

Respondent Name: Councillor Bob Hare

(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	DM 1 Privacy and amenity (D) (b)	Yes	No	Yes	Development Management Plan Policy DM1: Privacy and amenity (D) (b) Privacy and protection from overlooking. The earlier policy specified distances such as a 20m separation distance between 1st floor habitable room windows, with an additional 10m for each additional floor. I am concerned at the potentially significantly-damaging effect of the *blanket* removal of these distances. I appreciate that the application of these minimum distances to new developments could make it impossible to group taller buildings as part of a wished-for landscape (eg Tottenham Hale Village), and could affect viability. I recognise that such grouping of new taller buildings has a potentially crucial role in helping create a 'good' landscape in which there are areas of different character. However, the blanket removal of	Development Management Plan Policy DM1: Privacy and amenity (D) (b) Privacy and protection from overlooking. I consider that the policies protecting privacy and against overlooking should be re-framed so that distances are again specified where character is of lower-rise. In addition, that there should be specific policy/ies to assist the council as planning authority to define the future landscape of the borough in relation to tall buildings as part of the publicly-defined policy base rather than a site-by-site response to planning applications. The aim of these changes is better planning of the borough's landscapes and character, and policy that is clearer and better understood by both the public and developers.	Yes

Respondent Name: Councillor Bob Hare

(Submitted through online Snap survey)

					<p>these distances could make possible new developments in areas of existing, older housing stock, including in Conservation Areas, that could severely damage character. In potentially allowing tall developments close alongside lower-rise existing housing stock, the policy without distances could work against the aim of grouping taller buildings. It could also work against the aims expressed in other policies that are designed to conserve character, particularly in Conservation Areas. It could be said that the policies are internally-inconsistent.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--