AnsteyHorne

Our ref: RC/EK/ROL00366

Mark Adams
Appleyard & Trew
36 Long Acre
London WC2E 9SZ

14 February 2020

Dear Mark

Re: (ROL00366) Proposed development at Souvenir Press Building, 43 Great Russell Street – lift shaft in isolation

Thank you for meeting my colleague, Lance, and I on site yesterday. It was good to discuss the proposals for the above site.

I have set out below my initial thoughts with regard to the proposed lift shaft, which replaces the current dumb waiter structure and the new proposed plant. It is our understanding that the lift shaft will move out towards the rear boundary with 44 Great Russell Street and will sit upon the current boundary wall. The lift shaft will also reach towards the southern boundary of 43 Great Russell Street with 33 Coptic Street and will reach a height slightly above the current chimney stack height. Our assessment of the likely impacts has been based on our judgement by eye, using our knowledge and experience in similar matters. No technical study has been undertaken for this matter.

Daylight and sunlight (planning)

BRE Report 209, Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide to good practice (second edition, 2011) gives advice on designing development to achieve good daylighting and sunlighting in new buildings and to retain it in existing surrounding buildings.

The BRE method of assessment involves calculating the effect of the development on:

i) The 'vertical sky component' (VSC) which assess the daylight available at the centre of the windows;

ii) The area of working plane inside the room with a view of sky (this is known as the 'no-sky line' method or the daylight distribution method). This assess the daylight levels within a room;

iii) We then move onto sunlight where the percentage of 'annual probable sunlight hours' (APSH) at the centre of the windows is calculated, both annually and in winter; and

iv) The proportion of each garden or amenity space that can receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March.

In broad terms, the BRE guide works on the principle that if existing levels of daylight or sunlight will be reduced to less than 0.8 times their former values – i.e. exceeding 20% relative loss – the impact will be noticeable to the occupants.

The guide states it can be applied to any existing non-domestic buildings where the occupants have a reasonable expectation of daylight, i.e. schools, hospitals, hotels and offices, or have a special requirement for sunlight. However, in our experience, most local authorities usually only apply it to surrounding residential properties, nursing homes, schools and the like.

Likely Impacts

A plan showing the location of the adjacent properties and approximate distances from the proposed structure to these properties has been included in the appendices of this report.

<u>44 Great Russell Street- nearest property</u>
This building is on our client's eastern boundary and has windows to the rear of the property which will see the proposed lift shaft. There are windows that face south, and there are also windows that face east on the return of the building extension. Having looked on the VOA website, it appears as though this property is in commercial use, therefore, we will not test this property for planning analysis.

AnsteyHorne

33 Museum Street - this property is on the other side of the courtyard

There are windows that are located to the rear of 33 Museum Street, and the VOA website confirms residential council tax records for this building. This bank of windows looks towards the lift shaft, however, from external inspection when stood on the roof, it appears that these windows light a stairwell. The BRE guidelines state that it is only habitable rooms that need be tested in residential buildings, and therefore we would be able to scope these out of our analysis. There is a small window at ground floor level that is offset from the central bank of windows. Again, it is likely that this room is non-habitable, however, if it transpired that this room were nonetheless habitable and required analysis, we do not think that the impacts would be such that we would transgress the BRE guidelines, as light would still be received around the sides of the proposed lift shaft.

Courtyard to the rear of Great Russell Street

There are a number of windows that are located within the courtyard area, these being skylight windows which appear to light large rooms spanning the width of buildings and also some which receive light from multiple directions. We therefore do not believe these windows would be impacted in terms of their daylight and sunlight. There are some amenity areas again within the courtyard, and these may receive some reduction in sunlight, however, the proposed lift shaft would only cause a minor reduction in sunlight and as the sun passes round the narrow proposal, the sunlight would be restored. We therefore do not believe this impact would be such that it would transgress the BRE guidelines.

32 Coptic Street

Moving to the south of the site, there is a building extension which we believe belongs to 32 Coptic Street, which is a light brick in colour and appears to be in residential use. This extension has some tall but narrow windows that look north-west towards the lift shaft proposal. However, because of the distance from the proposed works and the fact that they would receive light over the rest of the courtyard, we do not think that the proposed lift shaft would have a material impact on these windows.

42 Great Russell Street – this property is across the street

Moving to the property on the corner of Great Russell Street and Coptic Street, this is in residential use. Because of the distance of the proposed massing from the residential windows of this property, it is unlikely that any of the windows or rooms to this building would be materially impacted beyond that of the BRE guidelines.

Planning Summary

In summary, therefore, we do not believe that there should be any planning impacts that should trouble the planning officers for the lift shaft and plant proposal. Each of the residential properties considered are likely to be far enough away from the proposed massing to not be materially impacted. Additionally, the level of proposed massing is likely to amount to a small obstruction relative to what massing currently exists and the existing light levels enjoyed.
If you would like to discuss any of the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

Rebecca Chapman

Rooftop – Daylight & Sunlight Study

Linear Distance from Proposed Lift Shaft:

42 Great Russell Street – 13.42 m

44 Great Russell Street – 0.96 m

32 Coptic Street – 9.4 m

33 Museum Street – 22.1 m

0 ——— 10 m