

John Sheehy
Senior Planning Officer

LB Camden

5 Pancras Square
London N1C 4AG

18th May 2021

Dear John,

RE: THE PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT OF 14-19 TOTTENHAM MEWS, 10 TOTTENHAM MEWS & 11-12 TOTTENHAM MEWS – DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT

In response to comments received from the occupants of No. 10 & 11-12 Tottenham Mews, Point 2 have undertaken property inspections and further technical analysis to quantify the potential Daylight and Sunlight effects to these buildings. The findings in this letter are supplemental to and should be read in conjunction with our November 2020 report.

Point 2 have been granted access to following properties:

- 10 Tottenham Mews (whole building)
- Flat 1, 11-12 Tottenham Mews (lower ground and mezzanine)
- Flat 2, 11-12 Tottenham Mews (lower ground and mezzanine)
- Flat 3, 11-12 Tottenham Mews (first floor)
- Flat 4, 11-12 Tottenham Mews (first floor)
- Flat 5, 11-12 Tottenham Mews (second floor)
- Flat 7, 11-12 Tottenham Mews (third floor)

We were unable to inspect Flat 8 which is located on the top floor of 11-12 Tottenham Mews. Our previous analysis appended to the submitted November 2020 report confirms the effects to this property are compliant with the BRE Guidelines. We were also unable to access Flat 6 and therefore, our analysis remains based on the floorplans previously obtained for this property.

We have updated our Daylight and Sunlight analysis to reflect the survey information collected during our site inspections. The analysis also accounts for the recent changes to the proposed layouts that have been made to the submitted scheme in response to comments received from Officers. The most relevant to our studies is the reduced footprint of the top floor of accommodation.

We have assessed the effects to No. 10 and 11-12 Tottenham Mews against both the existing baseline condition and the 2012 consent. Detailed schedules of results of both assessments are included within Appendix 2 of this letter.



17 SLINGSBY PLACE
LONDON | WC2E 9AB

Summary of Findings

11-12 Tottenham Mews

Generally speaking, the internal arrangement of the flats at 1st-4th floors do not materially differ from the plans we relied upon to undertake our assessment in the November 2020 report. The VSC and APSH results to these properties remain very similar to those previously calculated as they are measured at the centre of the window and are independent of the room layout behind the window. The enclosed schedule of results contain figures for each of the windows assessed. There are some very minor improvements which are associated with the reduced footprint to the top floor of the proposed scheme however, these are considered to be negligible.

There are far more notable improvements in the NSL results which arise from a combination of the rooms being slightly smaller than we had originally modelled (our November 2020 assessment was based on scaled PDF drawings which have been updated to survey measurements), developing a detailed understanding of the floor levels within the building, window sill heights and the reduced footprint of the top floor of the scheme.

In respect of the Existing v Proposed condition assessment, the NSL results for the flats at 1st-4th floor are summarised in the table below. Where the effects breach the NSL criteria, i.e where there is more than a 20% alteration, the effects have reduced by between 5-17%. The effects remain noticeable, as they would have been for the 2012 consent, albeit they are less than originally reported in our November 2020 report. To avoid duplicating our commentary on these results, we refer you to pages 20-22 in the November report for the detailed explanation.

Flat No.	Roof Ref	Room Use	% change Pre-Inspection/November 2020 report	% change Post-Inspection
Flat 3	R1/41	LKD	68.8	59.0
Flat 4	R2/41	LKD	60.3	49.8
Flat 4	R3/41	BEDROOM	64.8	59.2
Flat 5	R1/42	LKD	61.7	46.3
Flat 6	R2/42	LKD	59.2	45.0
Flat 6	R3/42	ASSUMED_BEDROOM	62.0	57.0
Flat 7	R1/43	LKD	18.2	17.3
Flat 7	R2/43	BEDROOM	58.1	41.1
Flat 7	R3/43	BEDROOM	8.2	0.0
Flat 8	R1/44	LKD	4.0	4.5
Flat 8	R2/44	BEDROOM	0.0	0.0

Our understanding of the internal arrangements of Flats 1 and 2 at the ground floor have a greater bearing on the Daylight and Sunlight results prepared previously and are discussed in detail below.

Flat 1, 11-12 Tottenham Mews



This property is arranged over a split level. Upon entering the premises, the LKD is accessed by descending a small flight of stairs to the lower ground floor. The mezzanine is accessed by ascending a similar flight of stairs to a gym.

The LKD is served by the main window to the property which is shown in the photo below (left). The gym contains two frosted glazed openings that are set back approximate 3.5 metres from the main elevation of the building and are shown in the photo below (right).



The main window serving the LKD spans the full width of the property and is full height from the ground floor level. It measures 3.9m x3.6m and serves the LKD which is predominately 3.5m deep although a small area increases to 4.5m. The window is therefore almost as tall/wide as the room is deep/wide and in that regard, is a particularly generous window size for this room dimension.

During our inspection, we noted the window is frosted, presumably to provide privacy to the occupiers. Whilst the frosting clearly serves an important function, it will influence how the development is perceived and viewed from this property. It is not possible to clearly distinguish the skyline through frosted glass (which is essentially the VSC and NSL test) as light is enjoyed via a 'glow'.

