

ARCHITECT'S STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY REVISED PLANNING DRAWINGS

1. South Elevation. At the request of Havant Borough Council significant changes have been made to the Ferry Road elevation which they viewed as not sufficiently "active" in the form originally submitted. The projecting oriel window at first floor level is now larger and an oiled iroko ventilation panel has been introduced to improve passive ventilation to the master suite and to add colour and animation. At ground floor level additional iroko paneling has been introduced on the east flank of the recessed front entrance. These changes, together with additional details of proposed materials are shown on the revised drawings. We believe that these changes strengthen the design, achieve a more active elevation and improve the relationship with the street.

2. Daylight, Sunlight and amenity. Although Havant Borough Council expressed no concerns in this regard in their pre-application report or in subsequent communications in order to address concerns expressed our client commissioned GIA to undertake an assessment of the proposals in respect of Daylight and Sunlight in accordance with BRE guidelines. The conclusion is *"The current proposal has no impact on the daylight and sunlight of The Deck House or any other residential property. We therefore find the proposed development acceptable in terms of daylight and sunlight."* The report accompanies this statement.

3. Privacy. In the light of comments received and at the request of Havant Borough Council significant changes have been made to the submitted design to minimise potential overlooking at the rear of Deck House from the proposed external spiral stair and first floor terrace. The spiral stair has been removed from its prominent position and replaced by a straight flight stair discreetly located on the west flank away from the more sensitive north elevation. In addition the first floor terrace has been shortened by a metre by moving the north wall of the single storey volume 1m to the south. These changes are shown on the revised drawings. The east flank of the terrace is set back by some 4.5m from the boundary with Deck House to minimize potential overlooking. This is in distinct contrast to the rear first floor terrace of Deck House which is only about 1.5m from the boundary. This close proximity is addressed by the careful positioning of the proposed two storey volume which screens the neighbouring terrace and prevents direct overlooking. The orientation of the house and proposed terrace has been designed to take advantage of sunlight from the south and west and harbour views to the north and west. The design of the proposed house is carefully considered in response to Deck House to ensure there is no significant loss of amenity by overlooking and to establish a comfortable relationship between the two houses within the site constraints. We strongly believe that these changes strengthen the design and significantly improve the relationship with Deck House.

4. Planting. Havant Borough Council requested that a statement be provided in support of the proposed planting in response to requests by the owners of Deck House that existing holly trees and privet boundary hedge be retained on the Tamarisk site.

The proposed house is set toward the eastern side of the site to achieve a primary requirement of the design brief that launching access from Ferry Road via the slipway is maintained. In addition we aimed to achieve a comfortable separation between the two houses and allow access along both sides so the distance of the proposed house from the east boundary broadly mirrors that of Deck House. These constraints together with the established north-south building lines dictated the relatively long and narrow proportions of the proposed house and required the removal of the two small holly trees and much of the planting along the east boundary.

In accordance with the submitted drawings it is proposed to replace the existing hedge on the east boundary with a low maintenance timber boarded boundary fence. The positions of both the existing hedge and holly trees together with the other site constraints are such that were these to be retained the carefully considered proposed design would not be viable. The holly trees are relatively small, of low quality and value and positioned in the centre part of the site where a new dwelling is logical. The hedge lies on the west side of the boundary fence and to retain it whilst maintaining side access would mean shifting the house a metre or so to the west which would prevent use of the slipway.

Photo 1 below shows the holly trees and privet hedge and, beyond the hedge, a timber boundary fence and the west flank of Deck House. Sketch 1 below shows the proposed footprint (as originally submitted) superimposed on the existing site plan (as submitted) with the holly trees coloured red.

The design brief also required extensive hardstanding for cars, boats and associated kit, outdoor seating and a low maintenance garden with robust planting and landscaping to suit the unique location. Section 12.0 of the submitted Design & Access Statement together with drawing 1505-PP-150 (Proposed Site Plan) set out carefully considered, appropriate, high quality landscape and planting proposals and a "suburban" privet boundary hedge requiring regular cutting does not fit the overall vision for the site. Our landscape and planting proposals are in accordance with the Ecological Assessment by ECOSA which was submitted with the Application.

