

13th October 2013

Mr David Eaves
Development Control
Civic Offices
Havant
Hants
PO9 2AX

Dear Mr Eaves,

APP/13/00857: 37 NORTHNEY ROAD, HAYLING ISLAND, PO11 0ND

I am in receipt of the objection letter dated 21/09/13 by Mr & Mrs Smith of No 36 Northney Road regarding the above application. Their letter raises concerns as to the impact the proposed extension to No 37 Northney Road would have on day lighting to their own property, specifically the 2 kitchen windows located under the car port.

To provide some clarity on this matter, I attach A4 drawing 1306/2050/PI which shows the section across the rear parts of No 36 and 37 as proposed.

Planning guidance requires that new buildings and extensions should follow the guidance of the BRE "Site Layout planning for Daylight and Sunlight – a guide to good practice". The 2nd edition of the guidance considers the specific problem of poor levels of day lighting to an existing window situated under a balcony (in this instance the carport is the equivalent of a "translucent" balcony) and Para 2.2.11 of the guide states:

"Existing windows with balconies above them typically receive less daylight. Because the balcony cuts out light from the top part of the sky, even a modest obstruction opposite may result in a large relative impact on the VSC (Vertical Sky Component), and on the area receiving direct skylight. One way to demonstrate this would be to carry out an additional calculation of the VSC and area receiving direct skylight, for both the existing and proposed situations, without the balcony in place. For example, if the proposed VSC with the balcony was under 0.8 times the existing value with the balcony, but the same ratios for the values without the balcony was well over 0.8, this would show that the presence of the balcony, rather than the size of the new obstruction, was the main factor in the relative loss of light."

Thus, the consideration of day lighting to the kitchen windows of No 36 should be considered as if there were no car port, as it would be iniquitous were the addition of a car port to one property prejudice a reasonable small scale extension to the adjoining property.

In considering the impact of the proposed extension on daylighting to the kitchen windows, the BRE guidance further states in Para 2.2.4 that:

“Loss of light to existing windows need not be analysed if the distance of each part of the new development from the existing window is three or more times its height above the centre of the existing window. In these cases the loss of light will be small. Thus if the new development were 10m tall, and a typical existing ground floor window would be 1.5m above the ground, the effect on existing buildings more than $3 \times (10 - 1.5) = 25.5\text{m}$ need not be analysed.”

In the case of Nos 36 and 37 Northney Road, the relevant distance would be $3 \times (2.545 - 1.637) = 2.724\text{m}$. As the new wall is 3.076m from the window, no further analysis is necessary – any undue loss of daylight would be due to the carport rather than the proposed extension.

The above comments apply equally to the proposed wall to the entrance courtyard, however as this would be no more than 2m in height it would in any event be allowed under permitted development.

I would be grateful if you would contact me should you require any further information in determining the application.

Yours sincerely

Jim Garland RIBA

For and on behalf of Jim Garland Architects Ltd

Cc Ms McCabe, Mr & Mrs Smith
