgate CAAC objection to [HGY/2023/2687](#) and [HGY/2023/2964](#) for 21 Highpoint 1, North Hill, N6 4BA

Highgate CAAC believes these applications are surprisingly poor given that Highpoint 1 is one of only six Grade 1 listed buildings in Haringey (Highpoint 2 being another), and amongst London's best modernist buildings.

The applications are hard to follow, in part because the drawing "HP block.pdf" is incorrect. There is no framed aperture in the location marked in red. The photos "HP21-1.pdf" and document "HP21-2.pdf" show that Flat 21 is on the opposite side of Highpoint 1, on the NW corner.

Document "HP21-3.pdf" does not give the HGY number of the earlier application which allowed a similar steel mesh to be installed as shown in document "HP21-4.pdf". We assume these were [HGY/2013/1795](#) and [HGY/2013/1797](#).

Ten years ago the case officer permitted those applications, saying that:

*"The proposed safety guarding on the roof would have no additional impact on the appearance of the building and as such would be acceptable, preserving the character of the Listed Building and the wider Conservation Area."*

However that aperture faces away from the main road and is sufficiently far from 57-67 North Road to be barely noticeable from any publicly accessible vantage point.

By contrast, as the photos in "HP21-1.pdf" show, the current applications concern a site which is more visible from the public realm and hence greater thought should be given to its appearance.

It is also notable that the roof aperture facing that mentioned in [HGY/2013/1795](#) and [HGY/2013/1797](#) is not covered in a similar steel mesh, but features less ugly horizontal wires. Hence there is not currently a consistent appearance throughout the building as suggested in document "HP21-3.pdf":



The application site is not part of the roof garden open to all residents and visitors according to the small diagram “7th Floor Plan (part)” in document “HP21-2.pdf”.

This plan does not show any windows but appears to show a door leading to the narrow area next to the aperture. From the photos it seems there is a horizontal band of windows looking out onto the narrow space. The 'aperture' in the external wall allows views through it from the horizontal band of windows. (A full scale plan of Flat 21 would have been helpful.)

One possibility might be to attach a notice on that door saying 'No Entry unless harnesses are worn' and a row of harness points on a rail could be installed on the access side. This would be a light touch solution and not visible from anywhere other than from the row of windows and would be an elegant solution from that viewpoint.

Or perhaps the height of the lower edge of the aperture (560mm or 590mm according to different application documents) could be brought up to the required 1100mm by a removable glass, perspex or similar strip.

HCAAC regrets that a less obtrusive solution has not been found. We believe that other solutions should be considered, given the architectural significance of this building.