With regards to the gym, the BRE Guidelines do not specifically recognise this as a primary habitable space for the purpose of Daylight and Sunlight assessments. The heavily recessed position of the window openings from the main façade of the building dictates that they receive zero VSC in the existing condition and will obviously do the same in the proposed. Furthermore, you cannot see any sky as the openings and main window are both frosted. Subsequently, no further consideration is given to this predominately non-habitable space.

Turning to the results of the existing v proposed condition assessment, the VSC and APSH results to the LKD remain the same as previously reported however, the NSL effect to this room has reduced from 51.6% - 41.2%. However, this result should be viewed in the context that you cannot actually see the sky through the frosted glass and so is somewhat hypothetical.

When assessed against the 2012 consent, there is less than 0.5% absolute difference in the retained VSC between the two schemes which is imperceptible. For NSL, a change of 23% remains and there is

not noticeable difference to the November 2020 report. Again, this result should be viewed in the context of the frosted glass window.

Flat 2, 11-12 Tottenham Mews

This property is arranged in a very similar way to Flat 1, save that the mezzanine level is a partitioned bedroom that is served by three frosted windows as well as a fourth window in the rear elevation of the property (see photo below, right). We previously understood the bedroom was an open mezzanine space above the LKD. The main window is of similar dimensions and is also frosted.

The heavily recessed nature of the frosted bedroom windows dictates they receive zero VSC in the existing condition and will of course do the same in the proposed. As there is no VSC reaching these openings and the glazing is frosted, no further consideration is given to this space.



The VSC and APSH results to the LKD remain the same as previously reported however, the NSL effect to this room has reduced from 30.8% - 21.4% which is only fractionally beyond the BRE Guidelines.

When assessed against the 2012 consent, there is less than 0.8% absolute difference in the retained VSC, between the two schemes which is imperceptible. For NSL, there is a change of 9.7% although, given the frosting of the main window, it is very unlikely this would be detectable by the human eye.

10 Tottenham Mews

Our inspection confirmed the room uses reflect the plans we obtained for the property, with an LKD on the 1st floor, bedrooms on the 2nd and 3rd and a living room on the 4th.

The bedrooms are slightly smaller than originally modelled as built-in wardrobes have been installed, thereby reducing the floor area of the rooms. The living room is of a similar dimension to that originally modelled.

The VSC and APSH to these rooms remain as previously reported as they are assessed independently of room layouts.

There are reduced NSL effects to all three rooms which is a combination of the reduced footprint of the top floor of the scheme, reduced room areas and a more detailed understanding of floors levels & window sill heights. The results for these rooms are summarised in the table below.

The 4th floor living room which is of course one of the main rooms in the property now meets the BRE criteria whereas previously it did not. The effects to the bedrooms continue to exceed guidance albeit the BRE Guidelines state *bedrooms are less important* at paragraph 2.2.8.

Roof Ref	Room Use	% change Pre-Inspection	% change Post-Inspection
R1/52	BEDROOM	63.3	62.5
R1/53	BEDROOM	60.5	54.7
R1/54	LIVINGROOM/BEDROOM	27.3	15.7

With regards to the 1st floor LKD, this is an unusually deep room. The living space measures 9m which extends to 11.8m when including the kitchen which is located at the rear of the room.

For the reasons stated above, the VSC and APSH to these rooms remains as previously reported as they are assessed independently of room layouts.

With regards to NSL, the existing no sky line contour only covers 24% of the room area. The BRE Guidelines state at paragraph 2.2.8;

'Areas beyond the no sky line, since they receive no direct daylight, usually look dark and glooms compared with the rest of the room, however bright outside. According to BS 8206, supplementary electric lighting will be required if a significant part of the working plane lies beyond the no sky line'.

In the existing condition, 76% of the room area lies beyond the no sky line which could reasonably be considered *significant* by reference to paragraph 2.2.8. According to the BRE Guidelines, supplemental electric lighting will be required in the existing condition to provide sufficient illuminance to this space.

The proposed development does result in a relative movement in the contour that notably exceeds the BRE recommendation (70% compared to 71% calculated previously), however it is questionable how material this change is. The front quarter of the room will not be as well-lit as it is in the existing condition however, given the depth of the room, supplemental lighting will be required in both the existing and proposed condition.

When compared to the 2012 consent, the room experiences substantially similar effects to that development.

In conclusion, our property inspections have confirmed there is generally a reduced effect upon NSL to that previously reported. VSC and APSH remain substantially similar as the assessments are independent of internal room dimensions.

In respect of the ground floor flats in 11-12 Tottenham Mews, there can be little expectation of daylight to the mezzanine level rooms as the window openings serving these spaces are significantly



set back from the main elevation of the building and they would be reliant on receiving light through two separate panes of frosted glass.

In respect of the main LKD's, they are severed by frosted glazing which will materially influence how the development is perceived and viewed.

With regards to 10 Tottenham Mews, the results are similar to those previously reported however, there are material considerations around the materiality of the effect to the 1st floor room.

Yours Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'N. Lane', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Nick Lane
Senior Director
For and on behalf of Point 2