



Emily Cochrane  
JLL  
30 Warwick Street  
London  
W1B 5NH

27 April 2015

Dear Emily,

**Re: The proposed UCLH Phase Five development at Huntley Street and Daylight and Sunlight**

I write in relation to our recent conversations and in particular those comments raised by the planning officer in connection to the Daylight and Sunlight report issued by Point 2 Surveyors dated February 2015. In addition consideration has been given to those comments made by the Gordon Mansions Residents Association and in particular their points made on page 5 and 6 of the objection letter.

It is understood that the Case Officer has requested for the detailed Daylight results be supplied in a certain format in order to compare the effects of the FAAP as well as the proposed scheme against the existing daylight conditions. Attached to this letter is a series of spreadsheets identifying the extent of both the VSC and NSL results for each of the neighbouring properties, which have a residential component and face the development site. For ease of reference the existing VSC for each of the windows overlooking the development site have been considered along with the changes to the VSC as a result of the FAAP massing in the first instance and separately the effects of the proposed scheme when compared to the existing condition. The NSL results have been assembled in the same format for ease of reference.

I believe that clarity on paragraph 6.3 within the Daylight and Sunlight report dated February 2015 is required. For ease of reference I have included this paragraph as identified below;

*“When compared to the true existing buildings which are located on the site today against the scheme proposal, the VSC method of assessment indicates that 30% (55 out of 184 windows tested) achieve BRE compliance. However, the assessment which includes the baseline of the FAAP massing will highlight a compliance rate of 80% (147 out of 184 windows). The remaining 20% of the windows (37 out of the 184) will fall within the 20%-29.9% loss range where the BRE suggest that a loss of up to 20% will not be noticed by the occupants.”*

The final sentence refers to a consideration of the FAAP results. That is to say that 20% of the windows assessed in relation to the FAAP massing will not achieve BRE compliance, albeit that these 37 windows will fall within 10% of the permissible 20% change (20-29.9% range) that the BRE suggest would deem acceptable.



Under the discipline of Daylight and Sunlight, the Gordon Mansions Residents Association objection letter can be summarized as below;

- There is a disagreement with the Daylight and Sunlight approach, which includes the FAAP guideline massing;
- Confirmation of specific windows located within Gordon mansions, including those on the basement level which have been identified as non-habitable (Appendix Spreadsheets).

I am not able to comment on the other points made by Gordon Mansions as ultimately these relate to specific opinions reached in connection to reading the Daylight and Sunlight report. Whilst there is a general frustration as to the levels of light loss that will be recorded as a results of the successful implementation of the proposed scheme, in reality these light changes would be in line with the BRE guidelines – based on the FAAP massing height and extent.

The Daylight and Sunlight report goes some way to explain the changes in light produced by the scheme when compared to the existing buildings located on the site, as well as the effects of the scheme when compared to the FAAP massing. The FAAP massing is a reasonable baseline condition for comparison as the street scape is clearly broken by the existing site buildings.

Specifics made as to the location of non-habitable rooms on the lower levels within Gordon Mansions were captured within the spreadsheet detailed albeit that the overarching conclusions reached within the Daylight and Sunlight report include these windows as serving habitable rooms spaces i.e. these have been included irrespective of the incorrect identification. Access into Gordon Mansions was not possible ahead of the planning application although every window facing the development site was recorded in its true position form the measured survey. This approach would not be uncommon as access would be required into all flats rather than just a handful.

I trust that this addresses those points recently raised.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Justin Bolton', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

**Justin Bolton**

Director

For Point 2 Surveyors Ltd

[justin.bolton@point2surveyors.com](mailto:justin.bolton@point2surveyors.com)