It is noted that the southern part of the Deck House site consists entirely of concrete hardstanding for cars, boats, trailers and so on with little or no planting, the house is built right up to its eastern boundary with Spindrift with no opportunity for planting and is located about a metre or so from the west boundary with Tamarisk providing side access but little opportunity for planting. Under these circumstances it seems inconsistent to argue that planting of low value on the adjacent Tamarisk site should be retained.

PHOTO 1





By Email

R Butler Esq.
John Pardey Architects
Beck Farm Studio
St Leonard's Road, East End
Lymington
Hampshire
SO41 5SR

DATE / REF

10/02/2016

RC/10506

ADDRESS

THE WHITEHOUSE
BELVEDERE ROAD
LONDON SE1 8GA

CONTACT

TEL 020 7202 1400

FAX 020 7202 1401

MAIL@GIA.UK.COM

WWW.GIA.UK.COM

Dear Richard,

Re: Tamarisk, Ferry Road, Hayling Island, Havant

GIA have been instructed to produce an assessment with regards to Daylight and Sunlight in line with the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines for a proposed residential building along Ferry Road, Hayling Island.

The proposed scheme consists of a new two-storey detached residential property, following demolition of the existing single-storey building. The proposed building will be set back further from the water than the current building, bringing it generally in line with a neighbouring residential property to the east (The Deck House).



Figure 01 – 3D Sketchup model of the proposed scheme

Daylight and Sunlight

We have identified one property that, due to its proximity to the development, is most susceptible to any changes in daylight and sunlight they will receive if the proposed is built. This is The Deck House, Ferry Road, adjoining the site to the east. See Figure 02 for the location of this property.



Figure 02 – The development site in relation to the surrounds

The BRE guidelines state that only habitable rooms, such as kitchens, lounges and bedrooms, are relevant for assessment with regards to daylight and sunlight. Other room uses such as utility spaces and bathrooms are not considered habitable and can be discounted.

From site photos, we have identified two site-facing windows on the western façade of The Deck House that could potentially be affected by the proposed scheme, one on the ground and the other on the first floor. From floor plans obtained through the Havant Borough Council planning department, the two rooms that these windows serve have both been identified as bathrooms, and are therefore not relevant for assessment under the BRE guidelines. Please see Appendix 02 for these floor plans and a site photo referencing the windows.

All other rooms in The Deck House will not be affected in terms of daylight and sunlight, due to having no site-facing windows serving them.

Conclusions

The current proposal has no impact on the daylight and sunlight of The Deck House or any other residential property. We therefore find the proposed development acceptable in terms of daylight and sunlight.

Kind regards,

Yours sincerely
For and on behalf of GIA

Roger Cole
Surveyor
roger.cole@gia.uk.com

enc Appendix 1-2

gia

Appendix 01

*Principles of Daylight
and Sunlight*

Principles of Daylight and Sunlight

Background

The quality of amenity and open spaces is often stipulated within planning policy for protection or enhancement and is often a concern for adjoining properties and other interested parties.

Historically the department of environment provided guidance in the issues, and in this country, this role has now been taken on by the building research establishment (BRE), the British standards institutions (BSI) and the chartered institute of building services engineers (CIBSE). Fortunately they have collaborated in many areas, to provide as much unified advice as possible in the form of industry best practice.

Many local planning authorities consider daylight and sunlight an important factor for determining planning applications. Policies refer to both the protection of daylight and sunlight amenity within existing properties as well as the creation of proposed dwellings with high levels of daylight and sunlight amenities.

In terms of considering what is material local authorities typically refer to the BRE guidelines and apply their criteria set out within. The guidelines were originally produced out in 1991, but superseded by the BRE guidelines (2011) *site layout planning for daylight and sunlight*.

Where developers are seeking to maximise their development value, it is often in the area of daylight and sunlight issues that they may seek to push the boundaries. Particularly in London, there is a priority on the creation of more housing and thus resulting in the densification of urban areas. Local authority vary in their attitude of how flexible they can be with the degree of impact on the daylight and sunlight amenity enjoyed by neighbouring owners and it is one factor among many planning aspects considered when determining an application. In city centres where high density is common, the protection of amenity is more challenging and there are many factors that need to be taken into account: each case has to be considered on its own merits.

