

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/2679
Type	Full planning permission
Location	Flat 7, 345, Wightman Road, London, N8 0NA
Proposal	Proposed metal fire escape stairs to the rear garden. with tilt and turn window to flat 7.
Case Officer	Oskar Gregersen
Valid Date	23/09/2022
Applicant	Mr Abraham Margalit
Agent	Mr Abraham Friedrich

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

REPRESENTATIONS

Zero representations were received in response to notification and publicity of the application.

The following issues were raised by neighbours, local groups and Councillors:

- No responses

REASONS FOR REFUSING PERMISSION

The subject site is a two-storey residential property, sub-divided as 7 flats, ratified by appeal decision. The site is not located within any conservation area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

The planning history of the site has been taken into account when coming to this decision.

The proposal seeks the installation of a tilt-turn window, with a fire escape positioned on the rear of the outrigger heading into the garden. There would be a fenced path to the proposed fire escape in an attempt to limit any use of the roof of the outrigger as a de-facto balcony space.

The proposed fire escape would be of steel construction, and the drawings show that there would be a railing that would allow light to still pass through, in an attempt to lessen overshadowing of neighbouring gardens and windows.

Given its height, overscale and siting the proposal would have an incongruous and obtrusive appearance when view from neighbouring rear gardens, appearing out of keeping with the pattern of development in the area and armful to local visual amenity.

The proposal is deemed unacceptable, as the impact on the amenity of 343 Wightman Road would be too great with respect to overbearing relationship and the creation of a sense of enclosure. The position to the rear of the outrigger would also allow overlooking into neighbouring properties and their gardens. Any attempt to screen the proposed

structure would only exacerbate concerns regarding its appearance and overbearing relationship.

The LPA notes that with the application, it would be preferable to submit a fire risk assessment, showing supporting evidence for the rationale behind the need for a fire escape, alongside technical specifications for the proposed fire escape. Additionally, the Haringey Standards for HMO's refers to the LACORS Fire safety guidance, which states (on external fire escapes as secondary exits) 'Typically a secondary means of escape will comprise an external staircase down the rear or side of the building. In some situations, this may prove impracticable, and as an alternative, a secondary means of escape could be achieved by creating a door through a separating wall'.

The LPA would like to highlight appeal decision APP/Y5420/W/19/3237672, which included the erection of a metal fire escape, wherein the inspector agreed with the LPA's concerns regarding the impact of the structure on neighbouring and visual amenity.

The proposed development is in general accordance with Policies DM1, and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017, and policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017. The proposed development also accords with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Reasons for refusal are set out below.

REFUSE permission

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed structure would by reason of its design, height, over-all scale and location, have an obtrusive and overbearing appearance and would allow an unacceptable degree of overlooking of adjoining properties and their gardens, and is therefore deemed detrimental to neighbouring amenity, contrary to DM Policy DM1, Local Plan Policy SP11, and London Plan Policy D6.

The proposed structure would by reason of its design, height, over-all scale and location, have an obtrusive and incongruous appearance, out of keeping with the pattern of development in the area and detrimental to local visual amenity and character, contrary to Policy DM1 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPDs and London Plan Policy D6.