

McClue, Jonathan

From: Rebecca Mair [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 July 2017 17:31
To: McClue, Jonathan
Subject: 195 - 199 Grays Inn Road_Planning Submission_Daylight
Attachments: AP.10.1 Daylight to LGF Windows.pdf; AP.10.2 Daylight to UGF Windows.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Jonathan,

We have considered the objection below and respond as follows:

- 1) The assertion that the memo is based on provisional designs is incorrect. The memo clearly states that the assessment is based on Section drawings AP.08.01-03 which are the sections submitted for approval
- 2) To the rear , the rationale behind the modelling of the bulk remains the same as in previously schemes: The existing wall is retained at the existing height and the roof form pitches away from the rear boundary at a shallow angle . In terms of daylight access to adjacent windows, the angle of the pitch and distance of the apex from the window are the critical factors not the maximum height of the apex itself.
- 3) The full daylight assessment which accompanied the previous application was done in excess of the requirements set out in the BRE guidance document "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight"
- 4) Section 2.1 of this guidance provides that, where an obstruction (new development) is relatively wide and at a uniform distance from a subject window the daylight access to that window can be assessed by establishing the angle of unobstructed sky, measured in section from a horizontal plane at the centre line of the window . It states that where the Unobstructed Sky Angle is greater than 65% (Obstruction Angle less than 25%) conventional window design will usually give adequate access to daylight .
- 5) It should be noted that the assessment treats the obstruction as a continuous plane ignoring the positive contribution of diffuse light available at the edges of the development

Upper Ground Floor Windows 4-6 Mecklenburgh Street

- 6) Attached drawing AP.10.02 demonstrates that the proposed development does not encroach beyond the 25 degree line and that the change in the angle of unobstructed sky is negligible.
- 7) Plans lodged on the online register under planning application 2003/1519/L indicate that the subject windows serve a room of approx. 10m² . At 2.2m² glazed area the subject window is of a good size constituting 22% of the floor area of the room.
- 8) These facts indicate that daylight access from the upper ground floor would remain at acceptable levels

Lower Ground Floor Windows 4-6 Mecklenburgh Street

- 9) Attached drawing AP.10.01 demonstrates that the Unobstructed Sky Angle measured from the centre of the lower ground floor windows is the same after development as before. There is therefore no negative impact resulting from the proposal.
NB. The section shows a window as per property No.s 5-6. No. 4 comprises a patio door in place of a window which would improve on the situation demonstrated in the provided drawings.

Could I please also clarify the situation regarding the increase in height. The scheme iteration comprising 3no shop fronts was viewed favourably in terms of design and conservation. This scheme has a front façade at 4.9m height and 4 no. pilasters at 5.2m. In the current proposed scheme, the height of the frontage along the pavement edge is lower at 4.7m with the piers between bays kept below this height. The slight increase in height of the setback roof

element cannot be seen from most vantage points at street level. We would suggest that the bulk of the new proposal is therefore different from, but broadly comparable to, that of the shop front scheme.

I hope that this deals with the outstanding query. We will wait to hear if the Access Officer is satisfied also.

Kind Regards,
Rebecca