



By Email

H Manley Esq  
DP9  
100 Pall Mall  
London  
SW1Y 5NQ

DATE / REF

09/12/2015  
AH/7988

ADDRESS

THE WHITEHOUSE  
BELVEDERE ROAD  
LONDON SE1 8GA

CONTACT

TEL 020 7202 1400  
FAX 020 7202 1401  
MAIL@GIA.UK.COM  
WWW.GIA.UK.COM

Dear Harry

Re: Templar House – Daylight and Sunlight

This letter is to provide clarification to our daylight and sunlight report dated 16 July 2015 that accompanied the planning application for Templar House, Holborn following representations made from residents within 47-51 Eagle Street.

At the time of writing the July 2015 report, no information regarding the internal room configuration for 47-51 Eagle Street was available and as such, and in line with common practice, assumed room uses and layouts were used. However, following representations, we have been provided with a room layout for a first floor flat within Eagle Street and have therefore used this to clarify the report. We would however confirm that this flat does not look directly at the site but have no reason to doubt that the layouts for the flats facing Eagle Street are the same.

It is also important to clarify that the internal room layout has no bearing on the Vertical Sky Component or (VSC) or Annual Probable Sunlight (APSH) assessments as the reference point for testing is the centre outside face of the window under assessment. Therefore, the results for these will remain the same regardless of changes made to the room usage or layout.

Our previous analysis assumed that the windows directly beneath the projecting balconies served living rooms and that the adjacent windows served bedrooms. Assuming that the layouts are the same as the floorplan obtained from estate agent's marketing websites, this configuration switches so that the bedrooms become the living rooms and the living rooms become bedrooms.

### Clarification of Results

Contained within Appendix 1 are the revised numerical tables for Daylight (Vertical Sky Component and No Sky-Line) and Sunlight (Annual Probable Sunlight Hours).

Firstly, the ground floor of 47-51 Eagle Street can be discounted as it is in commercial use and therefore not considered to be a sensitive user in accordance with the BRE Guide.

The residential accommodation is located between First and Fourth Floors and the windows serve Living Rooms and Bedrooms. Balconies providing private amenity space protrude from the evaluation and there is access to the Bedroom and Living Room. We have assessed a total of five Living Rooms and five Bedrooms at each floor level making a total of 40 rooms assessed.

Firstly, it should be noted that all of the bedrooms assessed, a total of 20 rooms, do not meet the suggested target values for daylight due to the fact that the majority of these are heavily recessed under projecting balconies and as such the windows receive virtually no daylight or sky visibility. The loss of daylight to these rooms is recorded as 0 or 0.5% Vertical Sky Component which is a level so low that it would not be noticeable by an occupant to the room. These bedrooms should therefore be discounted as there is no impact to the daylight and sunlight amenity.

With respect to the Living Rooms, a total of seven rooms are fully adherent to the BRE Guide. Of the 13 that are not, 9 Living Rooms retain Vertical Sky Component values of between 0.78 and 0.73 times the former Vertical Sky Component value. The BRE Guidance suggests that if a window retains 0.8 times the former daylight value then the loss of light would not be noticeable. All but two of these rooms retain more than 0.8 times the former No Sky-Line value and as such, we consider that 16 of the Living Rooms would not notice a change to their daylight as a result of the proposed development.

The four remaining Living Rooms, all located in the vertical file of windows to the east of the building, see losses to the Vertical Sky Component of between 44% and 50% from the existing values. However, when one assesses the actual absolute loss to the Vertical Sky Component, losses of between 5 and 8.5 VSC points are recorded. The already low Vertical Sky Component values mean that losses to the Vertical Sky Component result in large percentage changes. The first floor room will also retain more than 0.82 times the former No Sky-Line value and the second floor room will also retain 0.75 times the former value.

We would therefore consider that with respect to daylight, there will be a noticeable moderate/major impact to two of the 40 windows assessed within this building. However, when considering the dense city centre location of the development, it is – in our opinion – acceptable and the residual daylight values are consummate within the urban context.

With respect to sunlight, of the 40 windows assessed, 36 fully adhere to the BRE Guidance. Of the four that do not, these are Living Rooms located to the east of the building and directly opposite the site. From reviewing the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours table at Appendix 1, these windows retain Annual Probable Sunlight Hours values of between 13% and 22% Annual Probable Sunlight Hours. Given the fact that Eagle Street is narrow, any meaningful massing of the site will result in transgressions away from the BRE and we consider the losses to be acceptable.

With respect to sunlight amenity on the balconies to 47-51 Eagle Street, we do not need to assess these as part of the daylight and sunlight study as the height of the balustrades means that the floor area of the balcony cannot receive sunlight in the existing condition. Although the balustrades are solid, daylight consultants always treat the glass as a solid obstruction due to the fact that an occupant can place furniture and planting up to the glass face thereby causing an obstruction.

In summary and to clarify, the analysis for Daylight and Sunlight for 47-51 Eagle Street has identified that four living rooms within the building will experience a reduction to the daylight and sunlight that would be considered noticeable. However, when one considers the urban context and the fact that losses of daylight are not dissimilar to other city centre developments, we consider the transgressions away from the BRE guide to be acceptable.

Yours sincerely,  
For and on Behalf of GIA,



Anthony Harris  
Partner  
[anthony.harris@gia.uk.com](mailto:anthony.harris@gia.uk.com)