

To Ms A Taylor
Hampstead Hill School
London
NW3 2PP

By email: andrea@hampsteadhillschool.co.uk

Our ref. 41949/IM/nms
Date 31 July 2015

Dear Mrs Taylor

Proposed Development at Royal Free Hospital (the Hospital) (LB Camden Planning Reference Number 2014/6845/P) and Hampstead Hill School (the School) - Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing

I have now reviewed the letter dated 16 January 2015 from eb7 addressed to Simon Myles at Savills, which responds to the points raised in my letter to you dated 12 December 2014. I have also seen Simon Myles' email to Charles Thuaire at LB Camden.

In relation to eb7's letter I would comment as follows.

The trees referred to are deciduous species. These filter light in the summer and provide dappled shade, which is considered to provide pleasant amenity value and is better than the solid shade caused by buildings. In addition, during the winter months when light is at a premium, the trees are bare and filter out little daylight and sunlight. This is therefore a much better position than the solid opaque proposed structure that will limit light to the school windows all year round.

In relation to the garden classrooms, while these do have windows on the northern elevation, these cannot receive sunlight due to their orientation and therefore sunlight amenity is only available via the southern windows that the proposal will affect.

Malcolm Hollis LLP
140 London Wall, London, EC2Y 5DN
T 020 7622 9555 **F** 020 7627 9850 **W** malcolmhollis.com

Ian McKenna
Partner
DD 020 7627 6005 **M** 07767 886 040 **F** 020 7627 9850 **E** ian.mckenna@malcolmhollis.com

Malcolm Hollis LLP, a Limited Liability Partnership. Registered in England and Wales number OC314362. Registered office: 5 Brooks Court, Kirtling Street, London SW8 5BP. VAT number 863 8914 80. A list of members is available from our registered office. Regulated by RICS.

In the second substantive paragraph, eb7 claim that because the daylight distribution figures for the school meet the BRE criterion, the rooms 'will be adequately lit'. I do not agree with this statement for the following reasons. The daylight distribution test simply determines which part of the room can see visible sky and which cannot. Therefore, it does not consider the amount of light in the room and it cannot therefore follow that meeting the distribution test implies that an adequate volume of light will be available. The adequacy of light in a room in terms of illumination is measured using the average daylight factor (ADF) test. British Standard BS8206 Part 2: 2008 states that for a room to be have a predominantly day lit appearance, the ADF should be at least 2%. It goes on to say that for electric lighting not to be needed during the daytime, an ADF of at least 5% should be achieved. Levels between 2% and 5% will usually require electric lighting during the day. In this case, five of the seven rooms tested have ADF values below 2% and therefore it cannot be said that the room will be adequately lit.

Regarding the play spaces between the garden class rooms and the main school building, these should have been assessed to determine whether the proposed structure has an impact. The existing garden rooms are to the south and so will cause some existing shading, however as they are single storey this will be limited. It remains to be seen whether the much taller proposed building creates an impact to these play spaces.

In relation to the final substantive paragraph which refers to the 25 degree rule, I agree that the use of computer modelling will usually yield a more detailed study, however in this case; the garden class rooms which fail the 25 degree test have not been included in the computer model based analysis. The use of the 40 degree rule, which the applicant seems to be placing reliance on here, is not considered appropriate in this instance as this obstruction angle is meant for close grain urban locations such as mews developments usually where there is some correlation between the heights of the proposed and existing buildings. Here there is no such type of location or height equality. .

In relation to the email to Charles Thuaire, I disagree with the final statement that 'good levels of daylight and sunlight' will continue, for the reasons stated above, namely that the ADF results for the School are generally low and the garden class rooms and play spaces have not been assessed.

Yours sincerely

Ian McKenna
Malcolm Hollis LLP