



By Email

Paul Cook
Dukelease
22 Old Bond Street
London
W1S 4PY

DATE / REF

19/10/2016
EH/9109

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 Paul,

Re: 156 – 164 Gray’s Inn Road and 55 Gray’s Inn Road

GIA have been asked to comment on the 6 October 2016 letter of objection made by Temple Bright who act for the owner of 55 Gray’s Inn Road, regarding the redevelopment of Panther House. It is only the light issues raised within this letter that are being responded to here.

It should be noted that the letter comments on the possible rights to light impact to The Property. As rights of light is a private legal matter between a developer and an owner of the right to light within The Property, it should form no consideration on the part of the local authority. Therefore, no further comments will need to be provided on the objections raised on this matter.

As stated within the GIA daylight and sunlight report dated 12 May 2016, there are daylight impacts within the residential units at 55 Gray’s Inn Road that are beyond the suggested levels set out in the BRE guidelines. However, all windows and rooms would retain levels of daylight that could be considered high and commensurate with other instances in an urban location such as this. All windows retain Vertical Sky Component (VSC) values of 18% or more, which is slightly less than the suggested 27%. All rooms would retain a view of the sky to over 52% of the room area following construction of the proposed scheme.

It is important to note that the BRE guidelines are, to quote: *“not mandatory”* and *“although it gives numerical guidelines, these should be interpreted flexibly”*. The BRE criteria is based on a suburban model and given Panther House’s urban location, it is unreasonable to expect the same levels of daylight as one would expect in a suburban location.

The proposed frontage increases in height to match its neighbours. The BRE guidelines note that *“where there is an area with modern high rise buildings, a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if the new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings”*.

At present, 55 Gray’s Inn Road is benefiting from higher levels of daylight than other properties along Gray’s Inn Road due to this break in streetscape at 156 – 164 Gray’s Inn Road. By implementing the proposed scheme, the daylight levels will remain at levels similar to other properties along Gray’s Inn Road and reflective of the local urban environment.

The letter states that an Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) test was not undertaken for the almost due east elevation of the property. GIA have reviewed this and the elevation in question is orientated to an elevation plane of a north easterly direction. Therefore, given the orientation of the windows in this elevation, an APSH test is not required as the BRE states that only windows within 90 degrees of due south should be assessed.

I trust this answers all queries raised in the letter. Please let me know if you have any further queries.

Kind regards,

Yours sincerely
For and on behalf of GIA

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Elizabeth Houghton', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Elizabeth Houghton
Associate Partner
elizabeth.houghton@gia.uk.com