

---

**From:** A Noble  
**Sent:** 02 October 2024 09:09  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Sowray, David  
**Subject:** 2024/3480/P - Light assessment

---

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

## Planning Application - 2024/3480/P

Dear Mr. Wong,

A new document was listed September 27th 2024, on-line, regarding planning application 2024/3480/P , but comments were closed on September 23rd, therefore I am writing in response by email.

The document listed was, Daylight and Sunlight Assessment - 14 Solent Road, NW6 1TU - 25.9.24\_compressed. It clearly highlights a reduction of light to 12 Solent Road and furthers an objection to the proposed plans.

First, it should be pointed out that the report conclusion (4.5.1) completely omits the report's own finding that a living room window at 12 Solent Road will suffer a significant loss of light, as per the Vertical Skylight Component test. *"the rear reception room window, Window 6, does not meet the standard BRE criteria. This window will experience a reduction in its VSC level of 31%, which is more than the 20% threshold at which the Building Research Establishment (BRE) consider the reduction is likely to be significant."*

The report contains other discrepancies:

Section 2.1.1 - this section references a document, 1759 AD-2000 Existing Section AA & BB, that is not available on the Camden Planning Application pages. It is therefore not known what this document contains or whether the contents are accurate. A comment made against this planning application on 22.08.2024, highlights how previous documents have not been accurate.

Section 2.2.1 - The room layout for 12 Solent Road, used for the daylight distribution test cannot be taken as accurate. It is stated that the room layout was found on a website, [www.rightmove.co.uk](http://www.rightmove.co.uk). As the householder, I have no idea where the plans were sourced or who put them there. They are not formally produced nor recognised plans.

Section 4.4.2 - The report highlights that VSC levels for the living room at 12 Solent Road will be significantly reduced, *"All relevant window except one at 12 Solent Road with a requirement for daylight pass the Vertical Sky Component test. Only the rear reception room window, Window 6, does not meet the standard BRE criteria. This window will experience a reduction in its VSC level of 31%, which is more than the 20% threshold at which the Building Research Establishment (BRE) consider the reduction is likely to be SIGNIFICANT."* This statement is clear about the loss of light in one window, but glosses over the loss of light in other windows. Appendix 2 indicates that nearly all windows suffer a loss of light - see next comment.

Appendix 2 - the data in this appendix shows that five of the six windows at 12 Solent Road suffer a reduction of light.

Appendix 4 - the wording is misleading and implies that the projecting wing at 12 Solent is a self-obstruction that either did not originally exist or could be removed. This is not the case. The house was built in the 1800's and the projecting wing is a part of the original design.

Kind regards,  
Anne Noble