

Respondent Name: Michael Johns

(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	2.3 & 2.48	Not specified	No	Not specified	I wish to comment on changes made to the draft plan which was the subject of consultation last year. The draft policy prescribed separation distances for a new development of at least 20m at first floor level for facing habitable rooms, with an additional 10m for each additional floor. This provision is no longer included in the pre-submission version. The evidence behind this withdrawal is not stated. It seems to me clear that some such restriction is required to protect the privacy and amenity of neighbours. It may be argued that the general provision in DM1 to relate positively to their locality having regard to building heights and form, scale and massing prevailing round the site suffices, but this leaves a wide scope to subjective judgement. With the best will in the world, planning	In para 2.3 add at the end "Among other things, this requires a separation distance for a new development of at least 20m at first floor level for facing habitable rooms, with an additional 10m for each additional floor" In para 2.48 add at the end "Building heights should be subordinate to surrounding properties"	No

Respondent Name: Michael Johns

(Submitted through online Snap survey)

				<p>officers and committees may find it difficult to defend any particular proposal against attempts by developers with a financial interest in cramming buildings together as tightly as possible unless there is an objective criterion for judging the issue. To provide evidence in support of my comment, the planning application to redevelop Connaught House off Connaught Gardens N10 (HGY/2014/1973) was approved even though the new four storey block of flats is less than 20 metres from neighbouring properties. The building is now being constructed and it is already apparent that this is a substantial reduction in amenity for neighbours. In my view, this experience shows that the only satisfactory strategy to ensure that overcrowding does not occur is to prescribe general limits on separation distances. For the same reason I believe that DM7, the proposed backlands policy should include a specific provision that building</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Respondent Name: Michael Johns

(Submitted through online Snap survey)

					heights should be subordinate to surrounding properties on the lines of previous policies. In small infill developments there needs to be a strong control on height to prevent developments overshadowing local properties, with Connaught House being an example where the absence of such controls has led to an oppressive loss of amenity to neighbours.		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--