The BRE Guidelines

The guidelines are typically referred to for daylight and sunlight amenity issues, however they were not intended to be used as an instrument of planning policy. In the introduction of 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight (2011)', section 1.6 (page 1), states that:-

"The guide is intended for building designers and their clients, consultants and planning officials. The advice given here is not mandatory and this document should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy. Its aim is to help rather than constrain the designer. Although it gives numerical guidelines, these should be interpreted flexibly because natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout design (see Section 5). In special circumstances the developer or Planning Authority may wish to use different target values. For example, in an historic city centre, or in an area with modern high rise buildings, a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings".

Again, the paragraph 2.2.3 (page 7) of the document states:-

"Note that numerical values given here are purely advisory. Different criteria may be used, based on the requirements for daylighting in an area viewed against other site layout constraints".

Principles of Daylight and Sunlight

The numerical criteria suggested by the BRE are therefore designed to provide industry advice/guidance to plan/design with daylight in mind. Alternative values may be appropriate in certain circumstances such as highly dense urban areas around London, for e.g. The approach to creating alternative criteria is detailed within Appendix F of the BRE.

Measurement and Criteria for Daylight and Sunlight as set out in the BRE Guidelines

The BRE guidelines state that they are;

"intended for use for rooms in adjoining dwellings where daylight is required, including living rooms, kitchens and bedroom. Windows to bathrooms, toilets, garages need not be analysed."

They are therefore primarily designed to be used for residential properties however, the BRE guidelines continue to state that they may be applied to any existing non-residential buildings where there may be a reasonable expectation of daylight including; schools, hospitals, hostels, small workshop and some offices.

Daylight

In the first instance, if a proposed development falls beneath a 25 degree angle taken from the centre point of the lowest window, then the BRE suggests that no further analysis is required as there will be adequate sky light (i.e. sky visibility). This rule is applied when considering the scope of any assessments.

The BRE guidelines provide two methods for calculating daylight to existing surrounding properties:

- Vertical Sky Component (VSC)
- No Sky Line (NSL) also referred to as daylight distribution

A further method, the Average Daylight Factor (ADF) is provided for calculating daylight within proposed properties. However, it is sometimes applied as a supplementary assessment for existing surrounding properties.

Each method is described below:

Vertical Sky Component

Methodology


This is defined in the BRE as:-

"Ratio of that part of illuminance, at a point on a given vertical plane that is received directly from a CIE standard overcast sky, to illuminate on a horizontal plane due to an unobstructed hemisphere of this sky."

This statement means, in practice that if one had a totally unobstructed view of the sky, looking in a single direction, then just under 40% of the complete hemisphere would be visible. The measurement of this vertical sky component is undertaken using two indicators, namely a skylight indicator and a transparent direction finder.

Principles of Daylight and Sunlight

Alternatively a further method of measuring the VSC, which is easier to understand both in concept and analysis, is often more precise and can deal with more complex instructions, is that of the Waldram diagram.



The point of reference is the same as for the skylight indicator, at the centre of the outward window face. Effectively a snap shot is taken from that point of the sky in front of the window,

Principles of Daylight and Sunlight

before and after the obstruction is put in place together with all the relevant obstructions to it, i.e. the buildings.

An unobstructed sky from that point of reference would give a vertical sky component of 39.6%, corresponding to 50% of the hemisphere, and therefore the purpose of the diagram is to discover how much sky remains once obstructions exist in front of that point.

Criteria

The BRE Handbook provides criteria for:

- (a) New Development
- (b) Existing Buildings
- (c) Adjoining Development Land

- (a) New Development

Paragraph 2.1.21 of the BRE states that:

"Obstructions can limit access to light from the sky. This can be checked by measuring or calculating the angle of visible sky 'theta', angle of obstruction or Vertical Sky Component (VSC) at the centre of the lowest window where daylight is required. If VSC is:

- at least 27% ('theta' is greater than 65 degrees, obstruction angle less than 25 degrees) conventional window design will usually give reasonable results.
- between 15% and 27 % ('theta' is between 45 degrees and 65 degrees, obstruction angle between 25 degrees and 45 degrees) special measures (larger windows, changes to room layout) are usually needed to provide adequate daylight.
- between 5% and 15% ('theta' is between 25 degrees and 45 degrees, obstruction angle between 45 degrees and 65 degrees) it is very difficult to provide adequate daylight unless very large windows are used.
- less than 5% ('theta' less than 25 degrees, obstruction angle more than 65 degrees) it is often impossible to achieve reasonable daylight, even if the whole window wall is glazed."

