



BROOKE VINCENT + PARTNERS

CHARTERED BUILDING SURVEYORS, ENTERPRISE HOUSE, THE CREST, LONDON NW4 2HN

London Borough of Camden  
Planning Services  
C/o Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London  
WC1H 9JE

Our Ref: JC/RMM/500

Date: 21 November 2016

**For the attention of Mr Michael Cassidy**

Dear Sirs

**5-17 Haverstock Hill, London NW3 2BP – Planning Reference 2016/3975/P**

I act for Ms Dawn Kravitz, the owner of 8 Eton Place, Eton College Road. This ground floor flat is sited almost immediately adjacent to the development site and the majority of its windows look directly towards the development site.

Ms Kravitz is concerned that this development would be the cause of an adverse effect to her daylight and sunlight, which would be contrary to Camden's policies as further detailed below.

**Policy CS5 – Managing the Impact of Growth and Development**

The Council will protect the amenities of Camden's residents, and those working in and visiting the Borough by:

- e) Making sure that the impact of developments on their occupiers and neighbours is fully considered;

**Policy DP26 – Managing the Impact of Development on Occupiers and Neighbours**

The Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The factors we will consider include:

- c) Sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels.

It has been noted that one of the documents submitted with the planning application is a daylight and sunlight report, produced by Point 2 Surveyors dated July 2016. You will be aware that for some weeks, I have been seeking the window plan that is not included in the Daylight and Sunlight report, and this renders the report meaningless. There are many pages of results under the heading of Eton Place and windows/rooms have been given a reference or designation, but there is no means of identifying a location for each reference.



**RICS**

Directors: David Sirman MRICS Andrew Cornick BSc(Hons) MRICS Consultant: John Carter FRICS  
Brooke Vincent + Partners is the trading name of Brooke Vincent Limited, a company  
Registered in England and Wales No. 6009355. Registered address as above

I have also sought this information directly from Point 2 Surveyors but again, without success. I am forced to ask why not?

I have inspected my client's flat and considered the proposed development in relation to the existing buildings at 5-17 Haverstock Hill. It is possible that I have understood which results refer to Ms Kravitz's flat but for the reasons I have already explained, I cannot be certain.

I make no reference to the bathroom window as this serves a non-habitable space. However there are living room, kitchen and bedroom windows that face the development and these would undoubtedly be affected by a loss of light.

Such is the enlargement of the proposed development in relation to the existing buildings at the junction of Eton College Road and Adelaide Road, that by reference to the VSC values (daylight at the face of the window), the front living room window would receive an 18.22% reduction in light. This is close to the allowable reduction of 20%, as defined by BRE Guidelines. However, the second living room window, which directly faces the proposed development, has a loss of 44.46%. This is more than double the allowable limit and taken overall there will be an adverse effect to the daylight serving this room. This is further confirmed by the ADF calculation (a more comprehensive daylight appraisal than VSC). Although not recommended by BRE for use with neighbouring buildings, the ADF result shows that the value for the living room, at 1.2% in the proposed condition, would be substantially less than the BRE recommended value of 1.5%.

In the kitchen, the VSC value is reduced by 26.37%, which is substantially greater than the allowable figure of 20% and there would be an adverse effect. This is further confirmed by the ADF value which is reduced to 0.9%, compared to the recommended value of 2.0%.

In the bedroom that faces the proposed development, the VSC value will be reduced by a very substantial 36.02%, almost double the loss that would define an adverse effect. This is very serious.

Very large percentage losses follow through to the analysis of daylight distribution within each room. The results confirm losses of 31.1% and 26.3% for the kitchen and bedroom respectively, both of which, once again, confirm an adverse effect.

The Sunlight Analysis reveals a total of sunlight to the kitchen, which would be a real loss of amenity and an almost total loss of sunlight to the bedroom.

The proposed building is sited nearer my client's flat and will be to a greater height than the existing building. These two factors create a sense of enclosure and inevitably reduce daylight. As we have seen, these facts are also the cause of a total loss of sunlight availability to the kitchen and very nearly a total loss to a bedroom.

There really can only be one conclusion. If this development is approved, it would have a major effect on the amenity of both daylight and sunlight to my client's flat. This is entirely at variance with the two policies that are intended to protect a neighbour's amenity, including daylight and sunlight.

A further outcome would be the greater sense of enclosure that this development would cause to Flat 8. With all these adverse factors, I trust that your report to committee will recommend refusal.

Yours faithfully

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of John Carter.

John Carter FRICS  
For and on behalf of  
Brooke Vincent + Partners

A black rectangular redaction box covering contact information.