



Our Ref: AR/sy/17401

18 August 2017

Ms K Smith
Planning Officer
Regeneration & Planning
London Borough of Camden
5 Pancras Square
London N1C 4AG

Dear Ms Smith

**10B Wavel Mews, London NW6 3AB
Daylight and Sunlight Review**

In accordance with instructions, I have reviewed the daylight and sunlight report prepared by Right of Light Consulting submitted on behalf of Brickson Construction Limited for the redevelopment of 10B Wavel Mews, London NW6 3AB. This review is undertaken on behalf of the London Borough of Camden. We have been asked to review the daylight, sunlight and overshadowing assessment to advise on the suitability of the methods of assessment, the criteria used for the study and the conclusions derived from those criteria and the results obtained. This is to assist the Council in understanding the technical conclusions of the report, and the implications of these results on planning policy.

This review does not extend to a detailed technical analysis. We have not constructed a 3D computer model nor run our own calculations. This report assumes that the study undertaken by the applicants is accurate and simply reports on the results and the conclusions and recommendations given.

London Borough of Camden Requirements

The London Borough of Camden requires that the assessment of daylight and sunlight effect should be undertaken in accordance with Camden Planning Guidance CPG6 and by reference to the Building Research Establishment (BRE) report "Site Layout Planning for Daylight & Sunlight : A Good Guide to Good Practice 2011". The scope of the assessment should include those windows/rooms in the existing neighbouring properties to the development which are likely to be affected by that development (as defined in the BRE Guidance). These will principally be main habitable rooms to residential properties.

For daylight, the following parameters should be calculated:

1. Vertical sky component (VSC); and
2. No skyline/contour (NSL)

These should be used as the primary methods of measurement and should be presented on an absolute scale followed by a comparative scale measuring the percentage reduction.

Average daylight factor (ADF) can also be calculated. This should be presented on an absolute scale for testing the adequacy of proposed new dwellings and can also be submitted to supplement, but not in place of, VSC and NSL for measuring the impact on neighbouring properties. In calculating the ADF values, the input variables for glazing transmittance, reflectance values and frame correction factors should be agreed with the London Borough of Camden beforehand.

For sunlight, the Applicant should calculate the annual probable sunlight hours (APSH) for windows of main habitable rooms of neighbouring properties that face within 90° due south and are likely to have their sunlight reduced by the development massing. The results should be presented on an absolute scale followed by a comparative scale measuring the percentage reduction.

For the shadow assessment, gardens to residential properties and public amenity areas should be assessed. The BRE report suggests that for a garden or amenity area to appear adequately sunlit throughout the year, at least half of the area should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March. If as a result the new development and existing area which can receive direct sunlight on 21 March does not meet the above and is reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value, then this further loss of sunlight will be significant.

Appropriate Standards

I have reviewed the methodology and significance criteria set out in the daylight sunlight and overshadowing report. I agree with the methodology. The report sets significance criteria for the daylight and sunlight assessment that we agree with. This applies to VSC where VSC is reduced to less than 27%, to NSL, and to APSH where the APSH is reduced to less than 25% and/or less than 5% in the winter months.

- Reduction of 0% of 20% negligible impact
- Reduction of 20% to 30% minor adverse impact
- Reduction of 30% to 40% moderate adverse impact
- Reduction of more than 40% major adverse impact

This criteria should however be considered by reference to the overall impact on an individual dwelling or block of dwellings rather than necessarily related to one window alone.

Where I have expressed an opinion on impacts in this report, it is by reference to these criteria, as they apply to buildings as a whole or in relation to individual parts of the buildings.

Daylight – VSC and NSL

The daylight report includes a table with the vertical sky component results. This shows that there is very little impact on daylight to the neighbouring properties and in most cases there is little, if any, reduction in direct sky visibility. This applies to both the VSC and NSL results and as a result the scheme proposal is fully compliant with planning policy.

Sunlight – APSH

The report includes a table of sunlight results. For most windows there is no change in annual or winter sunlight hours and where changes do occur these are very small. In any event, all windows are left with annual and winter sunlight hours above the recommended minimum level so are compliant regardless of reductions in sunlight that take place.

Overshadowing

Shadow results have been provided for the properties at 11, 13, 15 and 17 Acol Road. Shadow plots have been produced showing the area of each of these gardens that is able to receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March at present and also shows the area that can see that sunlight once the development is complete. There is effectively no change to the area that can see two hours of sunlight in respect of 11 and 17 Acol Road. At 13 and 15 Acol Road there is a reduction in the area able to receive that sunlight but the reduction is 20% from existing at No. 15 and 11% from existing at No. 13. The required standard is therefore met.

One of the planning objectors raised a question about whether the computer model used for the analysis has correctly assessed the existing garden wall to 15A Acol Road. This is on the basis that the boundary wall at 15A Acol Road is not uniform in height but is lower at the eastern end and therefore allows a better access of sunlight than a modelling exercise which show based on a uniform height of wall. The information provided with the planning application is not

sufficient to identify the height of wall that has been used but I understand that the daylight consultant and scheme architect have visited the site and confirmed that the computer model does include accurate measurements.

Conclusion

The daylight and sunlight report shows full compliance with daylight and sunlight standards and little practical impact on the levels of daylight and sunlight that will be received.

The report shows compliance with shadowing to the gardens.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Alistair Redler', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Alistair Redler BSc FRICS

Senior Partner

Alistair.redler@delvapatmanredler.co.uk