

Alice Brown  
AAB architects  
Studio 9, Bickerton House  
25 Bickerton Road  
London  
N19 5JT

12 Dorrington Street, London EC1N 7TB  
t: +44 (0)20 7061 1100  
f: +44 (0)20 7061 1101  
e: info@surveyors-valuers.com  
www.surveyorsvaluers.co.uk

24<sup>th</sup> May 2019

Dear Ms. Brown,

**Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Response to Objection to Development at  
125 Arlington Road**

I refer to the neighbour objection based upon the impact of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing to 127 Arlington Road following the proposed development at 125 Arlington Road.

Concern has been raised to the accuracy of our report and the tolerances allowed; We would be happy to send Anstey Horne our model to check the accuracy to either confirm or contradict any discrepancies they have suggested. The tolerances that have been stated within our report are provided by our third party operators; as such we have detailed the tolerances that they have allowed for, where necessary the measurements and model have been adjusted so that it accurately reflect the built environment; some consideration and leniency should however be allowed due to the nature of the development i.e the developing party is not a commercial developer who is doing this for profit but to simply improve the quality of their home.

In addition to this the sunlighting levels have been considered to the Living Room Kitchen Diner, as the report states we are unable to inspect 127 internally as such we have relied on floorplans which could be found on public records (estates agents databases; planning applications, etc), which is typical and within the expectations of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing assessments (I enclose the floor plan in which Anderson Wilde and Harris used for our assessment).

Anstey Horne comments have been formulated as if the lower ground room was a Living Room, the floor plan shows that it is a Living Room Kitchen Diner. The BRE states under 3.2.3 'to assess loss of sunlight to an existing building it is suggested that all main living

rooms of dwellings, and conservatories, should be checked if they have a window facing within 90° of due south. Kitchens and bedrooms are less important'. This implies that providing the main living room (for 127 Arlington Road on the ground floor) allows for ample sunlighting to recur then secondary rooms, such as the Kitchen Diner, require less attention. The Kitchen Diner on the lower ground floor is subject to reductions nonetheless being that the room type does specifically require assessment and that it is situated on the lower ground floor (which imposes additional restrictions), the losses to winter months falls within acceptable levels for 'inner city areas'.

Lastly, I refer to the queries regarding the amenity space 'A1'. There has been an administration error in which the label has fallen behind the image, I enclose an updated contour. Essentially the assessment considered the patio on its own and an average consisting of reductions caused if all garden space was taken from a single height of 1.5m. The BRE does not state how sloping or stepped gardens should be assessed therefore we assessed 'A1' on its own and 'A1 and A2' at a single height. This explains why there are two contour hatches on 'A1' and why there may be some confusion with the rendered image, which has been assessed as the patio only. Where the 'purple' will cast its shadow, the wall is the result of a trellising being in place, In our assessment we wished to depict the trellising in the model, but there is no requirement to assess this again as per the BRE. I refer to 3.3.10 '...Where low fences or walls are intended, or railings or trellises which let through sunlight, no calculation of shadows is required.' This explains why there is a purple shadow cast, in reality it will allow for sunlight to penetrate through.

I would have to disagree with Anstey Horne's comments, although the BRE does state that the amenity space should retain 50%, this is generally not the case, I refer to one of Anstey Horne reports in Camden in which they allow for the amenity to achieve 0.8 of its original value, we would expect there to be at least some consistency with their commenting and report writing. In addition to this the reduction that occurs is only 6%, equating to a 1.2 sq.m reduction, in practical terms this a de-minimis are unlikely to be noticed or considered useable.

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'FC' with a stylized flourish.

**Felix Carter BA(Hons)**  
ROL Surveyor – Team Manager

M: +44 (0) 7557 477 309  
T: +44 (0) 20 7061 1100