

Respondent Name: Dr Chris Williams

(Submitted through online Snap survey)

Document	Policy/Para number	Legally compliant?	Sound?	Complies with DtC?	Please give further comments.	Please set out suggested changes	Do you wish to attend the oral examination?
DM DPD	DM1 Section D paragraph b DM7 B a, b	Not specified	No	No	I consider the Policy on Privacy and Overlooking to be unsound for the following reasons: 1) It is too vague and reliant on the variable subjective responses of individual planning officers. It will therefore lead to inconsistency in decision-making, and undermine the community's confidence in the planning process. 2) Site cramming and excessive density will result if no prescriptive separation distances are included. This is evidenced by the Connaught House development (HGY/2014/1973 & HGY/2015/1956), which has a density of 305 hr/ha 3) Planning approval will be given for developments which do not comply with separation distances as previously included in Haringey's Housing SPD (revoked November 2014) and in the Draft Development Management DPD (February	Policy DM3 of the Draft Development Management DPD (February 2015) should be reinstated, in order to ensure that the Policy on Privacy and Overlooking is clear and can be applied with consistency. Policy DM1 Section D b should therefore be revised as follows: All dwellings should provide a reasonable amount of privacy to their residents and neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents and the residents of the development, including a distance of no less than 20m between facing 1st floor habitable room windows of neighbouring homes. New homes should be designed so they and neighbouring existing homes have 1st floor (2nd storey) windows to habitable rooms that do not face windows of habitable rooms of another dwelling that is less than 20m away. Care should be taken to avoid	No

Respondent Name: Dr Chris Williams

(Submitted through online Snap survey)

				<p>2015). This is evidenced by the Connaught House development, where a four-storey block of flats comes within 16m of an adjacent two-storey house (HGY/2014/1973). 4) Angled windows and obscure glazing are an unacceptable alternative to a robust and clear policy on separation distances. See planning inspector's report HGY/2005/0979 5) Policy DM3 in the Draft Development DPD was withdrawn following responses of six planning consultants/agents on behalf of developers. I do not consider the decision to drop this policy is sound:- a) It does not reflect the wishes of the local community: almost 90% of respondents and more than 99.5% of those consulted had no objection. Its exclusion at the behest of a few developers conflicts with the stated policy in the Local Plan that people should be put at the heart of change. b) No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that development is undeliverable with a prescriptive distances policy.</p>	<p>any ground floor windows being overlooked although there will normally be natural screening (garden walls and fences) that mean this is not possible. There should be an additional 10m for each additional floor; a minimum of 30m between a 2nd floor window and any window that could be overlooked on the ground, 1st or 2nd floor, 40m between a 3rd floor window and any window that could be overlooked on the ground, 1st, 2nd or 3rd floor and so on, up to a separation of 60m (no greater separation is considered necessary).</p> <p>The following should be added to make the policy sound, in order to avoid inconsistency in planning decisions: "New buildings on backlands and infill sites should be no taller than surrounding adjacent properties"</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Respondent Name: Dr Chris Williams

(Submitted through online Snap survey)

					This policy is too vague and will lead to subjective and inconsistent decision-making by individual officers, thus undermining public confidence in the planning process.		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--