



Our Ref: 17267/sg/SG

Date: 13<sup>th</sup> June 2017

Michael Cassidy  
Principal Planner  
Development Manager  
London Borough of Camden  
5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

**BY EMAIL ONLY** – [Michael.Cassidy@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Michael.Cassidy@camden.gov.uk)

Dear Michael,

**Application 2016/6891/P – 1-6 Centric Close, London NW1 7EP  
Daylight and Sunlight Review**

Following receipt of a secondary daylight and sunlight report prepared by GIA on 6<sup>th</sup> June 2017 I have now reviewed this and can report the findings accordingly.

In order to support some of the justification for daylight infringements GIA had previously referred to Paragraphs 2.2.11 and 2.2.12 of the BRE Guideline which provide mitigation for daylight and sunlight criteria where inherent self-obstructing constraints like projecting wings, rear extensions, recesses and balconies will inhibit the direct access of light to neighbouring windows.

This June report presents the results of an analysis discounting these self-obstructing elements from the rear of the Oval Road properties in order to support or to demonstrate the conclusions of their May report.

The June report covers a total of 10 windows within the basement and ground floors of 19, 23, 25 27 and 29 Oval Road primarily affected by these self-obstructing elements. The report also highlights the room uses served by the windows considered in this report:

**19 Oval Road**

The two windows considered serve a living room and a bedroom. GIA have discounted these two windows from the VSC analysis as they are located next to a projecting rear extension of the property which has been removed for the purposes of this analysis but as all windows within this property fully comply with the BRE assessment criteria in the May report the effect on these windows are not of any material concern. They have however been included within the sunlight APSH analyses.

**23 Oval Road**

All three windows considered serve bedrooms.

**25 Oval Road**

The two windows considered serve a bedroom and living-dining space.

**27 Oval Road**

The two windows considered serve a reception room.

**29 Oval Road**

The window considered is thought to serve a store room and so could potentially be discounted but the actual use is listed as unknown.

### **Desk Top Review of Analysis**

- The analysis presents primary daylight (VSC) and sunlight (APSH) results to individual windows only and does not consider the effects to the rooms as a whole, nor does it consider the daylight distribution analyses as the May report had previously.
- The analysis illustrates that the self-obstructing elements to the rear of the Oval Road properties is a primary factor in the major adverse nature of the previous results at basement and ground floor levels.
- The analysis illustrates that when discounting the self-obstructing elements that the retained VSC levels will remain generally in line with the upper floors of the Oval Road properties and that anticipated for an urban location of a site such as this well in excess of 15% VSC.
- The analysis illustrates that when discounting the self-obstructing elements that the resultant retained APSH levels will remain fully compliant with the BRE Guideline.
- The analysis also illustrates that whilst discounting the self-obstructing elements however, that there will remain infringements of the BRE Guidelines in terms of the reduction ratio.
- The analysis demonstrates that these infringements are minor to moderate adverse rather than the minor to major adverse findings previously reported (by reference to the significance criteria of reduction ratios previously reported) demonstrating the effect that GIA had previously adopted as justification in the May report with regard to the self-obstructing elements of building.
- The analysis demonstrates that the reception room and living diner space windows within 25 and 27 Oval Road will retain VSC levels in excess of 15% and will experience reduction ratios within 0.7 times leading to only minor adverse effects.
- The analysis also demonstrates that those rooms with retained light levels of less than 15% and with reduction ratios of between 0.68 and 0.73 times each serve bedrooms which are of less significance as they are mainly occupied at night time.

### **Summary & Conclusion**

On review of the analyses it is clear that there will be some infringements beyond the BRE Guidelines in certain areas and to the rear of the Oval Road properties in particular. Whilst some of these infringements can be credited, in part, to the inherent design elements of the neighbouring buildings themselves it is also clear that the massing of the development proposals is also a contributing factor.

This latest analysis illustrates in taking into account the design elements of the neighbouring buildings themselves that despite the reductions recorded the retained VSC and APSH levels are typical for an urban centre such as this.

The BRE Guide states that *'in special circumstances the developer or planning authority may wish to use different target values'* but it does not state what those different target values could or should be. GIA have adopted a benchmark figure of 15% which, whilst not compliant with the BRE criteria, I generally agree can be considered good for an urban location such as this.

In order to mitigate some of the effects on the Oval Road properties it may be possible to incorporate modifications to the scheme proposals although full compliance with the daylight standards is unlikely to be achieved without considered remodelling of the massing adjacent to these properties.

Nevertheless, whilst the development proposals are not fully compliant with the BRE Guide in daylight and sunlight terms the effects are considered to be such that they should not be material enough so as to significantly and adversely affect the occupation of the neighbouring residential amenity in daylight and sunlight terms.

Yours sincerely,



Stuart Gray

**Partner**

[stuart.gray@delvapartnerredler.co.uk](mailto:stuart.gray@delvapartnerredler.co.uk)