**From:** Thuaire, Charles
**Sent:** 24 June 2019 13:41
**To:** Planning
**Subject:** FW: Condition 15: 2019/0711/P - lighting strategy

objection

Charles Thuaire
Senior Planner

Telephone: 020 7974 5867

**From:** Karen Beare [redacted]
**Sent:** 24 June 2019 13:30
**To:** Thuaire, Charles [redacted]
**Subject:** Re: Condition 15: 2019/0711/P - lighting strategy

Charles

We noted on Tuesday 18th June - just last week - two new documents were uploaded to the planning portal.

We would point out - once again - the following list of anomalies and a fundamental false assumption made in the two RSK reports. It would suggest this Condition cannot be safely discharged and would urge the Council to go back once again to this Applicant to revise and amend the proposals in keeping with the setting of the development site.

**1. RSK Letter dated 18th June 2019.**

This letter wrongly states the former building has been demolished. Not true.

But interestingly, contrary to the assertions by Oakbridge in the Demolition Condition 14, and as stakeholders would expect, RSK confirm the site is ecologically connected to adjacent areas including Hampstead Heath and likely to support assorted wildlife. Which of course we now know to be true.

We also note the maximum light sources should provide not more than 1 lux at the site boundary which is the equivalent to the light of a full moon.

**2. RSK Lighting Impact Assessment dated 19th June 2019.**

**On Page 3 in Point 3: Site Location RSK wrongly states "The site border has a number of trees forming a natural barrier to any artificial light that may spill [as a result of new project lighting] beyond the site to the North, South towards the Heath and to the West.**

**The consequence of not having any mature trees left along the site borders is that the impact of the 100 artificial lights proposed will be much higher at sensitive receptors as stated in 4.3. Particularly as the entire modelling for the site was carried out at site borders that were at the time heavily wooded with lush vegetation that is no longer exists.**

**This is a fundamental error.**

**It shows this was a theoretical desk study written up in June 2019 vs a more recent and accurate site visit. The site has been entirely cleared since March 2019. RSK should know this and should have modelled its software accordingly. The actual site visit on which all RSK assumptions are based was carried out on 31st October 2018, 8 months prior to all the trees being felled (except 5 bordering FP).**

It is not clear where the cumulative impact of the total number of actual decorative lights proposed (circa 100 in the rear garden) has been modelled by RSK , even if they are LED low lights, in the context of absolutely no natural barrier to artificial light along the N.S & S borders. The latter is of particular concern as it is in the direction towards the Kenwood Ladies Pond and Bird Sanctuary Pond, which is one of the most sensitive ecological locations in North London.

It is not acceptable to base a lighting strategy, such as this, on such a factually incorrect assumption. Common sense tells us the cumulative impact of 100 artificial lights, let alone complex lighting software using incorrect base line data, will create unacceptable light pollution in such an ecologically sensitive area in breach of the National Planning Policy Framework. This Condition should therefore be refused unless the Applicant revisits the proposals to make them more appropriate for this location as the NPPF demands.

Thank you.

Karen
Chair FPRA

> On 4 May 2019, at 18:58, Karen Beare [redacted] wrote:
>
> Charles
>
> I am following up on the 5 conditions that FPRA commented on on 20 March 2019.
>
> I note there are no further documents uploaded for this Condition 16, relating to a lighting strategy.
>
> In particular we note that "**Point 4: Recommendations for Further Work by the Applicant's advisors themselves in Condition 14,** Bats - A suitable lighting strategy should be prepared and implemented within the site to protect retained features suitable for commuting and foraging bats" has not been done.
>
> As we have already pointed out the Lighting strategy fails to address any wildlife, let alone the resident bat population of the area.
>
> Please can you let us know when the Council is hoping to receive outstanding information from the Applicant.
>
> Thanks
> Karen

On 21 Mar 2019, at 01:49, Karen Beare [redacted] wrote:

Charles

FPRA has the following concerns regarding Condition 15:

On page 3, RSK wrongly states the site border has a number of trees forming a natural barrier to any artificial light that may spill beyond the site to the North, South (to the ecologically sensitive pond in No55) or West. The site clearance has already been completed and I can confirm there are only a handful of trees having been retained. In fact we can see directly into the site from our property despite our being two houses from the site.

It is noted in the report analysis that no mention is made of the potential impact on ecology and wildlife of the surrounding area of the pond and towards the Heath. We note in Appendix F there are more than 70 lights proposed, many of which are to be located in the rear garden. Given the area supports a bat population (as determined at neighbouring No55), let alone numerous other wildlife, no consideration has been given to the impact of quite so many lights metres from the Heath.

It is also noted there is expected to be considerable light spillage toward the front of the house along Fitzroy Park directly opposite Sunbury which is unacceptable. We have also been unable to ascertain from the plans if the external lift shaft will also be lit as initially intended. This would also be unacceptable.

We would respectfully request this report is revised and the full ecological impacts of any increase light spillage considered before discharging this condition 15. As a courtesy I have copied Bob Warnock into this email given the potential impact on the Heath of increased lighting at this site.

Kind regards
Karen
Chair FPRA