- (b) Existing Buildings

Para 2.2.21 (page 11) of the BRE states:

"If any part of a new building or extension measured in a vertical section perpendicular to a main window wall of an existing building, from the centre of the lowest window, subtends an angle of more than 25 degree to the horizontal, then the diffuse daylighting of the existing building may be adversely affected. This will be the case if the vertical sky component measured at the centre of an existing main window is less than 27%, and less than 0.8 times its former value".

The VSC provide a quick and simple test which looks to give an early indication of the potential for light at the window face. However considered in isolation, it does not, in any fashion, indicate the quality of actual light within a space. It does not take into account the window size, the room size or room use. It helps by indicating that if there is an appreciable amount of sky visible from a given point there will be a reasonable potential for daylighting.

Principles of Daylight and Sunlight

(c) Adjoining Development Land


Paragraph 2.3.10 of the BRE guidelines states:

"in broad general terms, a development site next to a proposed new building will retain the potential for good diffuse daylighting provided that on each common boundary:

- (a) no new building, measured in a vertical section perpendicular to the boundary, from a point 1.6m above ground level, subtends an angle of more than 43 degrees to the horizontal;*
- (b) or, If (a) is not satisfied, then all points 16m above the boundary line are within 4m (measured along the boundary) of a point which has a VSC (looking towards the new building(s)) of 17% or more 2m above ground level are within 4m (measured sideways) of a point which has a vertical sky component of 27% or more.*

Alternative VSC criteria as per Appendix F of the BRE guidelines

The 27% VSC target criteria is based upon a sub-urban type environment whereby a 25 degree line was taken from the centre point on a ground floor window as shown below:



However, in city centre locations and urban areas where density levels are increasing, these values may not be considered appropriate. The BRE guidelines provide that *"different targets may be used based on the special requirements of the proposed development or its location"* (paragraph F1).

Appendix F of the BRE suggests several approaches as to how alternative targets may be considered including:

- Consented scheme – use of an extant planning permission to establish alternative benchmark criteria for VSC and APSH. It is not appropriate to treat a permitted scheme in the same manner as an existing building and allow a 20% reduction beyond this. If the levels of daylight and sunlight retained are similar to a previously consented scheme then it follows these levels should be considered acceptable again, notwithstanding other planning considerations.
- Mirror massing – to ensure a development matches the height and proportions of existing buildings, the VSC and APSH targets could be set to those of a mirror image of the same height and size, an equal distance away from the boundary (paragraph F5).

Principles of Daylight and Sunlight

- Consider surrounding context and existing obstruction angles as well as spacing to height ratios.

In addition, due to the requirements for external amenity space within local planning policies, many residential buildings are served by balconies. Balconies can restrict the view of the sky dome whereby even the modest obstruction may result in a large relative impact on the VSC. The BRE guidelines therefore provide that an assessment can be carried out comparing the levels of VSC with and without the balconies in place for both the existing and proposed scenarios, to establish whether it is the presence of the balcony or the size of the new obstruction that is the main factor in the loss of light (paragraph 2.2.11).

No Sky Line

Methodology

The NSL method is a measure of the distribution of daylight at the working plane within a room. The 'working plane' means a horizontal 'desktop' plane 0.85m in height for residential properties. The NSL divides those areas of the working plane which can receive direct sky light from those which cannot. If a significant area of the working plane lies beyond the NSL (i.e. it receives no direct sky light), then the distribution of daylight in the room will be poor and supplementary electric lighting may be required.

It is similar to the VSC approach in that a reduction of 0.8 times in the area of sky visibility at the working plane may be deemed to be noticeable. It is however, very dependent upon knowing the actual room layouts or having a reasonable understanding of the likely layouts.

