

SUMMARY PROOF OF EVIDENCE OF JEROME J WEBB MRICS

PUBLIC INQUIRY
APPEAL REFERENCE:
APP/X5210/A/14/2218243
APP/X5210/E/14/2218267

29 New End, Hampstead

Prepared by: GIA

Reference: 4632

Date: 31 October 2014



CONTENTS PAGE

CLIENT:	Bravo Investment House Limited
Issue Date:	31 October 2014
DOCUMENT REFERENCES:	4632-jw-1031-aah(Summary Proof of Evidence)
AUTHOR FOR AND BEHALF OF GIA:	JEROME WEBB
Authorisation for GIA:	Jevone Mulle

This report is intended solely for Bravo Investment House Limited and may contain confidential information. The Liability of this Report extends to Bravo Investment House Limited and their duly appointed advisors. No part or whole of its contents may be disclosed to or relied upon by any Third Parties without the consent of this Practice. This report is accurate as at the date of publication but does not take into account anything that has happened since the date of this report.



CONTENTS		Page
1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	SCOPE OF THIS REPORT	2
3.0	SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS	3
4.0	STATEMENT OF TRUTH	3



1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 My name is Jerome John Webb. I am a member of the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors and have been in practice for over 16 years. I joined Gordon Ingram Associates of The Whitehouse, Belvedere Road, London SE1 8GA, in January 2000 and became a Partner in the practice in 2004.
- **1.2** Gordon Ingram Associates specialise in daylight and sunlight issues and allied subjects. I have personally dealt with hundreds of cases over the last 14 years, specifically in the areas of daylight and sunlight for local residents, local authorities and developers.
- 1.3 I specialise in dealing with Daylight and Sunlight and have given numerous seminars and presentations on the subject, as well as appearing as an expert witness at numerous Public Inquires and hearings.
- 1.4 I appear at this Inquiry on behalf of the appellants to address and provide evidence in connection with Daylight and Sunlight.
- As set out in the Statement of Common Ground at paragraphs 5.23 and 5.24, it is concluded, having regard to the Council's' own professional advice, that the Appeal Scheme is acceptable in daylight and sunlight terms. However, the Rule 6 parties have raised questions which I have addressed in this proof of evidence.
- 1.6 In order to assess this issue I have reviewed and explained the BRE Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing methodology and demonstrated the difference in impact between the existing and proposed situations by way of the standard BRE tabulated analysis.

1



2.0 SCOPE OF THIS PROOF

- 2.1 This Proof of Evidence looks at daylight and sunlight impacts to adjoining residential habitable rooms and their windows by reference to the methodology and guidelines set out within the BRE guide 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A Guide to Good Practice (2011)'
- 2.2 In this proof I therefore consider and review the following:
 - 1. The BRE Guidelines (2011) 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A Guide to Good Practice'.
 - 2. The Planning Officer's Report to committee.
 - 3. The Reasons for Refusal.
 - 4. The Statement of Common Ground.
 - 5. Matters raised within the Statements of Case by the Rule 6 Party to the extent that they are relevant to an analysis of the Daylight and Sunlight impacts of the Appeal Scheme.
 - 6. A review of the technical analysis undertaken in terms of the impact upon the existing levels of Daylight and Sunlight from the Appeal Scheme on the surrounding properties.
- **2.3** From here I will draw my conclusions.
- 2.4 This Proof is supported by a number of documents, drawings and tabulated results which are all enclosed within the Appendices as listed on the Contents Page at the beginning of this Proof.



3.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.1 A detailed technical assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken in accordance with the BRE Guidelines and methodologies in respect of Daylight and Sunlight for the appeal scheme and its impact on the existing surrounding properties.
- 3.2 This has clearly demonstrated that there will be no impact to the existing residential properties. Full BRE compliance is demonstrated and there will be no noticeable change in daylight or sunlight.
- 3.3 The Local Authority's planning department, after very detailed and careful consideration, concluded that "The new building will not seriously harm neighbour amenity in terms of outlook, light, privacy or noise".
- **3.4** Daylight and Sunlight was not given as a reason for refusal of planning permission by the Local Authority's planning committee.
- 3.5 The Statement of Common Ground entered into with the Local Authority states at paragraphs 5.23 and 5.24, that "a comprehensive daylight and sunlight study was submitted" and that "it is agreed that the appeal proposals are acceptable in this regard".
- 3.6 The local residents have submitted a report on daylight and sunlight prepared by Mr Mark Behan. This however, contains errors and mistakes. I have demonstrated that each of the points of concern that he raises lack substance and can be dismissed.
- 3.7 This scheme has been designed to ensure there will be no impact on the daylight, sunlight and overshadowing of the neighbouring properties from the outset as it was always appreciated how important and sensitive the neighbours around this site are.
- 3.8 As such I have demonstrated that this proposal will not give rise to any noticeable change in daylight, sunlight or overshadowing to the existing adjoining properties and that the BRE guidelines are fully met.

4.0 STATEMENT OF TRUTH

4.1 The evidence which I have prepared and provide for this Appeal Reference APP/X5210/A/14/2218243 and APP/X5210/E/14/2218267 (in this Proof of Evidence, Written Statement or Report) is true and has been prepared and is giving in accordance with the guidance of my professional institution and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.

The Whitehouse Belvedere Road London SE1 8GA T 020 7202 1400 F 020 7202 1401 mail@gia.uk.com www.gia.uk.com