

Niall Tutton
Robert Tutton Town Planning Consultants Ltd
293 Havant Road
Farlington
Portsmouth
Hampshire
PO6 1DD

Date: 24 April 2023
Planning Ref: APP/22/01182
Our Ref : kc/3414/15321

Dear Niall

**Proposed Development at 4 Privett Road, Waterloooville, Havant, PO7 5HJ
Response to Objections Received (Dated 28/03/2023)**

In November 2022 we issued our final revision of the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment that had been undertaken to examine the impacts of the proposed development on the daylight and sunlight enjoyed by the neighbouring properties. In March 2023, further information on the neighbouring properties was provided by Thorns Young Architectural and the assessment report was updated accordingly.

Herrington Consulting Limited

All of our assessments are carried out in line with the guidance document published by the Building Research Establishment, entitled 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight - A Guide to Good Practice', Third Edition, 2022. In support of this we also reference current planning policy for each specific location along with other recognised industry guidance.

Canterbury Office
Units 6 & 7
Barham Business Park
Elham Valley Road
Barham
Canterbury
Kent CT4 6DQ

Tel 01227 833855

This letter provides a response to the points relating to daylight and sunlight raised in an objection letter dated 28th March 2023.

London Office
Unit 52.11 Woolyard
52 Bermondsey Street
London
SE1 3UD

Points of objection raised regarding No. 6 Privett Road

1) *'The use of the guide if calculations are to be made, relies on the knowledge of use of rooms and their sizes and layouts and the accurate sizing of any windows. This latest report makes the same assumptions. On Page 13 paragraph 8, it refers to habitable rooms having been identified. Then goes on to say or best estimates of room layouts and uses, which negates any further use of the prolific calculations and their assumptions of the effects of the proposals on neighbouring properties. It falls down straight away!'*

www.herringtonconsulting.co.uk

In response to this objection, it has been considered useful to first provide three relevant extracts taken directly from the BRE Guidance on Site layout and planning for daylight and sunlight – A guide to good practice (BR209 2022). These are as follows:

- a) 2.2.3 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. Another important issue is whether the existing building is itself a good neighbour, standing a reasonable distance from the boundary and taking no more than its fair share of light.
- b) 2.2.10 Where room layouts are known (for example if they are available on the local authority's planning portal), the impact on the daylighting distribution in the existing building should be found by plotting the no sky line in each of the main rooms. For houses this would include living rooms, dining rooms, and kitchens; bedrooms should also be analysed although they are less important. In non-domestic buildings each main room where daylight is expected should be investigated.
- c) 2.2.12 The guidelines above need to be applied sensibly and flexibly. There is little point in designing tiny gaps in the roof lines of new development in order to safeguard no sky lines in existing buildings. If an existing building contains rooms lit from one side only and greater than 5m deep, then a greater movement of the no sky line may be unavoidable'.

In response to the original comment, the window sizes and dimensions have been provided by Thorns Young Architectural, and these dimensions have been backed up by photographic information and estate agent drawings where possible. Whilst it has not been possible to obtain the room layouts and dimensions within No. 6 Privett Road, the room layouts have been based on a worst-case scenario, assuming the rooms are habitable and to a reasonable depth without gaining the benefit of a secondary window on a different façade. The BRE guidelines fully recognise that it is not always possible to obtain internal layouts from all neighbouring properties and in such cases, assumptions must be made. However, if the occupant of this property would like to provide detailed internal dimensions, room uses and images of their property in order for the daylight assessment to be as accurate as possible, we would readily welcome this.

Given that the dimensions of the rooms within 6 Privett Road are considered to represent a worst-case and they currently show full compliance with BRE Guidance when applying the No Sky Line test, it is considered very unlikely there would be a noticeable reduction in the distribution of daylight as a result of the proposed development.

Lastly, as stated in paragraph 2.2.3 of the BRE Guidance, it should also be taken into account whether a neighbouring property is set a reasonable distance from the shared boundary and the windows/rooms are not taking more than their fair share of light. For example, if a neighbour relies significantly on daylight availability from an existing development site, whilst the neighbouring building constrains the view from its own windows, this should not hamper potential development on the development site.

2) 'It should be noted that the only area on the sketches in the report (Appendix A.1 Scheme Drawings), relating to Privett Road, that a use designation is wrong. It is shown as a 'Hall' but is in fact a porch/Conservatory which is also used to 'bring on' plants all through the year and to allow delicate plants protection from frost during the winter months. This ability to use this area for that purpose would be seriously affected'.

On page 31 of the Daylight & Sunlight Assessment report in Appendix A.2, the room 'R1' in 6 Privett Road has been labelled as a 'Hallway' as from site images it can be seen that this room is a small entrance to the property. This room has been re-labelled in the assessment report as a 'porch'. However this is still

considered a non-habitable room and this does not change the conclusions of the report. This room is not large enough for any seating, a table etc and from provided images, it appears to be thin in width (maximum 1.5m), comparable to a standard hallway.

Despite the non-habitable nature of this room, it should again be considered that this room is relying on light across the development site, whilst the windows are significantly overhung by the first floor of its own building.

Yours sincerely



Katherine Collie

Associate Director

Daylight & Sunlight Sector