It is assessed by plotting the area of a room which can see the sky and which cannot, referred to as the NSL contour or daylight distribution contour. The contours assist in helping to understand the way the daylight is distributed within a room and the comparisons of existing and limitations of proposed circumstances within neighbouring properties. Like the VSC method, it relates to the amount of visible sky but does not consider the room use in its criteria, it is simply a test to assess the change in position of the No Sky Line, between the existing and proposed situation. It does take into account the number and size of windows to a room, but does not give any quantitative or qualitative assessment of the light in the rooms, only where sky can or cannot be seen.

Criteria

BS 8206 Part 2 (para 5.7) that the:

"uniformity of daylight is considered to be unsatisfactory if a significant part of the working plane (normally more than 20%) lies behind the no-sky line".

Therefore, it is implied that an NSL of at least 80% would be considered satisfactory in regards to deep rooms which are lit by windows on one side, the BRE Guidelines state (para, 2.2.10):

In regards to the alteration as a result of a proposed development or obstruction the BRE provide that the daylight may be adversely affected if *"the area of the working plane in a room which can receive direct skylight is reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value."*

Principles of Daylight and Sunlight

Average Daylight Factor

Methodology

The Average Daylight Factor (ADF) is defined within the 2011 BRE Guidelines as:

'a ratio of total daylight flux incident on a reference area to the total area of the reference area, expressed as a percentage of outdoor luminance on a horizontal plane, due to an unobstructed sky of assumed or known luminance distribution'.

Whilst the BRE guidelines provide this measure as a tool to understand daylight within proposed dwellings not existing dwellings, if room layouts are known it can provide a useful supplementary measure of daylight and is often requested by many local authorities.

The ADF method of assessment considers:

- The diffuse visible transmittance of the glazing to the room in question (i.e. how much light gets through the window glass). A transmittance value of 0.8% is assumed for single glazing and 0.65% for double glazed windows;
- The net glazed area of the window in question;
- The total area of the room surfaces (ceiling, walls, floor and windows); and
- The angle of visible sky reaching the window(s) in question

In addition, the ADF method makes allowance for the average reflectance of the internal surfaces of the room and of external obstruction (assumed to be 0.5 unless otherwise stated).

Criteria

The criteria for ADF is taken from the British Standard 8206 part II which gives the following criteria based on the room use:

- Bedroom – 1% ADF
- Living room – 1.5% ADF
- Kitchen – 2% ADF

Where a room has multiple uses such as a living kitchen diner (LKD) or a studio apartment, the highest value is taken so in these cases the required ADF is 2%.

Sunlight

Methodology

The BS 8206 part 2 (section 5.2) states that:

"Provided that the entry of sunlight is properly controlled, it is generally welcome in most buildings in the UK. Dissatisfaction can arise as much from the permanent exclusion of sunlight as from its excess. The provision of sunlight is important in dwellings, particularly during winter months. Sunlight is especially valued in habitable rooms used for long periods during the day."

Principles of Daylight and Sunlight

Sunlight is measured using a sun indicator which contains 100 spots, each representing 1% of Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH). Where no obstruction exists the total APSH would amount to 1486 hours and therefore each spot equates to 14.86 hours of the total annual sunlight hours.

The number of spots is calculated for both the whole year and also during the winter period (21st September to 21st March) prior to an obstruction and after the obstruction is put in place. This provides a percentage of APSH for each of the time periods for each window assessed. The 2011 BRE Guidelines note that:

- *"In housing, the main requirement for sunlight is in living rooms, where it is valued at any time of day, but especially in the afternoon."*
- *"all main living rooms of dwellings...should be checked if they have a window facing within 90° of due south. Kitchens and bedrooms are less important, although care should be taken not to block too much sun"; and*
- *"If the main living room to a dwelling has a main window facing within 90° of due north, but a secondary window facing within 90° of due south, sunlight to the secondary window should be checked."*
- *"...a south facing window will, in general, receive most sunlight, while a north facing one will receive it only on a handful of occasions. East and west facing windows will receive sunlight only at certain times of day".*

When a room has multiple windows, not all may have a southerly orientation however, these windows may contribute to the levels of sunlight within a given room even if by 1-2% APSH. As well as the assessment on a window basis the BRE guidelines provide that an assessment can be undertaken on a room basis.

