

Right of Light Consulting

Suite 6, Webster Court

Websters Way

Rayleigh

Essex SS6 8JQ

TEL 0800 197 4836

FAX 01268 770 988

E-MAIL enquiries@right-of-light.co.uk

WEBSITE www.right-of-light.co.uk

By Email

Kieran Rafferty
27 York Place,
Bournemouth,
Dorset
BH7 6JN

30th May 2012

Dear Mr Rafferty,

Daylight & Sunlight Study

Mixed Use and Student Accommodation Development

Thank you for relaying the feedback from the London Borough of Camden in connection with our Daylight and Sunlight Study dated 7th February 2012. I understand that the principle concerns relate to the impact on No. 1 Hartland Road. The development design has since been amended to address the concerns. The amended design is shown on the following drawings:

110910-A(GA)090B_Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan
110910-A(GA)100D_Proposed Ground Floor Plan
110910-A(GA)105B_Proposed Mezzanine Floor Plan
110910-A(GA)110D_Proposed First Floor Plan
110910-A(GA)120D_Proposed Second Floor Plan
110910-A(GA)130C_Proposed Third Floor Plan
110910-A(GA)140C_Proposed Roof Plan
110910-A(GA)300B_Proposed Section AA'
110910-A(GA)301B_Proposed Section BB'
110910-A(GA)302B_Proposed Section CC'
110910-A(GA)303B_Proposed Section DD'
110910-A(GA)400C_Proposed Chalk Farm Road Elevation
110910-A(GA)401D_Proposed Hartland Road Elevation

I am pleased to comment on the points raised by Camden with reference to the amended design.

Impact on 1st Floor Bedroom Window at No. 1 Hartland Road

I believe the main concern was in connection with the Hotel scheme; and not the Student Accommodation scheme. The design for the Student Accommodation scheme follows almost the same profile as the existing Esso shop; and will not materially affect the bedroom window at No. 1 Hartland Road. Nevertheless, for completeness I will respond to the queries raised as follows.

Mr McDonald from the London Borough of Camden queried whether the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) for the bedroom window (window 76 in our report) would be as low as 24.7% before the Esso site development. I have double checked this and confirm that the figure is accurate. One of the reasons it is not higher than this is because there is a projecting wing (the en suite of No. 1 itself) to the left-hand side, as viewed looking out of the window. I also confirm that the 24.7% also takes into account the Harmood Street development.

Mr McDonald also queried our VSC methodology and requested that for calculation purposes, the Harmood Street development and Esso site should be treated as a single development. I explained that this is not the conventional methodology and that in my opinion the BRE guidelines should be applied separately to each planning unit in the usual way. Notwithstanding the above, the figures requested are as follows:

Before both Harmood Street/Esso	28.7%
After Harmood Street and before Esso	24.7%
After Harmood Street and Esso	21.5%

The before/after ratio pertaining to the Harmood Street development is 0.86 (24.7%/28.7%) and for the Esso site Student Accommodation scheme is 0.87 (21.5%/24.7%). In both cases this is above the recommended 0.8. Whilst I don't agree that the two separate planning units should be assessed as one, if the test was to be applied in this way, the resultant ratio is 0.75 (21.5%/28.7%) – which is only marginally short of the recommended 0.8. In my opinion 0.75 is an acceptable score bearing in mind the urban context of the site. Moreover, the window is already hampered by its own projecting wing. Paragraph 2.2.12 of the BRE guide states that “A larger relative reduction in VSC may also be unavoidable if the existing window has projecting wings on one or both sides of it”.

Impact on 2nd floor terrace at No. 1 Hartland Road

We did not include the 2nd floor terrace at No. 1 Hartland Road in our earlier analysis. This is because the planning drawings for No. 1 Hartland Road show this as a roof with the main amenity area being the ground floor garden. However, I understand that the roof is in practice used as a terrace and accordingly we have worked with the architect to amend the Student Accommodation scheme so that this amenity area meets the minimum recommendation.

The amenity area is 'L' shaped. Helpfully, the BRE guide gives guidance on how to calculate the centre point of an 'L' shaped amenity area which is then used as the reference point for the calculation. The BRE guide recommends that the centre point of each amenity area receives at least 2 hours of sunlight on 21st March. The Student Accommodation scheme gives just over 2 hours of sunlight on the 21st March to the roof terrace. I am of the opinion that this is a satisfactory amount – particularly bearing in mind the urban context of the site and given that the gardens and terraces at the rear of Hartland Road do not benefit from an ideal southerly aspect.

In summary, I am of the opinion that the proposed Student Accommodation Scheme has an acceptable impact on the daylight and sunlight receivable by its neighbouring properties.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Paul', with a stylized, flowing flourish extending from the end.

Paul Andrew Fawell
B.Sc. (Hons) MRICS