

RRP/SJD/11/12/1480

APPRAISAL OF SUNLIGHT AND DAYLIGHT ISSUES
IN RESPECT OF PLANNING MATTERS

AT

**CRAVEN HOUSE
121 KINGSWAY
LONDON WC2**

R R Paice & Co
Building Surveying Consultants & Project Managers
20 Gloucester Court
Swan Street
London SE1 1DQ

Tel: 0207 403 9529
Fax: 0207 403 9544

October 2011

1.0 INSTRUCTION

- 1.1 We are instructed by Barr Gazetas on behalf of Schroders with regard to the planning application for the proposal to infill the lightwell to the north side of the property where it adjoins Aviation House, 125 Kingsway, London, WC2. We are asked to assess planning issues in respect of sunlight and daylight matters.
- 1.2 In conjunction with Barr Gazetas we have reviewed drawing details in particular drawing No. 1108/20.252 where we have been provided with details of the infill design of the lightwell with elevations and plans and the position of the adjoining building. We have undertaken an inspection of the lightwell areas of Craven House and a number of assessments have had to be made with regard to the adjoining building at present.
- 1.3 The calculations used to assess daylight and sunlight issues are in accordance with BRE Guidance 209 and we confirm that we are not requested to run full sunlight and daylight programmes.

2.0 ASSESSMENTS

Generally

- 2.1 The two windows to the south elevation of Aviation House, 125 Kingsway at first and second floor levels, both have a glazed area of 3.84 sqm. Approximately 2.72 sqm of each these two windows directly face the north wall of Craven House where the distance between the two buildings is 1.8m.
- 2.2 The remaining sections of the windows are opposite the north facing wall of the lightwell where this distance will reduce to 4,090m with the infill works. It was also noted that both windows are double glazed units having a slight brown tint to the glass.
- 2.3 Some assumptions have had to be made in respect of the room areas that enclose on to these windows in the adjoining building. The office at first floor level appears to be used as a print/photocopying and at second floor level for filing. Both rooms are assumed at approximately the same size of 6.0 x 3.4m.
- 2.4 The sectional drawing shows that the lightwell will be enclosed up to roof level resulting in three upper floors above the second floor window of the adjoining building, which represents a height increase of approximately 8.7m.

3.0 SUNLIGHT AND DAYLIGHT

- 3.1 We have assumed that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) are implementing policy EN8 as set out below:-

a) The LPA will ensure that both new and replacement accommodation particularly residential receives adequate daylight and sunlight. The LPA seek improvements where opportunities arise particularly in cases where the existing conditions are sub-standard.

b) The LPA will normally resist proposals which result in the material loss of daylight/sunlight particularly to existing residential dwellings and educational buildings. In cases where the resulting level is acceptable permission will be refused.

c) Development will not result in any significant increase in the sense of enclosure or overlooking or causing unacceptable overshadowing particularly on gardens, public open space or adjoining buildings where in residential public use.

4.0 DAYLIGHT

4.1 The BRE Guide sets out the criteria in assessing the effects of the proposal on the existing built environment. The first is that if the proposal subtends an angle less than 25 degrees from a point on the adjoining window wall 2m above ground level no further consideration is necessary as there will be adequate potential for good natural light to the adjoining buildings. Where the proposal subtends an angle greater than 25 degrees then more demanding calculations must be carried out to establish the nature of the effects.

4.2 The Guide recommends that points along the affected wall should have or be within 4m of a point that has a vertical sky component (VSC of 27%) and where there is to be a reduction in vertical sky components, that if this reduction leaves 0.8 times or better of the original value then the occupants are unlikely to notice any diminution in natural light. The vertical sky component is the area of the dome of sky visible from the window plain. The maximum value obtaining at a flat window in a vertical wall is 40%.

4.3 In considering the situation both office in the adjoining building loose light to the east side due to the close proximity of Craven House. At present the first floor office area receives light across an area of approximately 10.76 sqm and at second floor level over an area of 12.26 sqm.

4.4 From our calculation daylight into the office area at first floor level will be reduced by approximately 20% and by 15% at second floor level.

5.0 SUNLIGHT

5.1 Without detailed calculations we are not able to fully assess the amount of sunlight into these two office areas, we consider that it is minimal in the summer months given the space and positioning of the two buildings and it is unlikely that either area receives any direct sunlight during spring, autumn or winter. In our view the proposed infill of the lightwell will have little or no affect in this respect.

6.0 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 Compliance with the BRE Guide is not a planning criteria and the forward to the Guide is careful to make this point. The numerical values have to be interpreted carefully and not slavishly. In urban areas, where development is tighter, the criteria sought by the Guide is often unobtainable if the normal density and street scene of the locality is to be maintained while in rural areas it is more extensive, the values of the Guide might be seen as being too dense and crowded. Values in respect of the subject site need to be seen in context of a highly and densely developed part of Central London.
- 6.2 In planning terms it is evident that there is a loss of daylight into these offices, however, as we consider these to be secondary areas plus the fact that the windows are tinted does mean that the effect from the proposed infill will generally be minor. On balance, therefore, we contend that the proposals are not unneighbourly and therefore conform with the LPA policies and do not cause any unacceptable loss of amenity to the adjoining building.