Whilst the emphasis of the BRE guidelines is in regards to living rooms, it is not always possible to determine the room uses within all of the properties assessed and therefore typically all windows or all rooms with windows facing within 90 degrees of due south and facing the site are assessed.

Criteria

The BRE provide that for existing buildings a window maybe adversely affected if a point at the centre of a window receives:

- Less than 25% of the APSH during the whole year, of which 5% APSH must be in the winter period; and
- Receives less than 0.8 times its former sunlight hours in either time period; and
- Has a reduction in sunlight for the whole year more than 4% APSH.

In terms of the assessment on a room basis the criteria applied is the same.

For proposed buildings the BRE provide (paragraph 3.1.15) that a dwelling or building which has a particular requirement for sunlight will appear reasonably sunlit provided:

- At least one main window faces within 90 degrees of due south; and

Principles of Daylight and Sunlight

- Centre of one main living room window can receive 25% of APSH including 5% APSH in the winter months.

It continues that where groups of dwellings are planned the layout should aim to maximise the number of living rooms that meet the above recommendations.

Overshadowing

As well as daylight and sunlight amenity to neighbouring dwellings, planning policy often refers to the levels of overshadowing to amenity areas such as parks, public squares, playgrounds etc. The BRE guidelines provide two methods of calculation in regards to overshadowing which are as follows:

Sun Hours on Ground

Methodology

This method of overshadowing assessment uses the sun on ground indicator to determine the areas which receive direct sunlight and those which do not. This method applies to both new and existing areas of amenity space. The BRE Guidelines suggest that the Spring Equinox (21st March) is a suitable date for the assessment as this is the midpoint of the sun's position throughout the year. Using specialist software, the path of the sun is tracked to determine where the sun would reach the ground and where it would not.

Criteria

The BRE guidelines recommend that at least half of an amenity space should receive at least 2 hours of direct sunlight on March 21st. In regards to existing spaces where the existing sunlit area is less than half of the area, the area which receives 2 hours of sunlight should not be reduced by more than 20% (it should retain 0.8 times its former value).

Transient Overshadowing

The BRE guidelines suggest that where large buildings are proposed which may affect a number of gardens or open spaces, it is useful to plot a shadow plan to illustrate the location of shadows at different times of the day and year. For the purpose of this assessment, shadow has been mapped at the following times of the year:

- 21st March (spring equinox)
- 21st June (Summer solstice)
- 21st December (winter solstice)

The September equinox is not assessed as this would provide the same results as those for March 21st.

For each of these dates the overshadowing is calculated at hourly intervals throughout the day however some images may not be present given the early sun set during the winter period.

The BRE guidelines do not provide any criteria for transient overshadowing. Therefore the analysis provides a description of where additional shadow is cast as a result of a development with professional judgement to determine the

Principles of Daylight and Sunlight

Light pollution and Solar Glare

Light pollution is defined as any light emitting from artificial sources into spaces where it is not wanted for example from offices into neighbouring residential properties where it could cause a nuisance. The ILP Guidance notes provide details of how to measure light pollution and criteria based on the urban density of the respective area to determine the acceptability of the light levels.

Solar glare is particularly important at pedestrian and road junctions as well as along railway lines where the glare can cause a temporary blinding of drivers or pedestrians. Glare can occur from reflective materials such as glazed areas or metal cladding on the facades. This assessment is therefore undertaken from viewpoints surrounding the site at junctions and positioned at the driver's eye level. Focal points are dictated by the location of signals or oncoming traffic.


Other Amenity Considerations

Daylight and sunlight is one factor among many under the heading of residential amenity considerations for any given development design or planning application; others include:

- outlook
- sense of enclosure
- privacy
- access to outdoor space e.g. balconies or communal garden/courtyard

Appendix 02

Floorplans and Site Photo



GROUND FLOOR PLAN

HOUSE @ FERRY ROAD, HAYLING ISLAND - FOR MR & MRS STEWART


MAKE A: AS INDICATED. DN 20.03/04

REF: RM12/03-2/1A 8.01/04

MINOR
ATTENDMENT

23 MAR 2024

RECEIVED



WAC A: AS INDICATED. The 26.03'04

REF: BM 12.02-2/2A 8.01.04

REF: BM 17.03-2/2A

9.0104

